

nothing those offices can do in relation to School Board Governance and that monitoring of board behavior fell on AdvancEd/SACS. I began sending evidence of unethical, what some would consider immoral, illegal behaviors to AdvancEd. I also researched as to whom to make complaints to when AdvancEd does not fulfill their role and found out that this private business holding a monopoly in the accreditation business throughout our country answers to absolutely no one. School systems simply pay thousands of dollars to be accredited and AdvancEd has no requirements to fulfill on their job performance. Last year when Mark Elgart, CEO of AdvancEd was asked by a legislative committee how much time the AdvancEd staff spends monitoring the standards over School Governance Boards, Mr. Elgart replied about 5%. Five percent of their time monitor whether school board members throughout this country are properly modeling ethical behaviors, monitoring tax payers dollars, and making sure that students are achieving. I have found it puzzling that our school system can get the top rating from AdvancEd in accreditation standards yet the majority of our schools are making C's or below on the Governor's Report Card. The discrepancy is rather wide in my opinion and I don't understand how two different groups can see the same topics of achievement, culture, etc. so differently however AdvancEd holds all the cards in making sure your elected school board members do their job and that is where I had to turn for help.

During the last two years and while **filling only a partial term** of office I spent countless hours seeking help, I have sent documentation to AdvancEd nine times, sent letters to the State Department of Education twice, had four phone calls with staff at the State Department of Education, sent a letter to the chief of staff for the Governor of Georgia, had two phone calls with staff at the Governor's office, emailed the Professional Standards Commission several times and met with city leaders twice. I have sat in Executive Sessions watching blatant violation of the opening meetings act repeatedly and finally filed a complaint with the Attorney General's office – they would like to come mediate. I have witnessed board members being ridiculed by other board members in meetings, work sessions, trainings, and in Executive Session. During the superintendent interview process, other board members brought up several times that they “thought we had decided the interim could not apply.” Ms. Smith-Carter and I asked for two months who “we” was and when we asked we were ignored. Finally at one meeting when Ms. Smith-Carter again asked who “we” was, a board member turned to her and screamed “shut-up.” Mrs. Smith-Carter called for a point of order and the chair told her to “look in the mirror.” I filed a simple assault report against a board member who tried to start an argument with me during an executive session but I refused to allow her to bait me. After the session ended, she picked up her argument and began yelling at me. As I tried to leave the room, she came at me towering over me with her hand in the air screaming at me as I was backing out of the room. Another board member stood and watched the encounter never speaking. I went and locked myself in the restroom until the board member went into the main board room to her chair and I knew I would be in the presence of the other board members and the video tape would be taping her. Sadly, these despicable behaviors are kept from the public.

I know many citizens in Hinesville have voiced opinions about the “buy out” paid to Dr. Lee upon her exit from the school system. I spoke to this in an interview with the newspaper but I want to give more specific detail so you will all understand that this was an issue that contrary to reporting of being under the advisement of the attorney was because of the lack of due process and the required training of board members to evaluate the school superintendent. October 26, **2010**, school boards where notified with a timeline of requirements to fill Senate Bill 84 requiring mandated Code of Ethics, Conflict of Interest and training of school board members. The Standard for Effective Governance of Georgia School System written by the State Department of Education requiring that school boards be **trained** to evaluate the school superintendent were also sent to school boards October 26, **2010** and the date of three months after July 1, **2011** to be in compliance was given. In **2012**, Georgia Code 20-2-210 put into law “All personnel employed by local units of administration, including school superintendents, shall have their performance evaluated **annually** by appropriately **trained** evaluators.” In June, **2015**, Ms. Carolyn Smith-Carter because of issues of mistrust between the school board and superintendent began doing research on the Georgia School Board Association website realized that our school board members had never been trained to evaluate the superintendent therefore violating the superintendent's due process rights. Board members trained with me