

“Unfortunately, the information that was included as part of the PRR is not necessarily surprising as it speaks to the hostile work environment that has been created by certain board members since I interviewed for the superintendent position and assumed the role. When the district was searching for a new superintendent it specifically called for a transformational leader and one that would challenge the status quo. The reality is that the majority of school board members embraced the superintendent as an agent of change; however, some did not. The change that I have implemented and have proposed to implement has been deeply resented and contested by some board members. This is sometimes done through constructive means and at other times through means that are unprofessional. The PRR reveals this to be the case through the following:

- Select board members have misused the board auditor for muckraking purposes instead of high level financial reviews
- Select board members engage former administrators to find fault with the current administration

To answer your other questions, it is not my role to determine if sunshine violations occurred. Do I believe my relationship with some board members is repairable? The most honest response to that question is that I wonder if there was ever a healthy relationship with particular board members. I have attempted and will continue to offer and participate in board development sessions and one on one meetings to build greater understanding, improve communication, and trust. I was not welcomed and resented from the beginning of my tenure by some board members. From the beginning, proper lines of governance have been a great challenge for certain board members. It was clear from the beginning of the interview process that Ms. Wright and Dr. Hall were not interested in my hiring (one did not vote for me and other stated that she preferred the other finalist, respectively). Both have not fully embraced the reform that has been deeply needed in their districts and both have resented the reform agenda and at times, the successes and additional resources that have been realized and gained. References to lower school grades will be made regarding lower performance since I assumed the superintendency; however, those references are made without acknowledging two waves of significant statewide changes to standards and assessments that have caused an increase in F and D schools throughout the state, namely with Title I schools, and the fact that several of those schools have been low performing for over a decade.

Top ranking NAEP scores and graduation rates for African-American students have been overlooked.

For some board members, voting for my original contract or the extension was done so begrudgingly based on the support of the community. This is also the case for several highly contested board agenda items that were ultimately approved on 7-0 board votes.

Ultimately, the ongoing tension between myself and certain board members reached its apex when I announced the recommended boundary changes. This, in many ways, was the height of

the reform and therefore brought about the height of resistance, namely represented by the letter of reprimand and OCR complaint.

Lastly, at no time did any of the three board members engage me personally or professionally about the content of the PRR after knowing its content for some time. ”

In a second email Vitti addressed Hall’s “Special Ed in Action” comment.

Specifically, the comment was offensive, inappropriate, and hurtful for a former educator and now public official who now represents thousands of students like me who have disabilities. I have been transparent about my dyslexia since becoming superintendent. The comment was hurtful.