

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
January 10, 2017**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes- Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs- <i>Absent</i> Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Hilda Parler	Alex Quigley Eric Sanchez Tammi Sutton- <i>Absent</i> Becky Taylor – <i>Absent</i> Tony Helton Steven Walker
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Craig Tucker, Consultant Shaunda Cooper, Consultant Brian Smith, Consultant	<i>SBE</i> Martez Hill <i>Attorney General</i> Laura Crumpler <i>SBE Attorney</i> Katie Cornetto

CALL TO ORDER

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:03 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Steven Walker led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to approve the December 8-9, 2016 minutes as amended. Mr. Joseph Maimone seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

AMMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

- Due to the inclement weather, the original CSAB meeting scheduled, January 9, 2017, for January was canceled. Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS), proposed some amendments to the agenda for CSAB consideration.
- It was recommended that the application updates presentation, policy updates, and State Board of Education (SBE) updates be provided to the CSAB on January 10.
- Mr. Joseph Maimone suggested moving non-interview related items to Jan 11. The CSAB agreed with the proposed changes.

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- Dr. Townsend-Smith made a presentation providing a recap of the current status of the application process. Following the presentation, she provided a brief overview of each applicant group including its evaluation feedback, proposed enrollment over five (5) years, proposed county, and mission of the proposed school.
- The CSAB commenced with Policy and Performance Committee application reviews for 16 of 38 applicants proposing to open in August 2018. Following each review/clarification opportunity, the CSAB made recommendations on which applicants will be recommended for an interview opportunity before the full CSAB at its regularly scheduled February 2017 meeting.

Bishop George W. Brooks Academy

- Two board members the Chair and Vice Chair were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC) led by Mr. Quigley discussed each section of the application to determine items needing clarity and to decide if the applicant would be forwarded to interview.
- Specifically, there were concerns with the education plan and its lack of clarity. Mr. Walker had questions on the ELL plan and the at risk students as those components were vague. Overall the education plan contained many terms; however, the plan needed additional detail. Mr. Walker commented that not much thought was placed into developing the facility or lunch plans or with the at-risk student components of the application. The application felt rushed and possibly the due diligence was not conducted before submitting the application. Ms. Reeves confirmed the sentiments of Mr. Walker regarding the education and facility plans. She commended the experience of the board which contained members with a mission focus but was concerned that the plan has not been fully developed.
- Mr. Walker pointed out his concerns with the financial plan by year as projected in the application.
- Mr. Walker thought there was a lot of positive things with the application; however, there was a reference to another applicant group (Next Generation Academy) in the application. Questions were raised on if the applicant had truly evaluated its enrollment size given they projected running a small school; however, based on the numbers projected in the application, the school would be large.

- Additionally, background checks came back clean; however, Mr. Walker conducted an additional check and uncovered concerning information. Mr. Quigley summarized there were a variety of fails with the application. The PC questioned the board members present on the discipline plan provided in the application. The member present explained the plan and communicated that a zero tolerance approach does not work and its plan was to use a restorative discipline approach.
- Mr. Walker commented that there were are a lot of good ideas for the applicant group to build on in the future. Mr. Helton drilled the lunch plan provided in the application. The chair of the proposed school outlined the board's thinking as they developed the plan. Ms. Reeves and Mr. Helton pointed out that the Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) figure was not budgeted and should have been included in the application.
- Mr. Quigley reiterated that the application needed additional work and the applicants had some great ideas. He summarized that an interview was not appropriate at this time. Mr. Walker detailed that the application presented was a really good first draft and the application needed a bit more refinement before moving forward.
- **Ms. Reeves made a committee motion not to move Bishop George W. Brooks forward to the full CSAB to interview. Mr. Walker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Quigley made a motion to the full CSAB not move Bishop George W. Brooks to interview. Mr. Walker seconded.** Mr. Hawkes raised points about the board being strong and the performance of Guilford County schools. Additionally, he communicated the committee was being hard on the applicant. Mr. Quigley commented that the application becomes the school and right now this applicant group was not ready. Also, the submitted application must be evaluated. The application cannot be discounted. **The motion passed 7 to 1 with Mr. Hawkes dissenting.**

Next Generation Academy

- Dr. Townsend-Smith provided information regarding the status of the application, including the fact that it was a repeat applicant and that additional materials were submitted the day prior in the online application system. Four (4) Next Generation board members were in attendance for the application clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF) led by Mr. Maimone discussed the various sections of the application and the points which needed clarification.
- Ms. Parlér was concerned about the broad nature of the mission statement. She encouraged the use of more action words and the inclusion of outcomes. Mrs. Parlér was also concerned about the expectation of 50% proficiency in the first year, which she considered low. She was

impressed that the school would have a functional commercial kitchen and that students would have access to a cafeteria.

- Ms. Turner wanted clarification on the testing information in the education plan and the impact it would have on instruction. She also expressed a concern about the way in which ELL students would be accommodated. Additionally, she mentioned her concern over the performance standards specifically the decrease over the first 5 years. She also wanted clarification on the classroom technology and phone budget.
- Mr. Maimone sought clarification on the accessibility to outside funds mentioned on the applicant's website but not included in the application. In referencing the application evaluation, Mr. Maimone mentioned a general concern about identity, or those aspects that separated the proposed school from other schools in Guilford County. He also wanted clarification on the facility's prior use and its location.
- The board chair addressed the concern about what sets the proposed school apart from Guilford County by referencing a targeted approach to literacy and stated the school would recruit individuals who understood the importance of early literacy instruction. In reference to the question about the potential for the outside funding mentioned on the applicant's website, the board chair referenced an individual who was willing to contribute funding should the school be approved.
- In reference to the concern about the decreasing performance standards, the board chair stated a desire to be realistic in light of the low proficiency rates in the area. In seeking clarification on the Exceptional Children (EC) component of the application, Ms. Turner stated that she was fine delaying her questions until a possible full interview. In response to Mr. Maimone's need for clarification on the facility, the board chair informed the committee that the building was previously used by a private school and would serve as the school building for the first three (3) years, with the potential of moving to a new facility later.
- **Mr. Maimone entertained a motion from the Performance Committee. Ms. Turner made a motion to invite the applicant for a full interview; Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. The motioned carried with a unanimous vote in the Performance Committee.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to invite Next Generation Academy for a full interview; Ms. Turner seconded the motion. The motion carried.**

Essie Mae Kiser Foxx Charter School

- Four board members and one (1) Torchlight Academy Schools (TAS) representative were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC) led by Mr. Walker discussed each section of the application and pointed out items for clarification. Mr. Walker questioned the significance of the name Essie Mae and commended the board for obtaining a different board chair from its previous application of Paul L. Dunbar.
- The PC committee wanted clarification on the misalignment of the goals outlined in the application. The potential administrator for the proposed school clarified the differences and outlined the differences were a typo. Ms. Reeves and Mr. Helton wanted clarity on the proposed school calendar and the proposed administrator outlined the reason they chose the proposed calendar and how it would meet the needs of the targeted student population.
- Mr. Walker commented that for interview, clarity would be needed on the due process for students. The proposed principal outlined that the 4000 text limit resulted in the results not being included but due process had been adopted in the handbook. The applicant outlined the typos again in its application when asked for clarification on the number of students coming from a different county.
- Ms. Reeves pointed out the concerns with the contracted fees of the EMO (TAS) and Mr. McQueen outlined the services the EMO would provide and the funds they would contribute to the school for the first 5 years. Mr. Walker confirmed other schools under the EMO's umbrella and the EMO model was similar to National Heritage Academies (NHA). Mr. Walker and Mr. McQueen commented that Torchlight had the highest growth in all charter schools. Ms. Reeves outlined her concerns with the breakeven numbers and more questions would be asked during the interview. Ms. Reeves wanted to know why some personnel such as a counselor and PE teacher were not hired in the charter's initial year.
- **Ms. Reeves made a motion to the PC to forward the applicant to interview. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB to recommend Essie Mae Kiser Foxx for an interview. Mr. Helton seconded.** Mr. Hawkes questioned the criminal background information for one of the board members. **The motion passed unanimously with Ms. Turner recusing as the proposed lead administrator was a former employee of Sugar Creek.**

Ridgeview Charter School

- Three board members were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF) led by Mr. Quigley discussed each section of the

application and items which needed clarification. Mr. Maimone wanted information on the number of people interested in enrolling in the school given that the application was a second submission. Mr. Quigley commented that the education plan had a majority fails; however, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program was a proven model and provided specific examples of schools in another county who were successful implementing the model.

- Mr. Quigley wanted clarification on the proposed board's plan for IB. Ms. Turner clarified and pointed out the school would be using IC (the proposed applicant's version of IB) in lieu of IB as the school would not be applying to be an IB school. The proposed board member outlined becoming an IB school was not the first goal as the school needed to establish its students and existence before pursuing the IB accreditation. Mr. Quigley commented on the weaknesses with the application was the disconnection between the IC curriculum and its misalignment. Ms. Turner commented that IC was referenced but it was not an integral part of what was actually happening. Ms. Parlér echoed the sentiments of Mr. Quigley and Ms. Turner. Ms. Parlér would like more information on college readiness and the curriculum needed to be more developed. Mr. Maimone expressed concerns on the vagueness of the education plan and lack of commitment.
- Overall the PF was generally concerned with the education plan and pointed out that the plan needed work. Specifically, the applicant needed to rewrite with clarity. There were good ideas but the application did not provide the information necessary to move forward at this time.
- **Ms. Parlér made a committee motion not to move the applicant group to interview. Ms. Turner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Ms. Turner made a motion to the full CSAB not to recommend an interview for Ridgeview Charter School. Ms. Parlér seconded.** Mr. Walker commented that the CSAB previously recommended the application to the SBE last year and SBE did not uphold the recommendation. He reminded the CSAB that last year the group was recommended and passed with a 7 to 2 vote. He stressed he would like to interview the school. The CSAB discussed the previous application process and that the proposed applicant group was able to talk their way to approval. Mr. Quigley stressed the written application and board composition as equally important. A clear education plan is important. There are good ideas in the application that need more work and need to be clearly scoped. Mr. Maimone expected that since this was a repeat application, more attention should have been given to the comments placed in the previous evaluation rubric. **The motion passed 6 to 2 with Mr. Walker and Mr. Helton dissenting.**

CE Academy

- Three (3) board members were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC) led by Mr. Steven Walker had a discussion on each

section of the application and items which needed clarification. Overall he detailed that he liked the immersion philosophy; however, the application needed more development. The academic goals were not specific or measurable. Ms. Reeves echoed the sentiments of Mr. Walker. Additionally, Ms. Reeves detailed the specific need tied to the 6 legislative purposes as vague in nature and needed more detail.

- The education plan was intriguing with the immersion philosophy. Ms. Reeves read some statements from the application and pointed out misalignment with the curriculum it planned to implement. Mr. Helton commented that the goals outlined in the education plan were not measurable. Overall the PC pointed out that the application lacked specificity and needed more clarity.
- Mr. Helton discussed his concerns with the number of board meetings the board outlined it would conduct in its application. Mr. Walker pointed out that if the school was really going to implement its proposed immersion plan, then there needed to be an expert on the board to ensure the right people were employed. The staff plan also needed additional detail.
- Mr. Helton questioned the meaning of “diversity transportation” outlined in the application. The board chair of the proposed school explained the different ways transportation would be provided for its students such as carpool, etc. Mr. Walker communicated that the lunch plan lacked detail and the applicant did not budget any monies and the school must ensure that each student had a lunch each day.
- Ms. Reeves questioned the reference to Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) proposed in the application. The proposed board chair detailed that the school does not plan to partner with CSUSA. Ms. Reeves and the PC drilled the financial plan outlined in the proposed application.
- Mr. Helton detailed he felt this is a good group, but the group may benefit with hiring someone to help them write the application. One proposed board member outlined that the board has now partnered with a group to help them refine the application.
- Mr. Walker detailed he loved the idea, but the application was not ready at this time. Mr. Helton outlined desires to provide groups with more support with writing applications moving forward. Ms. Reeves encouraged the group to read the comments provided by external evaluators and CSAB members to improve the application and reapply next year. **Ms. Reeves made a committee motion not to recommend the applicant group for an interview. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a full CSAB motion not to grant an interview to CE Academy. Mr. Maimone seconded. The motion passed 7 to 1 with Mr. Hawkes dissenting.**

Raleigh Oak Charter School

- Board members and consultants were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF) led by Mr. Maimone, discussed the application and each section which needed clarification. Ms. Parlér expressed the need for ethnic diversity on the board. Also she wanted to inquire on the proposed school's Professional Development allotment proposed in the budget. Mr. Maimone and Ms. Parlér wanted more information on the administrative salaries versus the teacher salaries proposed in the budget.
- Ms. Turner detailed that the amount of staff development needed to be drilled if recommended for interview and how the proposed applicant would train the teachers it hired to implement the plan.
- Mr. Maimone commented he was impressed with the application but had concerns about the financial section as the evaluators gave overall fails in the section. Overall the PF concerns were financial regarding this proposed application. The proposed applicant was seeking to implement a weighted lottery and the PF wanted more information about its desire to do so.
- One proposed board member addressed the PF with its questions on its proposed budget. The PF continued to drill the proposed budget and the board's understanding of finances based on the information submitted. Mr. Maimone detailed the budget would be difficult with the proposed student numbers outlined in the application. The board members present outlined the revised budget they prepared and the PF communicated the application must be evaluated based on what was submitted and not on adjustments as adjustments are allowed once approved.
- The board chair answered questions specifically on the need for the school per the PF request. She also commented they had a strong marketing plan and outlined the number of events held and people who attended. The numbers in the application were conservative and hopefully and realistic.
- Ms. Turner pointed out her concerns around the instructional calendar hours. Mr. Maimone commented he was disappointed with the budget component but pleased that externals gave majority passes. Ms. Turner commented she had additional questions.
- **Ms. Turner made the PF motion to recommend an interview. Ms. Parlér seconded. Mr. Hawkes was interested in the group receiving an interview and would like to ask more questions of the group. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to move Raleigh Oak Charter School to interview. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Emereau: Roanoke Valley

- Two board members, the executive director and facility consultant were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC) led by Mr. Quigley asked specific questions on major sections of the application.
- Overall there were concerns with the lack of community representation currently on the board. Mr. Quigley and the PC questioned if it was the same board as Emereau: Bladen; as that school was in its planning year and not yet opened. The members present confirmed the founding boards were the same for both schools.
- Ms. Reeves commented that the school would be pulling from three (3) Local Education Agencies (LEAs) once at full scale. The educational need was not substantial and the legislative purposes lacked some clarity. The assessments and education plan seemed to be a long list of strategies and more detail was needed. She also expressed her concerns on the lack of community representation for the LEA in which the school planned to locate.
- Mr. Walker communicated that the CSAB approved this school last year and nothing changed his mind about the school. He thinks they have a slightly different model and the facility will help them recruit the students. Also a school that he approved to open last year he will not vote to not approve this year. Mr. Helton echoed some of the sentiments of Mr. Walker. Mr. Quigley pointed out he had concerns that there was not proof that the model works and the board needed to get one open first before seeking to open another campus. Ms. Reeves echoed the sentiments of Mr. Quigley. Mr. Quigley further questioned the rush for another campus so soon. Ms. Reeves pointed to the fails given by the external evaluators on the education plan.
- **Mr. Walker made a committee motion to recommend the applicant for interview. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion ended in a tie, thus failed.**
- **The full CSAB received a motion from Mr. Walker for a full interview. Mr. Helton seconded.** Mr. Hawkes commented on the county conditions from last year were still present this year and detailed the performance of the county by which the school proposed to locate. Mr. Maimone pointed out the mayor on the board, who was the chair, lives in Bladen County. One board member responded to a clarification on if the school would participate in FRL program and if needed stipulated the school would participate in the program. The board member detailed a weighted lottery would not be used. Ms. Turner pointed out her concerns that the Emereau board's attention would be divided and the board needed to open its current school and apply to open another campus later. The proposed board confidently communicated they would meet their enrollment numbers. Mr. Quigley urged the CSAB to proceed with caution, reminding all that

the committee vote failed with a 4 to 4 tie **The motion tied 4 to 4. Mr. Walker presented another motion to invite Emereau: Roanoke Valley to a full interview. The motion passed 7 to 1 with Ms. Reeves dissenting.**

POLICY COMMITTEE

- The policy committee, led by Mr. Steven Walker, discussed and provided possible revisions to several policies (TCS-U-007, TCS-U-10, and a new policy on charter schools receiving alternative status) for CSAB approval.
- TCS-U-007, the State Board of Education (SBE) policy to govern the renewal process, was a ten-year-old policy that, over the years, had numerous statutory changes regarding the renewal process. The changes, as outlined on eBoard, presents the required statutory language to ensure that the policy better aligns with statute GS 115C-218 and CSAB established procedures.
- **Ms. Reeves made a motion to approve the policy changes as amended with the technical changes discussed by CSAB. Ms. Hilda Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- TCS-U-10 was a policy that is copied directly from statute GS 115C-238.39F (d). The policy needed revision as charter schools are no longer classified as academically inadequate. House Bill (HB) 242 dictated that charter schools are classified as low-performing and continually low-performing, much like the traditional public schools. **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend to the SBE to strike the policy from the policy manual and to adhere to the statute as it is written. Mr. Helton seconded the motion. After further discussion from the CSAB, it was decided that the policy TCS-U-10 should only make a direct reference to GS 115C-238.39F (d). The motion passed unanimously.**
- The Charter Specific Alternative School policy, TCS-U-20, must have some sort of high school component. The policy was modified as follows:

At least 75% of the school's population in grades 9-12 must be at risk of academic failure as defined in GSS-Q-001, I.B, and must also meet one or more of the following indicators: a. The student must either be recently released from a juvenile justice facility, or otherwise be subject to and participating in the juvenile justice court process; b. The student must be currently served by a treatment facility licensed pursuant to Chapter 122C of the General Statutes, or have recently been discharged from such a facility; c. The student must be currently under long term suspension from a public or private school; or d. The student must be a high-school dropout as defined in GCS-Q-001; or be imminently at risk of dropping out as demonstrated by adequate documentation in the charter school's application for designation under this policy.

- Ms. Cheryl Turner questioned if schools with grades K-12 or 6-12 will become alternative schools because its high school meet one of the indicators as listed in the policy. Mr. Walker clarified that once the application template for alternative status is developed, it will ask the school to explain what grades will be affected by the alternative status. Every three years, the school will be reviewed to determine if the school should continue its alternative status.
- **Ms. Reeves made a motion to recommend the policy changes to the SBE for approval. Mr. Maimone seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION UPDATES

- The CSAB received an update on past and pending SBE items and made recommendations to the SBE on several requests. Mr. Machado led the discussion.
- At January's SBE meeting, the SBE was updated with the current assumption policy. The annual charter schools report was also presented and was approved on first reading. Several amendments were passed by consent, including several weighted lottery requests.
- At February's SBE meeting, Johnston Charter will be requesting a one year delay with its opening. Mr. Machado expressed concern about the amount of one year relay requests received from the Ready to Open schools. At the February CSAB meeting, OCS will present data to show the number of delay requested.
- Dr. Kebbler Williams, Education Consultant, OCS provided the CSAB, via eboard, a progress report of the schools currently within their planning year. Dr. Townsend-Smith provided a summary of the report to the SBE. The report outlined how many schools were granted a charter to begin their planning year and current planning year schools which requested a one-year delay.
- **After discussion with the CSAB regarding the one-year delay requests, Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend that the SBE include on their legislative agenda the consideration of a bill that would allow state funding to pay for all construction or expansion of new schools. Ms. Turner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Ms. Parlér made a motion for the CSAB to go in to closed session to discuss matters with their legal counsel. Mr. Walker Seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **The meeting adjourned via acclamation at 2:30 pm.**

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
January 11, 2017**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes- Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs- <i>Absent</i> Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Hilda Parlér	Alex Quigley Eric Sanchez Tammi Sutton- <i>Absent</i> Becky Taylor – <i>Absent</i> Tony Helton Steven Walker
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Craig Tucker, Consultant Shaunda Cooper, Consultant Brian Smith, Consultant	<i>SBE</i> Martez Hill <i>Attorney General</i> Laura Crumpler <i>SBE Attorney</i> Katie Cornetto

CALL TO ORDER

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 8:35 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Steven Walker led the Pledge of Allegiance.

SCHOOL UPDATES

- The CSAB received updated information from Kestrel Heights Charter School. Mr. Dave Machado, Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS), led the discussion by providing a brief update of the school's progress since their last visit in front of the CSAB in December.
- On January 3, 2017, Kestrel Heights provided OCS with a comprehensive report on exactly what happened with their graduation requirement discrepancies. The report detailed the graduation data from 2008-2016. The report further detailed that after the investigation began, it was discovered that 160 out of the 399 students that graduated did not meet all the state mandated graduation requirements. The principal and the guidance counselor that were employed during this time are no longer employed at the school.

- The students that were affected by the discrepancies were missing one or more mandated classes, including but not limited to: American History, American History II, English III, English IV, Math IV, Physical Education, Algebra II, Biology, Civics and World History.
- Kestrel Heights was in the process of notifying students and parents to make them aware of the situation and how they planned to remedy the matter. Kestrel provided three corrective courses of action:
 - 1) Credit attainment or recovery through Kestrel Heights administered proficiency exam
 - 2) Transfer of credit based on approved course taken through an accredited institution
 - 3) Proof that a required course was previously completed but not properly reflected on the transcript
- Mr. Machado explained that the situation that occurred at Kestrel was unacceptable and in direct violation of Kestrel's SBE approved charter and mission. He commended Kestrel Heights for self-reporting their actions and for working towards a solution that is in the best interest of the students who were impacted. OCS planned to continue to assist and monitor Kestrel's plan, if approved by the State Board of Education (SBE).
- Mr. Machado stressed that the incident at Kestrel was isolated and should not be a reflection on all charter schools in the state of North Carolina.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to go in to closed session to consult with their attorneys. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to move out of closed session. Ms. Reeves seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Quigley held any further discussion regarding Kestrel until the afternoon session.

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- The CSAB commenced with Policy and Performance Committee application reviews for 16 of 38 applicants proposing to open in August 2018. Following each review/clarification opportunity, the CSAB made recommendations on which applicants will be recommended for an interview opportunity before the full CSAB at its regularly scheduled February 2017 meeting. Dr. Townsend-Smith provided a brief overview of each applicant group including its evaluation feedback, proposed enrollment over five (5) years, proposed county, and mission of the proposed school.

Myrtis Simpson Walker Academy for Boys

- One board member was present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF) led by Mr. Maimone discussed each section of the application for the clarification opportunity.
- Specifically, the PF drilled the finances, marketing plan, goals outlined, and the mission statement. Mr. Sanchez wanted more detail on the proposed grade levels and supporting research. Mr. Maimone discussed the misalignment with the education plan and the proposed mission. Ms. Turner wanted to know the research on the HOPE Program and if it was effective in other areas.
- Ms. Turner raised concerns on the lack of a transportation plan in years 1 - 2 while there was a detailed plan in year 3. Ms. Parlér questioned the cost per student for the lunch program. Ms. Turner had concerns about the breakeven numbers outlined in the application.
- The proposed executive director of the school outlined the additional funds written in the application and who would be providing the additional funding. A private equity lender would provide support to the program. Ms. Turner confirmed that it was a loan if promises were not met and a grant if application promises were fulfilled. Mr. Maimone pointed out the numerous financial deficits the school may incur based on the information outlined in the application. The proposed applicant communicated they made adjustments after reviewing information supplied in the application initially. At this time the PF felt there was not enough detail included in the application and was hesitant to make a recommendation for interview. Ms. Turner outlined concerns with the proposed need and elimination of transportation and lunch in early years may not meet the needs of the targeted student population.
- **Ms. Turner made a committee motion not to recommend the applicant group for interview.** She pointed out that the application contained good ideas and the applicant needed to strengthen the proposal, including the finances, and reapply. **Mr. Sanchez seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a full CSAB motion not to recommend Myrtis Simpson Walker Academy for Boys for an interview. Ms. Tuner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Inner Banks Innovation Academy

- Three board members were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF), led by Mr. Alex Quigley, reviewed and

discussed each section of the application to determine if the applicant should move forward to interview.

- Ms. Turner commented she failed the governance section due to misalignment with the education plan. Also, she was concerned that no hardware was in the budget for a school with a 1-to-1 initiative. Mr. Sanchez commented that the high school goals lacked depth and needed further development.
- The board chair for the proposed school outlined the board's knowledge of Aspire with research and consultation services. No one from the board had visited an Aspire school. Another board member outlined the purpose of Aspire and their published research. The PF drilled the rationale for the proposed grade levels in the application. A board member present outlined it was based on the community response.
- Mr. Quigley commented that the transportation plan was limited for the number of students projected in year one. Mr. Sanchez pointed to the targeted population and questioned the transportation and lunch plans as outlined. Also, the plan may need to be more developed. Ms. Turner also wanted to know why there were no monies for technology in the budget with the proposed plan outlined in the application. A board member answered questions around some of the budget items outlined in the application and how the 1 to 1 initiative would be achieved.
- Mr. Quigley asked for clarification on the consultants outlined in the application. One board member outlined the board has worked with a variety of consultants to help them strengthen the application.
- Mr. Maimone asked questions about the Mt. Olive Campus facility referenced in the application. The board member explained the current facility plan for the school. Additionally, Mr. Maimone encouraged the school to seek partnerships from a community college as it strengthened the application.
- The PF continued to drill the financial component of the application. Mr. Quigley pointed out that there were concerns with the application; however, there are promising components to the application. He encourages the proposed board to fully develop its model as there were missing pieces. Additionally, there were some structural pieces with the application that cannot be fixed at this time. Ms. Turner commented there are some questions that may be further answered at interview. Mr. Sanchez commented that he would like to see if this board has the capacity to reflect and react to the questions/feedback posed today. Mr. Maimone hoped that the entire board comes for the interview.

- **Mr. Maimone made a committee motion to recommend an interview. Ms. Turner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to grant Inner Banks Innovation Academy an interview. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Moore Montessori

- Two board members were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF), with Mr. Maimone leading, led a discussion and asked specific questions on major sections of the application.
- The Montessori model description in the application was commended by the CSAB committee to the applicants. Ms. Schauss was asked to clarify the Montessori Model at Sterling Montessori. The board chair, from the county, is planning to be the head of school. Ms. Turner and the PF asked why the school did not apply for a weighted lottery given its proposed targeted population. The board chair outlined that the weighted lottery can be explored later. Mr. Hawkes questioned if this model was appropriate in Aberdeen with the proposed student population. The board chair outlined that the model was structured and has been successful with the proposed student population.
- Mr. Quigley and other members of the PF were concerned about the size of the school; however the application was well written. He reiterated that an application must be well written. Additionally, Mr. Quigley communicated that other pieces could be explored during the interview. The board of the school outlined its reason for starting small due to the model and advice received from others doing this work. Mr. Sanchez commented this application was innovative and would love to hear more in an interview.
- **Mr. Sanchez made a committee motion for an interview. Ms. Parlér seconded.** Mr. Hawkes was concerned about this model with the proposed student demographic. Mr. Maimone encouraged the group to take notes and be prepared to answer questions during interview. **The committee motion passed unanimously for interview.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB and recommended an interview for More Montessori Community School. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

CAROLINA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL PRESENTATION

- Staff and students at Carolina International School (CIS) presented information to the CSAB on achieving the Acknowledgement in the Global-Ready School Designation. Ms. Helga Faciano, Special Assistant, Global Education, led the discussion.
- At the recent November SBE, CIS was recognized for receiving the acknowledgement for being a global-ready school, one of the designations the SBE has implemented based on their global education strategic plan.
- Part of the SBE vision includes the expectation that every public school student will graduate ready for post-secondary education and work, prepared to be a globally engaged and productive citizen. In 2011, the SBE felt that they were not meeting their vision, not graduating students ready to work in the interconnected global community. A task force was created charged to bring back a recommendation about how public schools can produce students ready for the global community.
- Staff and students of CIS provided the CSAB information on the direct implementation of their Global Education programs and how they achieved the status which led to their acknowledgement from the SBE.

FINANCIAL UPDATES

- Ms. Alexis Schauss, Director, School Business Administration, provided clarification to the CSAB regarding an item on the upcoming SBE legislative agenda.
- The item on the agenda does not have to do with local funds, or any prior bills, but it's something that was needed since the cap was lifted on the number of charter schools allowed in NC. The huge increase in the number of charter schools and the size of the schools all impact the budget process.
- Charter school funding is embedded in every line item and in every appropriation line item within the state budget. The mechanics for the budget is that the Average Daily Membership (ADM) for new and growing charter schools are embedded in the total average daily membership, and the funding is embedded in each of those line items. The financial department is currently in a position where they are pulling the funding out and managing charter school budget with the school district budget, with the two essentially being dependent on one another. The item on the legislative agenda is proposing that the budgeting process has an appropriation line specifically for charter schools, leading to more efficient budgeting and the ability to address the needs of charter schools quicker. The separation of the two would also allow the management of charter schools as one unit, separated from the local education agencies (LEAs).

SCHOOL UPDATES

- Discussion regarding Kestrel Heights continued from the morning session. Chairman Quigley led the discussion.
- The CSAB commended Kestrel for making the effort to self-report, but stressed that the incidents should not go without serious punishment. After much discussion, the CSAB constructed a fair solution to recommend to the SBE. These options would allow the school to continue, to some degree, but it will also send a message to all schools around the state, traditional and non-traditional, that it was unacceptable to manipulate records and not give the correct information on transcripts.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend to the SBE that Kestrel Heights charter be renewed for a period of 3 years with five (5) stipulations:**
 - **Effective July 1, 2017, the charter is amended to the grades served on grades Kindergarten through 8th grade.**
 - **That Kestrel Heights, at no cost to current or former students, provide an appropriate remedy to the failure to provide an appropriate education that resulted in a Future Ready Core diploma, and that the remedy may not be a Kestrel Heights designated diploma monthly report.**
 - **That Kestrel Heights continue to make extensive efforts to contact all impacted former students and provide a monthly report to the Office of Charter Schools of those efforts and the results of those efforts.**
 - **That Kestrel Heights appear before the Charter Schools Advisory Board every six months to update the board on its progress.**
 - **Kestrel Heights must agree to no grade expansion to high school for its charter term.**
- **Ms. Reeves seconded the motion. Mr. Maimone advised Kestrel that they have thirty days to accept the recommendation and if they don't agree, the CSAB could recommend assumption of their charter to the SBE. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **The meeting adjourned via acclamation at 2:30 pm.**

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
January 12, 2017**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes- Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs- <i>Absent</i> Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Hilda Parlér	Alex Quigley Eric Sanchez Tammi Sutton Becky Taylor – <i>Absent</i> Tony Helton Steven Walker
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Craig Tucker, Consultant Shaunda Cooper, Consultant Brian Smith, Consultant	<i>SBE</i> Martez Hill <i>Attorney General</i> Laura Crumpler <i>SBE Attorney</i> Katie Cornetto

CALL TO ORDER

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:03 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Steven Walker led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- The CSAB commenced with Policy and Performance Committee application reviews for 16 of 38 applicants proposing to open in August 2018. Following each review/clarification opportunity, the CSAB made recommendations on which applicants will be recommended for an interview opportunity before the full CSAB at its regularly scheduled February 2017 meeting. Dr. Townsend-Smith provided a brief overview of each applicant group including its evaluation feedback, proposed enrollment over five (5) years, proposed county, and mission of the proposed school.

Anson Charter Academy

- Five (5) board members were present for the application clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC) led by Mr. Steven Walker discussed each section of the application. Mr. Walker

was pleased that there was a proposal for a county where there is not currently a charter school. Ms. Reeves wanted more information on the classical model referenced in the application. Mr. Helton commended the group on using the combination of Core Knowledge, MAP Testing, etc. Mr. Hernandez, board member for the proposed school, provided details that the school would indeed use a classical “like” model.

- Ms. Reeves drilled capacity of the board as the board currently has two (2) applications in the current round. Mr. Helton wanted more information on the lunch plan proposed in the application. Ms. Reeves also had questions on Goodall Consulting. One board member of the school outlined there is a possibility that he may roll off to become the headmaster; however, the current focus was building the board. Mr. Goodall answered questions on the proposed lunch plan outlined in the application. Mr. Goodall projected there would be a significant amount of students requiring free and reduced lunch.
- Mr. Goodall provided information on Goodall Consulting and confirmed that the firm would also provide services to the school. Also having one board and two (2) schools would be more economically beneficial. Another board member confirmed the services Goodall Consulting would provide and the reason he chose to go the charter route in lieu of the faith based approach. The board member outlined that Mr. Goodall would resign from the board if chosen to provide services. Mr. Walker sought additional clarification on the arrangement with Goodall Consulting.
- **Mr. Helton made a committee level motion to invite the proposed applicant group for interview. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously. **
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB to allow Anson Charter Academy an interview. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Kaleidoscope Charter High School

- One (1) board member and four (4) advisory board members were present for the clarification opportunity. The Performance Committee (PF) drilled the advisory committee and the board chair for the proposed school on the role of the advisory board and the services they would provide for the board. Mr. Maimone commented, if forwarded to interview, the expectation was that the board members were present.
- Ms. Turner communicated concerns regarding the goals outlined in the proposed application in relation to the schools the group outlined it would draw students. Mr. Maimone pointed out that possibly the need outlined was not clear in the application. The PF drilled the true need for the school and the evidence provided with the application. Mr. Sanchez pointed out the response to need was not substantial as the evidence provided was actually 129 responses. Mr. Maimone commented he is trying to understand the innovation and what will separate this school from its counterparts. Mr.

Sanchez echoed the sentiments of Ms. Turner and communicated that the goals outlined in the application were modest, vague, and not rigorous. Mr. Maimone reminded the committee of the importance of meeting enrollment numbers and truly evaluating need based on past experiences. Ms. Parlér commented that the outfit cost seemed rather low. Mr. Maimone also questioned if the facility costs projected were appropriate based on the county.

- Mr. Sanchez discussed the lunch plan and how the school planned to overcharge students to accommodate for any students needing FRL. The board chair responded to the questions on need and outlined Mooresville was a growing area and they planned to pull students because there was overpopulation and there would be a smaller community like school instead of the larger school and they planned to have a student focus. Also, the board chair outlined they wanted an alternative to the traditional public high schools for their parents. The board chair provided new information and indicated someone is holding a facility but did not want to provide that information in the submitted application.
- Mr. Maimone asked direct questions on the goals outlined in the application and the board chair outlined because the proposed model is “Montessori like” they wanted to set realistic goals. One of the advisory board members outlined the school will not use the term Montessori as the staff will not be Montessori certified. However, the student centered approach allowed the student and teacher to have close relationships and based on her research most high schools were still teacher centered which made this model innovative.
- Mr. Maimone drilled how the board will know if the school was successful with the proposed goals outlined in the application given the performance of surrounding schools. The advisory board member outlined her experience in charter schools and how most charter schools attracted students who may not be performing as they should and noted they did not include the evidence in their application. Mr. Hawkes expressed his concern with the Montessori concept or student centered approach outlined in the application.
- Mr. Sanchez pointed out he was concerned about moving the application forward based on the lack of information and the goals outlined in the application. Also, there was a lack of clarity and he had concerns with the financial plan as outlined along with some of the external evaluators. Mr. Maimone would like to hear more on true need as currently the need presented was overcrowding. Ms. Turner communicated she still had concerns related to the goals proposed in the application. Mr. Sanchez pointed out that the external evaluators did not pass each section and this raised concerns as schools typically fail for financial reasons.
- **Mr. Sanchez made a committee motion not to recommend the applicant for an interview as the application needed more work and refinement.** Additionally, he communicated the CSAB must take and consider applications based on the merits and not on the board’s charisma. **Ms. Parlér seconded.** Mr. Hawkes wanted to understand the rationale for the motion based on the responses

provided by the board chair. Ms. Turner reiterated the goals component outlined were concerning and applicant goals must be rigorous.

- Mr. Maimone communicated he was troubled by the goals and since this was a rewrite, the application should have been stronger. Mr. Hawkes argued for the group to move forward to interview. Mr. Sanchez pointed out that moving to the next stage was a privilege. A member of the proposed advisory board outlined her experience with the Wake Men's Leadership Academy and the population the school would eventually enrolled to support why they wrote the goals as outlined in the application. Also she outlined it was hard to explain an innovative program and encouraged the CSAB to move from its comfort zone. **The motion passed.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB not to recommend an interview for Kaleidoscope Charter High School. Ms. Turner seconded.** Mr. Walker commented he would support the vote of the committee. Mr. Hawkes reminded the CSAB of its mission and encouraged the CSAB to give the group a chance. Mr. Maimone pointed out that based on merit, the application was not in a place to move forward. Mr. Quigley encouraged the CSAB to be rigorous in its evaluation process as taxpayer dollars were at risk. Mr. Maimone encouraged the proposed group to reapply and write a strong application during its next submission. **The motion passed 10 to 1 with Mr. Hawkes dissenting.**

Apprentice Academy

- Four (4) board members were present for the clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC), led by Mr. Alex Quigley, discussed each section of the application. Ms. Tammie Sutton wanted more information on the proposed applicant's definition of at-risk. Additionally, the PC wanted to know if the school would seek the alternative designation. The board chair confirmed the school was based on an alternative definition. Ms. Reeves and Ms. Sutton commented that the mission statement was not framed in an aspirational way.
- Mr. Quigley pointed out his concerns on the proposed grade enrollment. He and other members of the PC detailed the concerns with the education plan and commented they agreed with the sentiments of the external evaluators. Ms. Reeves commented she was confused based on the various buzz words outlined in the application and there was lack of alignment and clarify.
- The board chair outlined that the proposal was not traditional. Additionally, he explained the proposed pedagogical strategies and its appropriateness. The content would be delivered in a blended learning environment and the students would have individualized learning plans. Mr. Quigley asked questions on how the students would achieve graduation requirements based on the written proposal. The board chair outlined the desire was to have dual certified teachers and the class size of 15 children would allow teachers to differentiate.

- Mr. Helton asked questions on the exit standards for the students enrolled in the school. The board chair responded to the questions to provide needed clarity. Mr. Quigley communicated that the education plan was not clear on how these pieces would work together. Mr. Walker communicated that he passed the sections of the application except the financial plan. Additionally, he liked the idea, but the application potentially needed more development. Ms. Reeves pointed out her concerns with the graduation requirements outlined in the application. The board chair reaffirmed his understanding of the NC graduation requirements.
- Mr. Helton pointed out that we must base the evaluation on what is written and would like to explore the application more as it was a different model. Mr. Quigley commented the application had potential but lacked clarity at this time. Additionally, the PC questioned the student recruiting strategy. The board chair outlined that since submitting the application there were over 90 respondents to support its need. The board chair outlined that since the application's submission, new board members were added.
- Mr. Quigley was intrigued by the application; however, the application needed more work before moving forward. Mr. Helton, commented he did not disagree with the sentiments, but would like to see the group back for an interview. Ms. Reeves pointed out other misalignment in the application. Mr. Quigley commented that the board chair was compelling; however, the charter is issued to a board and not one individual.
- **Ms. Reeves made a motion not to move the applicant forward to interview. Ms. Sutton seconded.** Mr. Walker communicated that he would like to see the group for interview as well and felt comfortable after reevaluating the financial component. Mr. Quigley felt the application needed more time and it would be critical that this proposed school was successful. **The motion passed 3 to 2. Mr. Helton and Mr. Walker dissented.**
- **Mr. Quigley made a motion to the full CSAB not to move the proposed applicant forward to interview. Ms. Reeves seconded.** Ms. Paler commented she was confused by the proposed education plan and how it would be implemented. Mr. Quigley pointed out that while he does not think the application is ready, he may vote to bring them in for interview. Mr. Sanchez pointed out that the application must be based on substance written and currently cannot support the application moving forward unless the subcommittee could substantiate the decision to move the group forward. Ms. Reeves commented on the many areas she failed the application and the comments of the external evaluators. While there may be a need, the written application lacks clarity at this time. **The motion ended in a tie 5 to 5 resulting in a failed motion. An alternate motion was made to allow an interview for the applicant. The motion passed 6 to 4 with Ms. Parlér, Ms. Reeves, Ms. Sutton, and Mr. Sanchez dissenting.**

Young Inspiration STEAM Academy

- No representative from Young Inspiration was present for the clarification outcome. The Performance Committee (PF), led by Mr. Maimone, discussed and reviewed each section of the application. Ms. Parlér provided comments regarding the mission statement. Mr. Maimone commented that the mission statement reflected a motto instead of a mission statement.
- Ms. Turner and Ms. Parlér questioned if the applicant group was proposing STEAM or STEM. The section lacked details, clarity, and raised many questions for the CSAB. Mr. Maimone encouraged the committee to hold through the process although the proposal received a majority of fails from the external evaluators. Mr. Sanchez pointed to the lack of quality with the curriculum outline provided in the appendix. Mr. Maimone pointed out there was no effort demonstrated to improve the application for the previous submission.
- **Ms. Turner made a committee motion to not recommend an interview for the applicant group. Ms. Parlér seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to not allow an interview for Young Inspiration STEAM Academy. Ms. Parlér seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ascend Leadership Academy: Lee/Ascend Leadership: Durham

- Three (3) board members were present for the application review, discussion, and clarification opportunity. The Policy Committee (PC), led by Mr. Walker discussed each section of the application. Since the applicant group proposed the same application for two (2) different locations; with the same board members, the clarification opportunity was extended beyond one hour.
- Mr. Walker communicated he failed the mission/purposes/goals as the goals were not rigorous, measurable, or specific. He encouraged the group present to be prepared to discuss the goals should they move forward to interview. Ms. Reeves commented on her pleasure with the proposal for Lee County as the county currently does not have a charter school.
- Ms. Reeves communicated her questions for the education plan are more interview focused instead of clarification and would like to hear more about the plan they have created for themselves.
- Mr. Walker pointed out that the board appeared strong in experience and profession. Ms. Sutton had concerns that there was not representation from Lee County and if approved the school should seek a member from that area. Ms. Reeves commented there were 5 board members and need clarification on if the administrator will be on the board or an administrator. Also, the organizational chart needed clarification.

- Mr. Walker raised questions on if the school intended to participate in the Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) or create its own program. Ms. Reeves questioned the bus lease fee between the Lee and Durham duplicate applications. Mr. Helton raised some clarification on the finances proposed in the application. Mr. Justin Smith, proposed board member, pointed out the reasons as to why there was no representative from Lee County on the board. Specifically, there are personal connections on the board to Lee County. Another board member outlined the plan for board recruitment should both applications receive approval.
- The board chair for the proposed application detailed the plans for the lead administrator should they receive approval. Additionally, the applicant affirmed that there were no plans to participate in the FRL but they would use Preferred Meals as a vendor. Ms. Reeves asked questions about the contracted services, which were potential conflicts of interest. The board chair outlined how the conflicts of interest would be handled and the other firms they have sought out for bids to ultimately provide contracted needs.
- Ms. Sutton questioned the reasoning of submitting two (2) applications. A proposed board member outlined the reasoning and past charter school experiences and resources to establish both schools. Mr. Walker commented on the need specifically for Lee County.
- **Mr. Walker made a committee motion to recommend an interview for the Lee County proposal. Mr. Helton seconded.** Mr. Quigley provided comments around the quality of the written product. Also, he did not see the need for two (2) applications at this time. **The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Walker would like the group to establish the Lee County campus first, if approved. The PC discussed potential assumption and replication for the board in the future should they be successful. **Ms. Reeves made a motion not to recommend the application for the Durham campus for interview. Ms. Sutton seconded.** Mr. Maimone commented it is a strong quality application and wanted more detail as to the reasoning not to move forward the Durham proposal. Mr. Walker provided the explanation. **The motion passed 8 to 1 with Mr. Hawkes dissenting.**

SCHOOL UPDATES

- The CSAB received an update on Thunderbird Charter Academy from OCS. Thunderbird submitted its board meeting minutes, budget updates, and its current enrollment so the CSAB and OCS can review and monitor these updates. Dr. Townsend-Smith led the discussion.
- At its July 2016 meeting, the SBE accepted the five recommendations that the CSAB submitted regarding Thunderbird Prep. One of the recommendations was that Thunderbird appear before the CSAB at its September 2016 and February 2017 meetings. In lieu of their attendance, OCS submitted appropriate documentation received from Thunderbird of its updates for CSAB review.
- On January 4, 2017, Dr. Kebbler Williams, Education Consultant, OCS, conducted a site visit to Thunderbird Prep and later provided feedback that included glowing practices and growth points for the school to consider.
- Mr. Walker questioned the current operational status surrounding Thunderbird along with facility issues such as mice. Concerns were raised regarding the school's financial viability due to the debt the school was dealing with. Ms. Turner commented that essentially the school was not receiving any additional funding for the school year so their current financial status is important. Dr. Townsend Smith clarified by stating that OCS will find out the current financial status of the school and submit that information at the February CSAB meeting.
- Mr. Quigley expressed the desire to see Thunderbird's enrollment information for the next school year at the March/April CSAB meeting. Although the stats reflected an upward improvement, Thunderbirds' enrollment information would be the best indicator on the schools viability.
- **The meeting adjourned via acclamation at 1:30 pm.**