

**Minutes of the  
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board  
Education Building  
301 N. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825  
January 8, 2018  
9:00 am**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Lindalyn Kakadelis Lynn Kroeger	Alex Quigley Tammi Sutton – <i>in at 12:30</i> Steven Walker Kevin Wilkinson - <i>Absent</i>
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i>  Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Shaunda Cooper, Consultant Stephenie Clark, Consultant	<i>SBE</i>  <i>Attorney General</i> Tiffany Lucas - <i>Absent</i>  <i>SBE Attorney</i> Jason Weber

**CALL TO ORDER**

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Quigley led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- No apparent conflict of interests were presented by the members of the board at this time.
- **Mrs. Sherry Reeves made a motion to approve the December 11-12, 2017 meeting minutes with recommended changes sent to Dr. Townsend-Smith. Ms. Cheryl Turner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS**

- Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith led the discussion by providing a recap of the application process. There were 29 applicants that applied this year. Dr. Townsend-Smith reminded the CSAB about the applicants appearing for clarification and interview at the January CSAB meeting. Next month the board will only have four (4) clarification interviews in addition to full interviews with whoever the board approved during this round of clarification interviews.
- The CSAB would conduct five (5) full interviews and would decide which applicants would receive a Ready to Open recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBE). As a reminder, the interview is a 1 hour opportunity where the Office of Charter Schools (OCS) provides an overview, applicants introduce themselves, the full board reviews and discusses the application rubric, the board questions the applicant, then there is time for deliberation and to vote on a recommendation.
- As a reminder, the clarification is a 30-minute opportunity to discuss applications within the board committees and make recommendation to the full board for a vote on whether an applicant will be granted a full interview. For this month's clarification, OCS notified nine (9) schools and released clarification rubrics.
- January applicant clarifications were presented as follows: Academy of Excellence submitted incomplete responses and Ballantyne Charter High School withdrew from the process on January 4, 2018.
- Mr. Joe Maimone asked with Ballantyne dropping out of clarification interview, could the board have one of the applicants after lunch interview during their time. Dr. Townsend-Smith clarified that the OCS has work that the board needs to do with regards to the waiving of their ten-dollar stipend.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith went over the applicants each committee would review during clarifications. Mr. Steven Walker asked what was incomplete for Academy of Excellence. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that it was their board background check information.
- Mr. Maimone discussed whether they wanted to interview all eight (8) applicants on the same day next month and that it may make sense to balance it to six (6) and six (6), including the four (4) clarification interviews. Mr. Walker commented that it will depend on which schools are invited to full interview from this month's meeting.
- As a reminder, the February meeting will be held on the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>, and the board will know who they are interviewing based on tomorrow's discussion and board decisions.

*Bishop George W. Brooks Male Academy*

- Mr. Steven Walker led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. OCS gave an overview of the applicant, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, proposed county, whether the applicant had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence, and pass/fail ratings on the application. This is a repeat applicant with a twist, prior they were not a single gender applicant and in addition, they received assistance from Next Generation Academy during the application process. Mr. Walker asked the board to introduce themselves.
- Ms. Cheryl Turner expressed concern that there was no evidence to support an identified need to reach the projected enrollment of 300 male students. Mr. Maimone clarified why the school would shift to apply for an all-male population and what indication the school had through surveys. Mrs. Sherry Reeves inquired about how the school would manage students with gender identification. Mr. Walker wanted further information on whether Next Generation Academy had a waitlist and would there be enough students to fill both schools.
- Ms. Turner identified that the goals covered grades K-3, but the school would operate grades K-5, and wanted more information on what the school's goals would be for those remaining grade levels offered. Mrs. Lynn Kroeger noted that there was no mention of growth in the goals provided.
- Ms. Turner wanted to know how instruction was going to look different since the school would be an all-male academy. Mr. Walker wanted clarification on how the school is different from the LEA, other than being all-male. Mrs. Reeves mentioned that cooperative learning and holding competitions seemed counterintuitive for the education plan. In addition, the applicant was not specific with the components of AIG, ELL, and at-risk students, which made that section very weak. Mr. Quigley had similar sentiments and questions around the education plan and noted that the curriculum and scope and sequence provided was not very strong. Mrs. Lindalyn Kakedelis sought clarification around what types of assessments the school planned on using.
- Mrs. Kroeger asked the board to elaborate on the relationship between Next Generation Academy and this school. Mrs. Reeves noted that three of the board members were instructors at Next Generation Academy.
- Ms. Turner noted that the breakeven number is really tight given the high enrollment number needed. Mrs. Kroeger wanted clarification around the compensation for bus drivers and whether \$25,000 was sufficient for technology in the budget.
- The Board addressed the number of students and the number of male students in that population. They cited the academic performance of the students in targeted area ranging around 30% proficiency in reading. Particularly, the male population's performance ranged from 20-22%. This

posed as a great market for the school to draw in that demographic of students with the promise of emphasizing early literacy. Additionally, the board never saw it to be an insurmountable challenge to attract all males to the school.

- Mr. Walker sought clarification on whether Next Generation Academy was open now or whether they would open this fall. The Board replied that the school has started applications, and open houses, through the ready to open process.
- Ms. Turner clarified whether Next Generation planned to open with 300 students. Mr. Walker asked how many applications have been received. The Board replied that they have received 90-95 applications and have a plan to meet the 300 applications needed by opening time. Ms. Turner inquired on how many students the school would need to recruit when Bishop George W. Brooks opens. The board clarified that they would need 400 students total, with 100 new students for Next Generation Academy and 300 for the opening of Bishop.
- The Board additionally provided information that they would be the only school in Guilford County that would offer door to door transportation which has proven to be a huge plus. In addition, they plan to have hot meals for breakfast and lunch. These are some of the things that other schools are not able to offer. Mrs. Reeves asked how many other charter schools are within the 10-mile radius. The Board replied that all of them are within that radius and that the closest in proximity would be Triad Math and Science Academy.
- Mr. Walker asked whether the Board was aware of the length of the waitlist for Triad Math and Science. The Board replied that they are aware of the large waitlist for Triad and that they would be able to recruit some of those students.
- Mr. Maimone wanted clarification on the school's marketing plan specifically what would be the selling hook along with what the board would do differently to attract all-male students to the school. The Board responded that they are present on Facebook, within the local YMCAs, are marketing on the radio station, and have developed a relationship with community center pastors. Additionally, they are doing all the marketing that they can afford through a grassroots campaign. They just hired a community planner and plan on doing door to door and marketing at local supercenters. The selling point for the school is the emphasis to parents that the school will provide families with a choice and to hook them in with offering of early literacy.
- Mr. Maimone sought further understanding on the difference between the two schools with regards to marketing. The Board responded that they place an emphasis on early literacy. Additionally, they have identified a partner that will help provide 1-to-1 devices and internet connection for students that need it outside of the school setting. This individual will work with both Next Generation

Academy and Bishop. The school will also provide nightly sessions where parents can attend for tutorial sessions.

- Mr. Walker identified that 70% proficiency by the end of year 1 is quite a lofty goal considering what the LEA is doing with the same demographic of students and inquired how the school would plan to reach this goal in year 1. The Board responded that they would use strategies and instructional methods to achieve those goals. The increase in the access to the literature needed would impact achievement. The technology the school is looking to employ would quadruple the number of on-level books the students can access. The gradual release of responsibility coupled with a rigorous curriculum that requires multiple steps will give students a chance to receive feedback. Currently, instructional strategies do not employ the gradual release methodology in the surrounding LEA. The school plans to use microdata and culturally relevant teaching methods, which are two of the most impactful methods for building the capacity of the learner.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know what a typical day would look like at this all-male school. The Board responded that engagement would be the most important piece. There was clarification around the competitive strategy listed in the application and that it will not be framed as “me versus you” but would include challenges for self through goal setting. The Board also emphasized that students will try to achieve beyond the goals set and that while the cooperative learning works, the competitive learning works within the self-learning. The Board acknowledged that the day is not physically going to look different, but the instruction will have to look different. Instructional practices will include more feedback given and data collected and applied.
- The Board believes that they can give students devices immediately. They cited that another school in Guilford County is technology centered and has opened the 1-to-1 technology up to grades Pre-K through 5. They strongly believe that it is possible to do and the school will have to look at how to mirror and model the implementation of 1 to 1.
- Mr. Quigley inquired what students would be doing on the devices. The Board responded that the students would be given individual activities and programs to do while the teacher is working with a small group.
- Ms. Turner sought clarification on how the teachers will be monitoring the students and receiving feedback from those activities and programs. The Board responded that just like any teacher would differentiate work in the classroom, they would provide empowerment and accountability to students when using the devices. Additionally, the devices and programs would be controlled in the curriculum.

- Mr. Quigley asked how long students are on devices. The Board responded that small group would include a rotation model, where there would be a 45-minute time where students rotate to the teacher to get on-level instruction and the other groups would engage in activities to improve needed skills.
- Mr. Quigley sought clarification on what instruction will look like on the day to day. The Board responded that the 1-to-1 technology will be unique to their day to day instruction, but they recognize that you cannot leave out the teaching and modeling portion and the teachers must be trained. For example, during the literacy block, you would have whole group instruction, but engagement may look different to target the male population. The school will utilize the balanced literacy approach and with the access to technology, students would have books that they can read or have read to them to improve fluency. The use of the literacy program through technology will allow students to read at their Lexile level and decrease frustration while a small group is reading a print text with the teacher.
- Mr. Maimone asked if they have enough adults to make this plan happen as the application states the school will have 14 teachers and 4 assistants. The Board responded that with the 1-to-1 technology, the various programs that focus on core literature, the teacher would set procedures and goals coupled with management and holding the students accountable. Additionally, the school intends to have a dedicated reading specialist for K-2 along with other specials teachers who will rotate to each classroom when they are not on class duty. The schedule will be staggered in a way that adults will rotate to each classroom. Also, the school plans on engaging with the community to have classroom volunteers.
- Mr. Maimone responded that since the school projected such large surpluses on the budget in further years down the line that the school may want to consider the addition of more staff members to make this model work. The Board responded that the budget is projected to have a surplus in the end of each year in order to ensure the school does not end each year at a balance of \$0. The board feels comfortable with what they have.
- Mrs. Kakedelis asked whether what was explained for model of instruction will be utilized at both schools. The Board responded that the balanced literacy approach will be used at both Next Generation Academy and Bishop.
- Ms. Turner asked how instruction will be different. The Board responded that the structure will be the same, but the methodology will be different. The all-male school will place emphasis on microdata, goal setting, competition, and cooperative learning. Additionally, research supports that language is harder to access for speaking and writing in male brains, and as such, the school will use word banks, sentence starters, and other strategies. There will be a balanced approach to getting the boys interested in fiction and to link reading materials to careers.

- Mr. Maimone mentioned that he is impressed by the background experiences of the board. He directed a question to the former ROTC instructor on the board. He asked what this background will bring to the school as an all-male school. The board member responded that with males in a normal school setting, one of the highest used management strategies is a punishment strategy. Bishop plans on engaging students with a more rewards based strategy and plans to challenge the students through the competitions and build them up.
- Mrs. Kroeger asked the board to elaborate on the relationship between Bishop and Next Generation Academy and how this will work with one school opening next year. The Board responded that there will be one person who will remain on both boards. Ms. Graves (a board member) will come off of Next Generation board and work solely with Bishop. The initial duality purpose was to share resources and the board emphasized the need for members to be on both boards if the schools plan to share transportation or staffing in the future. Transportation may include teaming up to drop students off at both Next Generation Academy and Bishop.
- Mrs. Reeves asked whether Next Generation was opening a building and then moving the first year for Bishop to take over. The Board responded that Next Generation will open up in a facility where it will remain for four (4) years. Bishop will open up in a site that is approximately one mile away. Eventually, both schools will be on the same acre property potentially sharing one gymnasium and the cafeteria.
- Ms. Turner sought to clarify whether they were sharing resources. The Board responded that the facility would belong to the person/company who is building it. The Board of each respective school would be leasing the facility.
- The Board sought to clarify the questions around bus drivers and the proposed budget and noted that this will not be a problem as they will either have staff members or board members to get their bus driver's license.
- Mr. Steven Walker led the board to deliberate and discuss after the interview.
- **Mrs. Phyllis Gibbs made a motion to recommend the school to the SBE for Ready to Open Process. Mr. Alan Hawkes seconded.**
- Mr. Alan Hawkes commented on a visit by himself and Mrs. Phyllis Gibbs to an open house for Next Generation Academy and noted he was impressed by the individuals they met, the tour of the school, and the quality of the board. Mr. Hawkes mentioned that the individuals on the board are an integral part of the Greensboro community and that they will not let the State down with this concept. Mr. Hawkes recognized that the need is great, and this all-male school needs to be given a chance. Mrs. Gibbs commented that Dr. Misher is a well-known school leader in Greensboro, and

they are getting all of these retired teachers to come work for them. Mr. Hawkes stated that we need to try this all male approach. Mr. Quigley wanted to commend Dr. Misher for his leadership through the iterations, but wanted to state that the education plan is aspirational and there is much work to be done where the rubber meets the road. He encouraged the school to take the education plan the next step forward and strengthen the plan whether that is through a school visit or further research prior to the Ready to Open process. Mrs. Kakedelis commended the board on the comment of going to get bus drivers licenses and identified that the need is too great so she will support this. She did comment that she is concerned with reaching the enrollment of 300 boys. Mrs. Turner will support the application because this is a strong board and there is a need for the school, but expressed her concern with the budget, finances, and enrollment. Mr. Hawkes stated that the achievement goal is lofty and enrollment goal is lofty, but there is confidence. **The motion passed unanimously.**

#### Ridgeview Charter School

- Mr. Alex Quigley led the interview. Dr. Townsend-Smith outlined the applicant information for the CSAB and included that the applicant did receive assistance in by Mrs. Shannon Stein who is the Director of Lake Norman Charter School.
- Mr. Walker commented on the applicant not being passed in previous years and how it has strengthened its application this year. He asked what changes the applicant made this year to garner the reviews that they did from external reviewers.
- The Board presented themselves to the CSAB.
- Mr. Walker identified a few issues around the budget including the absence of a breakeven number. Additionally, from a recruitment stand point, the retirement figures would not be attractive to teachers and he sought clarity around how they worked out the figure for health insurance and whether these would impede the hiring of quality teachers. Mrs. Kroeger identified that the technology budget could suffice for 15 classrooms, but that the Social Security and Medicare budget lines seemed low. Mr. Maimone commented that these numbers are concerning given that the applicant had three chances to revise as this is their third year applying.
- Ms. Turner was curious to see what interactions the Board has had with the local government, given that other schools were not able to open due to not getting a facility and one school had to move to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg line. Given the political push back in the past, Ms. Turner wanted to know what interactions have they had with the county government that would indicate otherwise for the opening of their school.
- Mr. Walker asked what specific changes were made to the application this year. The Board responded that the most significant change made was to the education plan. In the past, this portion of the application received the most push back, therefore they focused on creating a strong education



plan. The Board identified that the international piece is the framework, and the curriculum would support that framework.

- Mrs. Kakedelis sought clarification around the mission statement and the focus on the college market, and wants clarification around what mission and goals the school has for high school performance. The Board responded the proposed location area is looking for growth, and many potential employers may have hiring requirements aligning with college preparatory. The school hopes to impact the number of college graduates in that area, which is why the mission statement focuses on that. The school plans to prepare students to take AP/IB classes along with courses that will set them up for college. In addition, the school culture will support that as well.
- Mr. Quigley asked a broad question on what has improved from the prior applications. The Board responded that the educational plan was written better, they improved the goals, including having a base line for the first-year academic goals and clearly stating goals around academic growth. Additionally, there were questions in the past around how the mission statement was supported through the remainder of the application so the board ensured alignment of all sections with the mission this year.
- Mrs. Reeves sought clarification in the education plan around the separation of boys and girls in middle school. The Board confirmed that during core classes they want to accomplish this. Mrs. Reeves followed up by asking how the school will handle any discrepancies with the number of each gender per grade level. The Board has discussed this issue and has conducted research on single gender programs and plans to talk to an expert in South Carolina. Overall, minority students respond better to single gender programs, and separation by gender promotes academic gains in underserved. The school will have to schedule classes based on the number of students they have in those seats since they cannot manipulate their school admission process.
- Mrs. Reeves wanted to make sure the school would inform teachers that the genders may not be equal or balanced for each grade level. She advised that they may need extra support for certain grade levels or classes. The Board responded that they have budgeted for the possible need of additional support.
- Mrs. Reeves wanted to clarify promotional standards. Middle schoolers of the LEA are less than 50% are proficient. She asked how will the school make this work in the promotion plan, especially with the inherited students? The Board responded that they have employed successful methods of growing students. One method is a bridge program where all staff are on hand to ensure students are growing to meet proficiencies. A child will not be held back based on one factor, i.e. the EOG. The promotion or retention would be on an individualized basis and students will not be held back based on only EOG scores and a lack of proficiency there. Mrs. Reeves expressed concerns that the plan looked a little cut and dry, but given the Board's response is reassured that multiple factors would be taken into account.

- Mr. Walker clarified if the school would promote students who are not at grade level. The Board responded that the school and family would need to have a meeting to look at the complete picture of a student and have a conversation regarding what is best for the student.
- Mr. Walker requested to talk with the Board Treasurer and asked how many students the school would need to breakeven. The Board responded that the breakeven was 312 students.
- Mr. Walker inquired about the quotes for health insurance. The Board responded that this was based on a prior calculation. The current treasurer did not have the opportunity to look over the budget figures provided in this application. Mr. Walker commented that if approved, the board would need to rework the budget and that they were about \$1700 short per employee on taxes.
- Mr. Walker inquired on what are some options the board will employ to still project a surplus but meet the expenses that the CSAB noticed were short. The Board responded that they would look to reduce the budget of the CEO in addition to not filling the position of assistant principal. Lastly, they would look to adjust transportation costs. Mr. Walker followed up with the comment that the transportation plan was very aggressive and asked in what areas could the school make cuts. The Board responded with the option of having staff certified to handle the transportation of students. Additionally, they would explore deeper the location of the school, which would not require as much support of transportation to get students to the school. The Board may revisit facility costs to reduce expenses. Lastly, the Progressive Coalition may help to reduce the cost of facility, which could end up being less than \$10,000 a month.
- Mr. Walker commented that a budget may be an easier thing to fix compared to having to correct an education plan. The Board recognized that the budget is a guide and that they will need to revisit and tweak the budget in certain areas.
- Mr. Quigley wanted to talk through the instructional program. He asked the Board to talk about the international curriculum framework. The Board responded that it is an international program that started in Europe, which is used by the IB program. The program entails limited time spent by the teacher lecturing, with this timeframe being adjusted for the different age groups, and more time for small group or large group student led interactive learning. The international curriculum allows for student led instruction. It also allows for students to see that there is a larger world out there and that decisions impact beyond a textbook or piece of literature and can affect the students themselves, their neighborhoods, the community, and so forth.
- Mr. Quigley wanted to clarify whether they would be an IB school. The Board confirmed that they would not be an IB school, but wanted to inform the CSAB of the IB programs use of the international curriculum because it is so successful. Mr. Quigley sought clarification around what

math curriculum the school would utilize. The Board responded that the school will use Math in Focus which is a Singapore Math program.

- Mr. Quigley stated that it is important for the school to clarify how this international curriculum framework is integrated into instruction and the program. This should be clarified for teachers and parents, otherwise the concept can become muddled once the rubber meets the road if this is not fully fleshed out and clarified. The Board has recognized this and has identified a professor to provide training to teachers, additionally the framework itself comes with training offerings.
- Mr. Quigley commented that he was hoping to see more from the scope and sequence and noted that it was bare bones. He acknowledged that fleshing out scope and sequence would be something the school would obviously do if they made it on to the next round.
- Mrs. Reeves asked whether the board had experience with the international curriculum framework. The Board responded that they have experience with consulting schools that are using the IB program. Additionally, on a personal level one of the board members is a product of the IB program. Their personal story including coming from a large family and being one of the only children to qualify for the IB program. After having seen so many inequities growing up, there was a large pull towards implementing the international curriculum framework.
- Mr. Walker planned to ask whether Ms. Williams could be a strict disciplinarian since she is such a pleasant person but his question was answered with her statement of being the 7<sup>th</sup> child out of 8. The Board responded that the culture of the school is centered around rewards, but she is capable of enforcing rules and being a strict disciplinarian.
- Mrs. Kakedelis asked for further explanation of whether Ms. Williams has stepped down from the board and if so who will be board chair. The Board responded that Ms. Williams would step down from board and that a current member would step up to become board chair.
- Mrs. Reeves wanted further clarification on Ms. Turner's question around push back from the county. The Board responded that they have realtor who is well connected and supportive of the school. The Gaston County Coalition is supportive and Ms. Williams has attended several of their board meetings. Additionally, the coalition has expressed disappointment in what was being said for the plans of improving things academically after a meeting with the superintendent. The Board acknowledged that it is difficult to find buildings in Gaston County, but they are relying on the board (GCC) and the realtor who is connected to find the right fit. Since the administrator has been involved in the GCC, doors have been opened. Lastly, the county commissioner provided a letter in the application in support of the school.
- Mrs. Reeves asked which charter would be closest to the proposed school. The Board responded Piedmont Classical High. Mrs. Reeves asked what was the distance. The Board responded 10 miles.

- Mr. Maimone asked what will be the hook or marketing theme to attract students. The Board has traveled around to speak at large areas of Gastonia using the theme of equity. Additionally, the Board has marketed through pastors and influential contacts to attract families. The mall in Gastonia has agreed to allow the Board to use the facility for meetings and to conduct surveys. Additionally, the school will use open houses as an opportunity to recruit. The Board has secured a web designer and will utilize Facebook, a website, banners, flyers, and the local newspapers.
- Mr. Maimone clarified the target population of being 40% minority and whether this was a realistic projector or if it would be higher. The Board responded that this will be higher potentially, but they are expecting to have a diverse population. Mr. Maimone asked a follow up question around what are the demographic percentages of the surrounding schools. The Board responded that those percentages are very close to the census population, but that those schools are D/F schools. One board member commented that the need is there, for example there is a waitlist for Piedmont Classical High.
- Mr. Maimone expressed concern that when an applicant group submits an application over several years they become stale, but he is happy to hear the inspiration in the responses of the new board members.
- Mrs. Reeves wanted to thank them for persevering over these past three years.
- **Mrs. Sherry Reeves made a motion to recommend the school to the SBE for Ready to Open. Mr. Steven Walker seconded.** Mr. Maimone thanked them for the tenacity and urged them to make it work. **The motion passed unanimously.**

*Kaleidoscope Charter High School*

**Ms. Tammi Sutton reported to meeting – time 12:30pm.**

- Mr. Steven Walker led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith provided an update of the applicant information including proposed location, projected enrollment, whether there was an LEA impact or due diligence, and the pass/fail ratings for each section. This is a repeat applicant from a prior cycle. Mr. Walker asked the board of directors to introduce themselves and include their position on the board if they have one.
- Mr. Walker asked what the applicant has changed from the prior submission and commented that per the external reviewers' comments, they may want to ask some questions around the finances.

- Mrs. Reeves would like clarification around the administration of the Myers-Brigg twice a year as a personality test. The Board responded that they used this as an example of how to get to know the students and that they may use another type of personality assessment. Ms. Tammi Sutton wanted clarification how the school would measure the personality of a student through a pre-and post-assessment. The Board responded that the Myers-Briggs was just used as an example. Mr. Walker clarified if they wanted to see how the personality develops. The Board responded once again that this is used as an example and that it would be used to give the students an understanding of themselves. Mr. Walker commented that you cannot measure or grow in Myers-Briggs, so if you take it twice it should stay the same. Mr. Maimone commented that the assessment is probably misplaced.
- Mr. Maimone noted that did not see any goals around the ACT, the SAT, or AP exams, but that these are a component of the school application in the academic portion. The Board responded that it is the goal of the school to prepare all students to take ACT and SAT exams. Their intention is to prepare students to take those exams. They also acknowledge that not all students will take the path to college.
- Mrs. Reeves inquired around giving partial credit. Additionally, with a later start time, how will all the components written in the application fit into the bell schedule. Lastly, will they require all students to take SAT, as the state pays for the ACT. The Board replied the purpose of the two weeks of intensive courses is to have an opportunity to use this week as credit towards electives. The last five days of a semester, that is when testing occurs. Mrs. Reeves asked if this was mandatory. The Board responded that this would depend on the student. Ms. Turner clarified that the school will have to abide by the testing calendar for the state. Mrs. Reeves stated to that end that there is one stipend built in to the budget and inquired how one person will manage the intersession. The Board responded that they would have experts in the field along with parent volunteers to interact with students during this time.
- Ms. Sutton sought clarification around what portion of the portfolios will be used. Mrs. Kakedelis asked how they will ensure all students get through the required courses if they don't come in at the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Mrs. Reeves noted that on page 44 of the application it states that staff will be chosen to serve on committee to evaluate the director and that she did not feel staff should be on the committee to evaluate the director, this should fall to the board.
- Mrs. Kakedelis sought clarification around the one part time EC teacher, despite expecting a significant percent of the student population to be EC. Ms. Sutton would like to hear more about the school lunch program, particularly ordering online, and how students can access this. Mr. Maimone asked whether technology budgeted match the school nutrition ordering program.

- Mrs. Kroeger commented on the two percent (2%) raise and expressed that she is not sure they should promise this in addition to this not being included in the budget. She sought clarification around who is paying for 401K and dental plan. She noted that the technology budget and instruction materials budget seemed low, given that it is a high school, which usually requires more textbook funds.
- Mr. Walker asked about the marketing budget and why it is growing so robustly over time. The Board responded that they do not have an answer to this question, but they do believe that they could recruit over time with less money. Mr. Walker sought to clarify how Economically Disadvantaged Students can receive devices if the school is essentially “bring your own device.” Mrs. Reeves asked how the school ensures the security if it is “bring your own device”, additionally will Free and Reduced Lunch students have access to technology. The Board responded that they plan to lease devices for those students in need. With regards to security, the students would be required to lock up their own devices and with regards to online security the school would use a firewall and Wi-Fi security programs.
- Mr. Walker clarified how students would be held accountability since they can have their own software and content. The Board replied that at Sterling Montessori they have a Wi-Fi system that does not allow full access to all content. If a student has their own data, they obviously would be able to do what they want. They did note that the student-centered learning and culture of the school would allow for students to be more on task.
- Mrs. Reeves sought clarification on the marketing budget and expressed that she is unsure that there are enough classroom teachers in the budget. Ms. Sutton asked how they plan to market or bring students into the 10<sup>th</sup> grade, as that is a hard grade to market for.
- The Board responded to the question around the late start to the day. They stated that doors would open at 8 am. Mr. Walker sought clarification as to what a typical day would look like given this schedule. The Board responded that they spent a significant amount of time constructing a bell schedule that would work. What they decided on is that on Mondays the first period would be longer, on Tuesdays the second period would be longer, so on for the remainder of the week. Additionally, they would build in club time at lunch. Ms. Sutton asked the board to run through a typical day. The Board responded that there will be a little of wiggle room and that they would not have a schedule that looks like a typical high school. 8:45 students will start first period class, then the students would go into period two, the board did not bring a fleshed-out bell schedule with them.
- Mr. Walker asked what time the day would end. The Board responded at 3 pm. Ms. Sutton asked how many classes a student would attend during this schedule. The Board responded about 5 classes.

- Mr. Maimone asked if the board had any evidence that there is enough demand for this high school with competing high schools in this area. The Board responded that over the past five years they have had increased support from the community in Morrisville, along with families in the surrounding communities such as Cary. When the school is published in the media, they continue to get more contacts, through social media. They have the current mayor of the town of Morrisville and first female mayor on their advisory board.
- Mr. Maimone asked what is the hook that makes your school different. The Board responded that they use student centered learning. The focus of the school is to have student centered learning be the staple of the instruction and this will increase student engagement.
- Mr. Maimone would like a facility issues update. The Board responded that they are looking for a facility and have had brokers take them on site visits. One good thing is they are currently building a bypass which will open close to 300-400 acres. The future will create more space availability. The school anticipates occupying a temporary space when they first open, but hopes to find a permanent place in Morrisville. Mr. Maimone clarified whether the school was considering modular buildings or a permanent building space. The Board responded that they would primarily look for a building and if that did not work out, modular buildings would be an option.
- Mr. Walker sought clarification around zoning issues and asked the board whether they foresee any issues for the buildings in which they will consider locating. The Board responded that there is an area in the airport overlay district in which you cannot place K-12 building, but they are hoping for a resolution in the future.
- Mr. Maimone commented on the amount budgeted for marketing in the first year and the growth of that budget line over time and asked the board whether this was intentional. The Board responded they don't have a logic behind that and commented that the CSAB is absolutely right about the rationale of school spending more on marketing in the first few years.
- Mr. Maimone inquired on what changes the applicant made this year and asked the board to provide a few highlights of what changed. The Board responded that they clearly responded to the student-centered learning, included MTSS protocol, improved the goals, and that the application benefited from the legal and business expertise of new board members.
- Mr. Maimone sought clarification around why the enrollment drops in year five. The Board replied that with the bubble over time enrollment would drop to a stabilized.
- Mr. Maimone asked what were the closest competing charter schools. The Board responded that Research Triangle High School located in Research Triangle Park is the closest competing school. The school (RTHS) has a waitlist and technology focus, but our school will offer more student focused learning. Additionally, we pull from Cary as a surrounding area.

- Mr. Walker asked clarification on how student-centered learning works and how the portfolios are managed. The Board clarified that students will have input into their learning, but they would not run the instruction and their learning. The school plans to create avenues for the students to connect with the school including the expectation of teachers to build strong relationships with students. The school believes that students have needs in their developmental age including feeling loved, valued, and appreciated. There will be some elements of lecture, but students may choose the avenue in which they show mastery of an objective. Students will be held accountable for learning objectives, but they will choose how they demonstrate this mastery. As far as portfolios, the students will have the opportunity to add work they believe demonstrates growth. Teachers may require specific items to add to the portfolio. The portfolios are essentially a comprehensive history of the student's time at Kaleidoscope High School.
- Mr. Walker clarified whether the school was basically offering differentiated learning with a twist, and the twist being that students have an input in how they are evaluated. The Board responded that students may have some input in the content and a choice in what they are learning to stay excited and engaged. Mrs. Reeves clarified how this structure works with math instruction. The Board responded that since math is more structured, there are less options with student choice of content, but they will still have some choice regarding how mastery is demonstrated.
- Mrs. Reeves asked how the school plans to keep students on pace in Math I with the block schedule. The Board responded that if a student is ahead they may have a chance to do a project. Mrs. Reeves commented that during that intervention period hopefully a student who is behind would have the chance to get the help they needed.
- Mrs. Reeves asked for further clarification around the block schedule. Mr. Walker sought to understand whether the classes were all year long. The Board clarified that block scheduling is because they would have A/B day schedule and that classes would go the whole year long rather than end at the semester.
- Mrs. Kroeger asked questions around governance and whether the board lost any members and replaced them or have they added new members. The Board responded that they have added board members and that some members have rotated on to an advisory board. Mrs. Kakedelis asked how many members are on the board. The Board stated that they currently have six (6) board members and that they plan on opening the board candidacy up once they are approved.
- Mr. Walker directed a question to the student advisory member of the board. He asked how the individual became a member of the board. The student advisory member responded that they once attended Sterling Montessori and got involved through a connection with the XQ Super School platform which looks at unconventional ways to educate high school students. Mr. Walker followed



up with asking whether the student would go to the school if it were open. The student replied that they would if it were open.

- Mr. Walker identified that it is evident that the school is not a cookie cutter school due to the robust CSAB discussion and the breadth of the questions they had for the applicant.
- **Mrs. Phylliss Gibbs moved to recommend the school to SBE for Ready to Open. Mr. Joe Maimone seconded.** Mr. Alan Hawkes mentioned that the same reasons that we noted this should be approved last year are the same for this year. Mr. Quigley commented that they persisted. Mrs. Reeves shared that they did not do themselves service with their explanations. Ms. Turner arrived today certain of the school, but after the interview portion she is left not so confident. Ms. Sutton asked what about this school is different. Mr. Walker commented that A/B days and having a portfolio is different. We had so many questions about how the education plan works so that we could gain a better understanding, which shows there is enough innovation here that there will be enough families in this area that would be interested to attend. Mr. Walker also commented that the budget could be massaged over time. It was unfortunate that they could not give exact answers to clarifying questions, but it is innovative and different enough to make a difference. Mrs. Kakedelis commented that they should reference other local high schools or charter schools with PowerSchool. Mr. Hawkes recommended that they front load the budget for marketing and advertising, but this can be easily fixed and commented that enrollment is everything. Mrs. Kakedelis commented that this is different and I support this. Mrs. Kroeger thought that the finance issues presented were not insurmountable and could be fixed. **The motion passed 9 - 1 with Ms. Tammi Sutton dissenting.**

#### MINA's place

- Mr. Joe Maimone led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. Dr. Townsend-Smith provided an update of the applicant information including the proposed location, projected enrollment for the first five years of operation, LEA impact statement and due diligence, and the pass/fail ratings for each section. Mr. Maimone asked the board of directors to introduce themselves and include their position on the board if they had one.
- Mr. Maimone expressed that one concern is the enrollment numbers and he hoped to get additional information through survey data. Mr. Walker asked a clarifying question around enrollment and whether there is currently a charter school that is at 10% of their LEA. He expressed the concern for the school to meet this percentage within the first year of operation. Additionally, he noted that the finance section had issues and those issues coupled with enrollment posed a concern. Mrs. Reeves commented that many of the goals were not written in measurable terms. Ms. Turner had trouble connecting to the need and noted that there was a list of issues with the LEA one of which is that they hired too many experienced teachers. Ms. Turner noted that the further she delved into the application she has concerns that they will not be able to accomplish the proposed programmatic plan with beginning teachers and sought clarity around their philosophy on experienced teachers.

- Mr. Walker sought clarification around how they will use mastery-based learning. Mrs. Reeves wanted to know how all the components come together to achieve a sound instructional program. Mr. Quigley asked what a typical day will look like. Ms. Sutton wanted to clarify if the board understood what will happen instructionally when students are with them. Mrs. Reeves asked how the board will recruit a qualified cohort of teachers to do the comprehensive things mentioned in education plan.
- Mr. Maimone would like to understand a little better who are they key board members versus the advisory members. Ms. Turner sought clarification on the background checks as they seemed odd. Specifically, she asked for more information about the company that did background checks. Mrs. Reeves noted that there is one educator on the board and asked whether they plan on adding more. Additionally, she sought clarification on the annual financial contribution by board members and whether that is a deal breaker. She asked how are parents involved in academic advisory, will teachers be compensated for AIG certification, and why teacher aides are paid just as much as the teachers.
- Mrs. Reeves noted that teachers are required to report at 7 am and stay until 4:30 and asked how they will be compensated. Mr. Walker noted that location would be very important for the success of the school and was surprised to see that the facility plan was going to be close to downtown Sanford. He asked whether there was going to be enough enrollment in that area to meet their goals for students.
- Mr. Maimone noted that the teacher pay was an issue. Mr. Walker and Ms. Sutton sought clarification on child nutrition and only having one personnel for food services. Mrs. Kroeger noted that the application mentioned 1-to-1 devices, but the budget did not reflect expenses for technology programs or an IT person. Additionally, she questioned the budget line for transportation. Mr. Maimone commented that the budget summary page projects a surplus that is so large considering the many needed materials for instruction.
- Mr. Maimone asked how the school plans to attract 10% of the LEA for enrollment, especially given the plan to locate right in the middle of the county. The Board responded that they understood that trying to get the 400+ students in the building was going to be a large task. When the board examined the area and researched, they felt like they can approach 400 kids in the first year. The Board has added some professional educators to their board since their last visit in front of the CSAB. Additionally, Lee County has approved the building of one more elementary school and listed a second on the priority list, thus showing a need and the charter plans to fill that gap. The goal is to have the school serve as a community school for more of those bubble students. The Board believes they can provide some academic opportunities for these students that surrounding traditional public schools are not providing. The recruitment plan includes collecting letters of intent, open a school website, and having members of the board speak in front of various entities in the

community. To attest to salaries, the Board felt they had to be prudent with the budget and they will seek out retired teachers through which they will not need to pay full salary.

- Mrs. Reeves noted that Ascend Leadership Academy will open in August given that they complete the Ready to Open process and sought clarification on where this school would locate in relation to Ascend. The Board replied that they cannot attest to the full plan of Ascend, but can only mention that they are further in the process with regards to a securing a building.
- Mr. Maimone asked if the board expects a positive working relationship with the Lee County Board. The Board responded that they do expect a positive working relationship given that a member of this board is a former board chairman for the Lee County School Board.
- Mr. Maimone asked clarification on Ascend Leadership Academy's projected enrollment. Ms. Turner stated that Ascend would open with 160 students in the first year. The Board mentioned that the school will be K-8, while Ascend is 6-12, so they would only be competing for middle school grade students.
- Mr. Maimone sought clarification around the education plan and the measurable goals. The Board responded that the goal was to perform at or above Lee County by 2%.
- Mr. Maimone asked how will software get paid for as this was not addressed in the budget. The Board has talked through this with many providers of systems, but in terms in financing, it has all been very speculative up to this point. For the proposed budget, the Board lumped the technology fees in with teacher technology line item. With regards to the use of technology during the instructional day, the Board has looked at the Steve Jobs school and other coding schools. The typical day would consist of 30-minute instructional period with 20 minutes of technology application.
- Mr. Maimone asked the board to walk through a typical day. The Board responded that day begins with a yoga exercise, then the instructional day begins with the first 50-minute block of class, a break, another 50-minute block, another break, recess, science, followed by lunch, and to close out the afternoon with the remaining instructional piece. Additionally, the end of the day is blocked out for strengthening/remediation or enrichment. Ms. Sutton wanted to know what enrichment would be provided and what it would look like. The Board responded that during the period of instruction the group could be divided by level and provided differentiated instruction based on mastery level.
- Mr. Maimone clarified whether the school wanted experienced teachers or beginning teachers and how they will be compensated for their 9.5 hours of work. The Board responded that the teachers may have rotating duty days during which they will have a longer morning or later afternoon. The Board is seeking a combination of experience and teachers who are sold on the mission of innovative

education for students. This would encompass some experienced teachers and some inexperienced teachers, and that the salaries budgeted represent an average. Mr. Maimone commented that the figure provided cannot be an average since \$35,000 is the minimum amount required for a beginning teacher and to have an average, the school would need to have a figure amount that is in the middle. The Board responded that they believe they will attract teachers that are cutting edge as they plan to market themselves as cutting edge. Additionally, to bring the projected surplus to a full picture, the board believes that if the school can recruit students effectively, with that \$800,000 budgeted surplus they can provide teacher bonuses, additional professional development based on interests, and purchase materials requested by teachers.

- Ms. Turner asked whether it is considerably cheaper to live in Lee County and brought up the fact that living off of \$35,000 may be very difficult to do for a single individual. The Board will recruit based on working with staff members and claimed that they wanted to be genuine in the teacher salary figure provided in the application rather than overestimating.
- Mr. Maimone sought clarification around the background check company. The board chair responded that he vetted the company himself.
- Ms. Sutton asked what is the most impactful piece in contingency plan if the school does not reach the enrollment needed. The Board identified that the technology is a major piece where they would look to begin to cut to ensure they had qualified teachers in the classroom.
- Mr. Maimone inquired on how child nutrition would function with one staff member. The Board responded that they would have teacher assistants and the one staff member in addition to using Preferred Meals as the vendor. Mr. Walker asked at what cost. The Board responded that Preferred Meals will do it for less than the reimbursement costs.
- Mrs. Kroeger shared that financially the revenues are possibly overstated and this is concerning with the expenses potentially being understated. Mr. Walker expressed that his concerns all go back to enrollment and that if the school goes forward with 200 students, that it wouldn't be enough. Mrs. Reeves commented there is one charter school trying to open in August, the county is proposing to open another elementary school, and the county population is low already. With the location being between two of the higher supplemented (paying) counties the board may find it difficult to recruit staff to this school. Mr. Hawkes made a point that this board has the former chair of the Lee County School Board on it which shows there may be a working relationship between the proposed school and the LEA. Mrs. Reeves noted that they have made suggestions to schools in the past that they should start with a lower enrollment. Ms. Turner noted that the number of grade levels versus the teacher pay and number of teachers needed is a recipe for disaster. Mr. Hawkes commented that the school is being a little overly optimistic and expressed uncertainty that there is going to be some symbiosis between the prior approved charter school proposing to locate in the county.

- **Mr. Steven Walker made a motion to recommend to the SBE that the school not be moved forward for Ready to Open Status with the caveat that they come back next year with an improved application, facility nailed down and try for the acceleration track. Mrs. Lindalyn Kakedelis seconded.** Mr. Maimone and Ms. Turner suggested that they be more specific with the data that they are collecting through surveys for interested families that have students in the projected enrollment grades. Mrs. Lynn Kroger suggested that the school budget the expenses higher, unless they have contracts signed and know the costs. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Clara Science Academy

- Mr. Alex Quigley led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. OCS provided information on the proposed school. This is a repeat applicant in a prior cycle. They received assistance from Leaders Building Leaders. Mr. Quigley asked the board of directors to introduce themselves.
- Mrs. Kakedelis wanted to address enrollment again. Mrs. Reeves asked what the waitlists are like as the survey data did not indicate there is a need. Ms. Turner echoed that she did not observe the survey showing there is a need. Mrs. Reeves wanted to clarify if the goal is to be K-8. Mrs. Reeves also noted that the goals were not written as SMART goals, which is disappointing given this is not the first time this application has been submitted. Mr. Walker indicated that they were missing the timeline portion of the goals. Mrs. Reeves indicated that the language portion is included in education plan, but not represented in the goals section. Mrs. Kakedelis noted that they have a goal to meet or exceed the state average and eventually get to 95% proficiency, but there is not a timeline.
- Mrs. Reeves noted that the target population was unclear and that it is unbalanced to have a standard school day with 200 minutes of literacy. She commented that there are many strategies with ELL/AIG students but not a lot of detail as far as implementation. With every strategy imaginable listed she asked how will the school make this work in a cohesive plan. Mrs. Kakedelis asked how will the language piece will be incorporated. Mr. Quigley noted that the applicant submitted a strong curriculum outline, but lacks alignment to what is presented in the education plan. With those aspects of misalignment, he asked the school to address how they fit together.
- Mr. Quigley sought clarification on the background checks being processed through the FBI. He asked a clarification around whether the background checks were from the FBI and what are the requirements for submitting resumes versus bios. Dr. Townsend-Smith directed the CSAB members to an additional appendix that had the board information that was missing and was resubmitted by the applicant.

- Mr. Quigley noted that he had some questions around the lunch plan, bagged lunches and bringing lunches.
- Mrs. Reeves asked who is going to do student accounting or will the school contract out those services. She noted the limited expenses budgeted for transportation. Additionally, health insurance and benefits are low. She commented that some line items are very unrealistic and that the applicant only has a Professional Development budget for \$3500. Mr. Walker wanted to clarify whether the facility will be construction or a lease. He also commented that the transportation costs come out further in the operating years, the health insurance costs are low, and noted that if the school is operating at full capacity they may start to operate at a deficit. He had additional questions around the part time finance officer.
- Mr. Quigley noted that the application has improved from last year significantly. Mrs. Reeves wanted to start with benefits and sought clarification as all of the components are too low. The Board responded that they put a lot of the budget into the technology and the teachers since they are a science school. After contacting Health Care United they received information on group health care plans. Each group plan is calculated differently and the figure the school wrote down is what United Health Care provided for a group plan.
- The Board addressed student accounting questions and stated that they contacted Charter Success and received feedback that this could be contracted out. Ms. Turner asked where this is accounted for in the budget. The Board did not account this in the budget. Through recent discussion the board noted that they will contract out student accounting, but could not change the initial budget as submitted in the original application.
- The Board addressed transportation and stated that the quote they received for a five to ten-mile radius is around \$25,000. Mr. Walker asked if they will acquire buses in later years. The Board responded that they will contract the first year and acquire buses later.
- Mr. Maimone noted that the budget included other expenses including education consultants, board training, and software consultants. He then asked who are the education consultants as that is a big number for someone to advise the school. The Board responded that currently they had not identified any education consultants.
- Mr. Walker asked clarifying question regarding facility and whether the school will be leasing or buying. The Board responded that after the last visit in front of the CSAB they have talked to two potential places to lease. The church may lease \$11,000 - \$12,000 a month. Mr. Walker asked who will cover the maintenance of the facility. The Board responded that the landlord of the facility would and in addition they sought an estimate for a typical bill for the building they are seeking to occupy from Duke Energy.

- Mr. Quigley asked for the board to clarify child nutrition. The Board responded that they do not know how many students would be Free-Reduced Lunch and given that USDA applications are approved they have contracted with Coffee Cup Cafeteria to provide lunch for individuals who do not have lunch that day and will take care of the expenses. Ms. Turner brought forward the concern that these individuals may not have a clue on how to participate in child nutrition, nor the full understanding of the cost and reimbursement. The Board noted that their contingency plan will be to contract with another vendor.
- Mrs. Kroeger sought clarification regarding staffing, specifically the plan to offer three different foreign languages and whether the school will have three different teachers doing this. The Board is a strong believer in being dual-certification. The science teacher will serve as the language teacher as well. The special would actually be focused on teaching cultural information in the lower grades. When the students get to the middle school, they will get to choose the language they would like to take.
- Mrs. Kakedelis asked clarification around what area they plan to locate as the application references being in the Steele Creek area, but provides little evidence to support this claim. The Board responded that they were looking to recruit more towards Charlotte than Lake Wylie.
- Mr. Quigley asked how the curriculum fits into the personalized learning format. The Board responded that the school is starting early with K-2 and wanted to focus on the foundation which is literacy. With that foundation, they would be able to build on the science and math. Mr. Quigley followed up by asking if the students would have science every day. The Board responded yes. Mr. Quigley clarified who will teach science. The Board responded that a teacher would instruct science. Mr. Quigley asked where those individuals were accounted for in the budget. The Board responded they are the instructional support (science specialist, math specialist, literacy/reading specialist). Mr. Quigley wanted to clarify what specials would be offered. The Board responded that there would be three language classes (Spanish, Arabic, and Chinese).
- Mr. Quigley identified that there are many things mentioned in the school application and he is seeking to find alignment between the mission and the other components of the application. The Board responded that they have some very interested personnel with a variety of certifications and background experiences that bring forward the mission of the school.
- Mr. Quigley advised the Board to ensure that they make the mission real. Mrs. Reeves noted that the mission says they will be a STEM school, but that did not come through in the rest of the application. The Board responded that there is a need for a STEM school in the area. Mrs. Reeves acknowledged that there is a need, but the application does not show evidence that the vision and mission live in the application.

- Mr. Quigley commented that the need is great, but there may need to be more revisions and alignment with the mission throughout the application. Mrs. Reeves shared she is excited about what they have, but the sections of the application did not mesh with the mission. Mr. Quigley is very impressed with the quality of the board. Mrs. Reeves personally had many bells go off in the overall application. Mr. Maimone asked whether it was mostly in the education plan that was not meshing for Mrs. Reeves. She responded that it was in the mission, the vision, and how this is encompassed in the operations and finances. Mrs. Kakedelis stated that the educational plan presented was very strong, but this did not live out in the mission. Ms. Turner expressed that the mission and the overall plan have to come together in order to make it work. Mrs. Kakedelis expressed concern about the child nutrition piece. Ms. Turner stated it is unlikely for a restaurant to meet the requirements for child nutrition and have to feed 500 students over time. Mr. Walker noted that the budget is problematic as many things are underbudgeted and the surplus in the first year is tight. In addition, the education plan needs to match up with the mission a little better. Mr. Walker commented that the education plan was not a problem for me, it was the budget.
- **Mrs. Sherry Reeves made a motion to recommend to the SBE that the school not be moved forward to Ready to Open, but does encourage the school to come back next year through the acceleration if they can square away a facility. Mrs. Lindalyn Kakedelis seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

- Mr. Walker presented to the board that they would be constructing stipulations for the two schools that they proposed a 3-year renewal for prior to the voting for an State Board approval.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:40 pm. Mr. Maimone seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**



**Minutes of the  
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board  
Education Building  
301 N. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825  
January 9, 2018  
9:00 am**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Lindalyn Kakadelis Lynn Kroeger	Alex Quigley Tammi Sutton Steven Walker Kevin Wilkinson - <i>absent</i>
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i>  Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Stephenie Clark, Consultant	<i>SBE</i>  <i>Attorney General</i> Tiffany Lucas  <i>SBE Attorney</i> Jason Weber

**CALL TO ORDER**

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Steven Walker led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- Mr. Dave Machado introduced the Office of Charter Schools new administrative assistant, Ms. Patricia Nnadi-Purvis.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION UPDATES**

- Mr. Dave Machado provided the CSAB an update of action and discussion items from the State Board of Education January meeting. The SBE approved the applicants recommended for acceleration with a stipulation for Mountain Island to place charter school in the name.
- The SBE approved The Experiential School of Greensboro's request to amend its mission statement.
- The State Board discussed the eleven (11) schools up for renewal. Nine (9) of the schools were recommended for a 10-year renewal and two (2) of the schools were recommended for a 3-year

renewal. The SBE is asking that CSAB discuss and recommend stipulations for the two (2) schools that were recommended for a 3-year renewal.

- The Office of Charter Schools presented on the program audit of Kestrel Heights.
- Some wonderful news shared with the CSAB is the naming of the 2018-19 Charter School Teacher of the Year. The recipient of this nomination is Mrs. Courtney Samuelson from The Capitol Encore Academy. The other finalist was Mr. Alex Rowe from Pinnacle Classical Academy. The Office of Charter Schools, accompanied by the current North Carolina Teacher of the Year Mrs. Lisa Godwin, made a surprise presentation at The Capitol Encore Academy on December 20, 2017. Mr. Alex Quigley wanted to point out that Courtney Samuelson was hired and developed at Maureen Joy Charter School.
- The Annual Charter School Report is due to the SBE on February 14, 2018 and the General Assembly on March 15, 2018. OCS requested a one month extension. The finalized data will be sent to the CSAB within a week. Mr. Steven Walker asked what is the proposed timeline for the annual report. Mr. Machado responded that the CSAB would get it at some point next week, with plenty of time to review and suggest changes prior to submission to the State Board and General Assembly.
- Discovery Charter School in Durham is asking for a 2<sup>nd</sup> year delay. A representative from Discovery Charter School presented before the CSAB.
- Mr. Carl Forsyth informed the board that Discovery Charter School is a STEAM based charter school that will be located in northern Durham County. The school is currently on a one year delay that was approved. This delay was requested because a group of residents where the school plans to construct the school appealed the county Board of Adjustment. The residents are suing Durham County Board of Adjustment. The legal case between the county and the residents continues to drag on. The school has been actively participating in the Ready to Open process and are actively looking for a secondary location, but due to factors impacting finances for up-fit, instructional program and such they could not make this work. The Board is confident that after all boxes are checked the special uses permit will be granted again and they hope to close on property in May and begin construction in June. The board feels like requesting from the CSAB a 2-year delay is the most responsible step for the school to take.
- Ms. Turner pointed out that a 2-year delay is the maximum the school can receive and asked at what point will they say this isn't working and what will they do to ensure they open in time. The Board responded that they have put together an action plan to address what Ms. Turner has brought up. They have located a second location that does not need any up-fit but can only house 100 students. The board understands clearly that this the last delay that will be approved and the school had better be able to open in the fall.

- Mr. Maimone clarified whether they will use any modular buildings. The Board chair responded that it is the building will be a regular construction building. Mr. Walker commented that this is unfortunate and cannot think of a better reason for the CSAB to approve a request for 2-year delay.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend to the State Board of Education that Discovery Charter be granted a 2-year delay. Mrs. Sherry Reeves seconded.** Mr. Alex Quigley mentioned he will be recusing himself from anything related to Discovery Charter as he has had conversation with the Board of Discovery regarding the situation. **Motion passed unanimously, with Mr. Alex Quigley recusing himself.**
- Mr. Machado clarified that the State Board of Education would have the item for discussion first, and would act the following month.
- Mrs. Reeves asked for an update on the transportation grant and how many applications were submitted. Mr. Machado responded that between 40 and 50 transportation grant applications were submitted. Mr. Quigley asked why the number was higher given they expected a smaller number of applicants. Mr. Machado and Dr. Townsend-Smith clarified that it was a lot of last minute submissions. Ms. Turner asked if the requests exceed the amount of money available. Mr. Machado responded this is something the office will be working on. Mr. Quigley asked whether all applicants would qualify. Dr. Townsend-Smith gave an update what a school would need to qualify.
- Mr. Walker posed a question regarding the new school report card website. There is a section that denotes the use of funds for each charter school, including the state average and the individual school. He asked if there is any data that shows the average of how traditional public schools are using their funds versus how Charter Schools are using their funds.
- Ms. Turner asked a question around the data presenting the percentage of students who are ready for 6<sup>th</sup> grade and the percentage of students who are ready for high school and why those numbers do not match proficiency for that grade level (5<sup>th</sup>/8<sup>th</sup>). Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that they would ask accountability to see where that data is coming from.

### **2018 RENEWAL STIPULATIONS**

- **Mr. Alex Quigley recused himself from discussion and left the board room.**
- Mr. Walker led the discussion of the two charter schools who have received a recommendation from CSAB for a 3-year renewal in 2018. The State Board has asked that CSAB provide some stipulations for those schools. Stipulations were provided to CSAB.

- Ms. Turner suggested that the school should come in once a year in September after data has been presented versus twice a year.
- Mrs. Kroeger asked if they could get the financial information in September. Mr. Walker suggested that the school should come in during the November meeting since the audit would be in at that time.
- Mr. Maimone is concerned with the state's growth model and holding this model as a do or die for the charter schools. Even with dramatic changes in the academic proficiency a school would not show the type of growth one may expect to see with that level of increase. Ms. Turner presented the fact that through general statute those schools will be held accountable. Mrs. Kakedelis stated that there are no consequences there presented on the stipulations. Mr. Walker suggested softening the stipulations to requiring the schools to meet or exceed growth 2 out of 3 years.
- Mr. Machado mentioned that although the stipulations do not state that a school will be closed there is an implication that they may be closed.
- Ms. Turner stated that they may not improve a letter grade either if they do not meet or exceed growth.
- Mr. Maimone stated that with that caveat, it is worth it to note in the minutes that there is continued concern with the growth model. Mr. Machado responded that Accountability was going to present in December/January, but the schedule of interviews created the CSAB agenda to be too booked. Mr. Maimone requested data on the quartile ranges and whether a school met or exceeded growth.
- Mr. Hawkes asked where the stipulations are coming from. Mr. Walker responded that the Office of Charter Schools is providing the recommendations of stipulations to the CSAB. Mr. Machado responded that the State Board asked of OCS and the CSAB to come up with stipulations for the two schools recommended for a 3-year renewal. Mr. Hawkes wanted to clarify whether the State Board came up with the stipulations for the CSAB to consider. Mr. Machado confirmed that they did not.
- **Mr. Steven Walker made a motion to recommend to SBE that the stipulations as follows be recommended for 3-year renewal schools Healthy Start Academy and Success Institute:**
  1. The charter school shall appear before the Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) 1 time per year during its 3-year renewal term. The appearances shall take place in November of the three-year charter term (including the renewal year). During the November appearances, the charter school will outline its strategic plan (presented to the CSAB in its renewal presentation) and detail progress toward the plan. Specifically, documented evidence will include SMART goals to indicate progress of its academic performance and previously submitted plan. The schools will submit any required materials a week prior to its CSAB appearance.

2. The charter school shall meet or exceed expected growth 2 of 3 years of its 3-year charter term. Additionally, each school shall demonstrate growth in overall student achievement, indicating an upward trend of academic performance with its targeted student population.
- **Ms. Cheryl Turner seconded. Motion passed unanimously, with AQ recusing himself.**

### **APPLICATION UPDATES/REVIEWS**

**Mr. Alex Quigley rejoined the CSAB meeting.**

#### **Academy of Excellence**

- Mr. Walker led the discussion and requested that during the brief overview of the applicant OCS confirm what portion of the application was missing.
- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. The incomplete information as requested by CSAB was the criminal background check information.
- Mr. Walker stated pursuant to SBE policy that the CSAB shall reject all incomplete applications, given that this applicant provided documentation outside the timeline to submit missing information. Mr. Walker opened the floor for any representative of the Academy of Excellence to address the CSAB. None were present.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion that we do not move Academy of Excellence forward. Mrs. Lindalyn Kakedelis seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

#### **Piedmont Career Academy**

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Assistance was provided by Charter Success and there were no fees paid to the third party.
- Mr. Maimone led the performance committee in discussion of the application. Mr. Maimone had a concern with the enrollment number and the projection of having 15% of the LEA. He expressed the familiarity of the CSAB with Bethel Hill Charter and their enrollment difficulties in the past. Mrs. Reeves brought up the concern that grades 6-10 may be difficult to recruit. Mrs. Kakedelis saw

discrepancies with the marketing budget given the number of students and grade spans they would need to recruit. Mrs. Reeves is unsure that a middle school parent is able to make that decision on whether students should pursue a career and technical track and noted misalignment with mission.

- Mr. Maimone is perplexed why the external evaluators gave the applicant such a higher mark given the mission and the size of the district. Mrs. Phyllis Gibbs wanted clarification on which counties the school was pulling from. Mr. Maimone sought clarification on whether there was survey data provided that would convince CSAB of the need. Mrs. Kakedelis asked about intervention specifics and noted the heavy reliance on the LEA for transportation. Mrs. Reeves brought up that a huge component of the program is an internship as every child in the high school will have an internship, but Person County is small, and asked where are we putting 200 students to conduct internships yearly.
- Mr. Maimone proposed that if they are going to work with smaller number of students, can they make it work in the budget. Mrs. Reeves noted that the breakeven number is 220 which is very close to the 250 expected. In addition, this number is close to 15% of the LEA population. Mrs. Kakedelis wanted to know what is the school's plan for ensuring that every student meets NC graduation requirements. Mr. Maimone sought clarification around what involvement does the Discovery Charter Board Chair (Carl Forsyth) have on this board, especially since Discovery is having trouble with the delayed opening in Durham.
- Mrs. Reeves noticed that there are low line items and wanted to clarify whether the budgeted surplus is a representation of these items. For example, they indicated no life insurance, no finance officer, no transportation, or food service costs, and if the school increased even one of those line items, there would be no fund balance.
- The Board responded that they neither market nor pull solely from Person County. They plan to locate in a place that is equidistant from Person, Roxboro, Durham, Hillsboro. The Board spoke to the demographic information from that part of the state and noted that the entire area is similar in population density and contains agricultural and rural sub divisions. The Board recognizes that they will have the chance to market to the same demographics of families. To respond to the need, the Board indicated that they have over 200 community surveys with over a 90% positive survey response to the school. Additionally, they conducted a business and industry survey that indicates that this type of school is what the area needs.
- Mr. Maimone asked whether the board has visited any other schools with a similar program. The Board responded with none and that the only vocational programs that they are aware of are those programs that are geared to specific career clusters. The school plans to have a very direct partnership with local economic commission and to utilize projected jobs to inform students where

they should be looking for a career. This research will help the school place interns. Additionally, the internships will not be year-long and will not be restricted to solely Person County.

- Mr. Maimone asked whether the goal of 70%+ proficiency in the first year is realistic given the county proficiency is in the 40% range and that the school will have a group of students that may not be college bound. The Board responded that it is an ambitious goal and simply a projection as they do not know what students they will attract to fill the seats. The difference in the education program is going to be relevance to the industries. In large parts, most kids that are not performing well, could do much better with specific relevance in what they are learning to a future job or career. Research has proven that project based learning can accomplish this. Additionally, RTI and MTSS are going to be the type of interventions the school will have in place.
- Mr. Maimone stated that the application indicates 200 or 205 come from Person County and clarified whether this is over 10% of the county. The Board responded this is conservative estimate. Mr. Maimone sought clarification of how 10% of non-college bound students is conservative. The Board clarified that they do not expect to have that heavy of a load from Person County and that they anticipate the possibility of more students coming from surrounding counties.
- Mr. Maimone asked what percentage from the survey conducted came from outside of Person County. The Board responded that they did not have any survey responses from outside of Person County. Mrs. Reeves responded that of the total surveys there were less than 10 each from Durham, Granville, and Caswell. Ms. Sutton asked what was the breakdown of 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> grade families that expressed interest. The Board did not ask this information specifically on their surveys. She followed up by asking if the Board has any evidence to suggest that the school will be able to attract students grades 6-8. The Board responded not specifically.
- Mr. Maimone asked for the school to talk the CSAB through the budget, given the concerns they have with the enrollment numbers. Specifically, address the breakeven number and how the school will work with the LEA for transportation. The Board clarified that the budget numbers were provided by Charter Success and that they do plan to utilize them as a contracted service. Admittedly, some of those numbers are projections, particularly the lease as the number came from current and past projects of Charter Success. The Board recognized that they may need to adjust once they find a facility. The breakeven has to do with being able to provide services with the selected grade span and they believe there will be a market to recruit 10<sup>th</sup> graders given the dissatisfaction with 9<sup>th</sup> grade.
- Mr. Maimone asked questions of Mr. Forsyth, specifically around why he believes this is going to work. Mr. Forsyth responded that for two years did charter school application reviews and if he was sitting on this current CSAB, he would ask some of these questions that were posed today. What attracted him to this application is that it is innovative and will attempt to try new things that could

be replicated in traditional public schools. Mr. Forsyth expressed having a gut feeling that this school would be successful, though it will be a challenge to recruit students and a tight budget to operate.

- The Performance Committee deliberated. Mrs. Kakedelis responded that they did not have enough survey data from the other county areas, but there is no question that they have a great idea and that there is a need. Mrs. Gibbs thinks that they have a board member who could tell you all about the need for these students to come out career and technical ready. She posed the question of what we are going to do when everyone goes to college and no one knows how to fix anything in the future. She noted that some of these students don't want to go to college and they need a job. Mr. Maimone asked whether Mrs. Gibbs believes that the school can draw the kind of enrollment percentages described in the application. Mrs. Gibbs responded that she does not know, but the board is confident that they can get the kind of numbers they presented in the application. Mr. Quigley shared some of the sentiments about the enrollment percentages and mentioned that this seemed analogous with the situation with the Apprentice application. He suggested that the board has to have a little bit more robust data to show they can get the enrollment numbers, and believes the decision point for career/technical track should come after middle school. He stated that we should strive to place 8<sup>th</sup> graders in a position with the reading skills and math skills that they can choose the path they want to pursue. Ms. Sutton indicated that it is particularly hard because they are targeting to get the largest percentage in middle school.
- Mr. Maimone suggested they rework the application, strengthen it and ensure that they have survey evidence to support the suggested grade span and submit an acceleration request so you can still open in the same time frame.
- **Mrs. Kakedelis made a motion that we do not move school forward for the interview stage, but encourage them to go back and work on the numbers, budget, intervention, and big picture learning. Mrs. Reeves seconded the motion.** Mr. Quigley wanted to be clear on the criteria of suggesting the school come back for acceleration and sought to inform the Board of the importance of meeting those statutory requirements. Dr. Townsend-Smith shared the four components that must be met. **Motion passed unanimously in the Performance Committee.**
- **Performance Committee Chair Mr. Maimone made a motion of recommendation on behalf of the performance committee to the full CSAB board that they do not move Piedmont Charter Academy to the full interview stage. Mrs. Reeves seconded.** Mr. Hawkes expressed concerns that the CSAB is attempting to write the application for the school. He noted that it is not up to us to determine whether Person County has enough students in it to have another school. He noted that the concern is not legitimate and that the concept needs to be provided the opportunity. He mentioned they have a strong board, viable concept, and could use some polishing, then asked why are we being overly concerned for Person County Schools. Mr. Maimone stated that it is about the CSAB



ensuring the applicants/school have all they need to be successful. The road map is there for them to accomplish the same goal within the next year. Mr. Hawkes noted that we are doing a deep dive here in the application and not giving them enough credit. **Motion passed 8 – 2 with Mr. Alan Hawkes and Mr. Steven Walker dissenting.**

Ballantyne Charter High School

- **Applicant withdrew.**

**FEBRUARY 12-13 PLANNING DISCUSSION**

- The CSAB was informed that they have four interviews scheduled and may potentially have policy review work during this time. The meeting will begin at 9 am and the CSAB may receive an RTO update and a mini report on the Performance Framework. As a follow-up to Dr. Howard's presentation to back in December, the board may receive a report from Dr. Tomlin. As requested, the CSAB may receive presentations from some of the renewal schools that received a 10-year renewal due to having such great academics. Lastly, the CSAB may have an AIG presentation for a potential policy decision.
- Mr. Quigley requested if they could do 3 applicant interviews on each day in February.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to confirm the March dates one more time. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that the final dates are March 5<sup>th</sup> and March 6<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Maimone requested to keep it front loaded that month because he will have to leave early on the second day. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that in the April meeting they will need to go over the next application cycle and shared the remaining board meeting dates as follows, February 12-13, March 5-6, April 9-10, May 7-8, June 11-12.
- Mrs. Gibbs asked if they will start back up in August. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded if they do not have a July meeting they will start back up in August.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith asked if all board members completed the HR component that was needed today. She informed the board members that they will need to walk down to HR as there is an identification document requirement. Dr. Townsend-Smith will turn in their forms, and next month they will the board go down to HR with two documents of identification.

## **APPLICATION UPDATES/REVIEWS, CONTINUED**

### **Steele Creek STEM Academy**

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Assistance for this application was provided with Alliance Education Services.
- Mr. Maimone led the discussion with the Performance Committee's review of the application. Mrs. Kakedelis wanted clarification as to why this school was not a replication of Mallard Creek. Mr. Maimone sought clarification around the enrollment numbers, especially within the first year of operation. Mrs. Reeves sought clarification around the measurement of goals. Additionally, she asked whether they would share board members with Mallard Creek Stem.
- Mr. Quigley asked if there were any shared board members. The Board responded that they are the exact same board. Mr. Quigley asked clarification on the exact replication. The Board responded that the decision was based around the 3-year stipulation in the replication requirements and noted that Mallard Creek Stem has not been operating for 3-years.
- Mr. Quigley asked how they can get those enrollment numbers projected in the application. The Board responded that it is one of the fastest growing zip codes. There is a public school that has a partial school that is magnet and STEM, but has been very limiting with regards to getting students into the STEM program of the school and has become a relief to overcrowding.
- Mr. Quigley inquired on the waitlist at Mallard Creek and clarified what is the distance. Ms. Turner responded that it is a 30-minute drive. The Board responded that they have 430 on the waitlist. Mr. Quigley asked whether the Board was aware that Charter Schools USA has an application for a school named Steele Creek. The Board responded that they were not aware.
- Mr. Quigley asked what data or survey data the school can provide an evidence of the need. The Board responded that they conducted a Google survey through which over 100 people completed. Additionally, school choice is a big issue in that community.
- Mr. Maimone commented that since they invited the other Steele Creek back for an interview, it will be interesting and quite the challenge to see how they will provide program for students in that area and whether there will be competition.

- **Mr. Maimone made a motion for the Performance Committee to recommend to the full CSAB that they invite Steele Creek Stem Academy for a full interview. Mrs. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously in the Performance Committee.**
- **Mr. Quigley made a motion on behalf of the Performance Committee to the full board to invite Steele Creek Stem Academy to full interview. Mr. Walker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Ms. Turner suggested that they bring survey data as those numbers are going to be very important. Mr. Maimone requests that they also have idea of where they will locate.

*Rising Above the Stars Academy*

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Assistance was provided by Leaders Building Leaders and the applicants indicated that they paid the third party \$6,000.
- Mr. Quigley led the Policy Committee in discussion. Mrs. Kroeger wanted clarification on the two board members serving that were listed as residing out of state. Mr. Quigley asked whether this was currently an afterschool program.
- Mr. Quigley asked the board to introduce themselves. The Board members clarified that they just have after school experience, but it is not an existing program.
- Mr. Walker commented that he passed each section except for finance section. He had concerns with the breakeven number and identified that he had no questions for clarification, but would like an explanation of the number. Mrs. Kroeger brought up the fact that Leaders Building Leaders helped with the application for a fee of \$6,500 which is significant.
- Mr. Quigley had questions around the breakeven number and stated that it is hard to open a school with so few students since there is such a smaller margin for error. Mr. Quigley noted that the questions tend to be more interview questions.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion for the Policy Committee to recommend to the full CSAB that they invite Rising Above the Stars Academy to full interview. Mrs. Kroeger seconded. The motion passed unanimously in the Policy Committee.**

- **Mr. Walker made a motion on behalf of the Policy Committee that the board invite the applicant back for a full interview. Mrs. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Tillery Charter Academy

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Assistance was provided by Goodall Consulting and the applicant indicated that they did not pay a fee to the third party.
- Mr. Maimone led the Performance Committee in the application review. He opened with a concern around enrollment and how the school will open with 15% enrollment of Montgomery County schools, which is already a high performing district. He commented that he would like to see very convincing evidence of that prior to moving to full interview phase.
- Mrs. Reeves asked whether the intent is just to operate as a K-5 school, and recognized the following may be an interview question, but, how is the rigorous classical education mentioned in the mission laid out in the education plan. Mr. Maimone noted that it may be known that Core Knowledge is essentially classical education.
- Mrs. Kakedelis had a clarification around the proposed LEA and whether the board just approved a charter to open in Anson county.
- Mr. Maimone inquired why there were not any MAP goals defined since MAP is one of their core assessments. Mrs. Reeves asked around the specific process for identifying AIG students as it was not clear in the application. Mr. Maimone commented that the question may be more in line with an interview question.
- Mr. Maimone asked if anyone on the Performance Committee found any convincing survey responses. The Performance Committee members responded that they had not found that information in the initial application. Mrs. Reeves commented that the marketing plan was scant.
- Mr. Maimone asked a member of the board to address how they can convince 15% of students from a successful LEA to come to their charter school. The Board responded that Montgomery County has met or exceeded growth, but their proficiency is low with around 55% not meeting proficiency. The Board has identified that there is a need present. When the school first applied, they had 50 surveys completed and have now 112.

- Mr. Maimone asked how they constructed their target numbers. The Board responded that this was a goal they felt they could meet and be successful based on survey and interest meetings held. Mr. Maimone responded that when we look at a new charter school looking to gain 10 or more percent of the LEA, we need some hard evidence. He stated if the school were to be invited back to the full interview they will need some convincing survey data and information. He commented that year after year we see that schools cannot make those enrollment projections.
- Mr. Maimone asked the Board to talk about the classical education and how they plan to market this to families. The Board responded that they wanted to focus on the grammar portion of classical education in order to build on foundations. Mr. Maimone asked further clarification on how this ties to marketing. The Board responded that they plan to use this data to present the benefits to potential families.
- The Board clarified the question regarding the “Anson” under the transportation section and responded that this was simply a typo.
- Mr. Maimone sought clarification around the goals with relation to not having a MAP related goal. The Board responded that they wanted to administer the MAP to gauge what the proficiency scores of students are throughout the year in order for teachers to use this data to change instructional styles in the classroom. The Board feels comfortable being judged on proficiency scores and not incorporating any MAP related data.
- The Board clarified the marketing plan and stated that they will focus on doing face-to-face marketing and plan to engage with the community including speaking at events at Town halls, churches, and small community buildings.
- Mr. Maimone asked if there were any relationships forged with Montgomery School Board individuals. The Board responded that they do not believe the Montgomery School Board will be thrilled if they are approved and that the LEA may be afraid of losing students to charter schools.
- Mr. Maimone asked if they could provide a head count of enrollment for local private schools in the proposed LEA. One board member has a current student in a K-8 private school and they have about 50 students. The charter would be a great benefit to the county as it would give parents another option to pick from. Mrs. Kakedelis commented that there are two (2) private schools in Montgomery County with over 100 students enrolled.
- Ms. Sutton asked whether both private schools based in classical education. The Board responded that they are both Christian private schools. Ms. Sutton followed up by asking if survey data had information on how many parents would be coming from a private school expressing interest in the charter. The Board did not have that information.

- Mr. Maimone stated that one thing they had going for them is that there are no other charter schools in the area. The Board addressed the CSAB and commented that one of the things not mentioned today is that the school is offering a rigorous curriculum that the school district has not been providing to students. The school will create an option for families that they do not currently have and this will help to pull back some students into the county that have chosen a charter school in a surrounding county.
- **Mrs. Reeves made a motion that the Performance Committee make a recommendation to the full board that the applicant be invited for a full interview. Mrs. Lindalyn Kakedelis seconded. The motion passed unanimously within the Performance Committee.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion on behalf of the Performance Committee that the full board recommend Tillery Charter Academy for full interview. Mr. Walker Seconded.** Mrs. Kroeger stated that since the school is attempting to recruit 15% of the LEA enrollment, the budget is very tight and the projected surplus is very small. Mr. Maimone suggested that the Board have competence in breakeven numbers and the budget and provide full survey data. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Wilmington School of the Arts

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Assistance was provided by Goodall Consulting and the applicant indicated that they would have a \$24,000 payment contingent upon successful opening of the school.
- Performance Committee discussed the application led by Mr. Maimone. Mr. Maimone asked what is the justification to meet such a large enrollment number. Additionally, he noted that the education plan seemed to be a focal point of external evaluators and asked the committee members if there were any particular sections they should hone in on. Mrs. Kakedelis sought clarification around the parallel assessment program defined by school, how cooperative learning and multiple intelligences go into Core Knowledge and how this is all blended with an arts focus. Mrs. Kakedelis noted that in two different places the school mentioned a specific targeted population and asked whether the school will use a weighted lottery to get those populations. As a follow-up, how will the school achieve those percentages if they do not have a weighted lottery. Mrs. Reeves noted that the goals were not written in the format of a SMART goal. Additionally, the education plan had a lot of strategies listed but the application did not indicate how those come together to create a strong academics while adhering to the arts. Mrs. Kakedelis inquired on whether the applicants have visited an arts school that uses core knowledge. Mr. Quigley stated that the education plan needed some

more work. Mrs. Kakedelis asked regarding the population they are trying to reach, what interventions will be utilized.

- Mr. Maimone asked the board to elaborate on the education plan, how will they market the school to be attractive to parents, and how will they address enrollment percentage (5% of LEA). The Board introduced themselves then responded that Core Knowledge and art are woven together. The arts are a part of core knowledge and the school intends to hire staff to teach specific art programs as specials classes. Core knowledge is thematic in nature.
- Mr. Maimone commented that they only two elective teachers in the budget for 300 students the first year and asked if this is manageable. The Board responded that they believe it is. With regards to marketing and enrollment they took an average of the classroom sizes for the county and then reduced their projected numbers from those figures. Their marketing plan has already begun with an active Facebook page and website in addition to PowerPoint presentations, pamphlets, and recruitment at the daycare and preschool facilities in the New Hanover area. A questionnaire has been developed and attached to the Facebook page and website to gauge interest and receive additional information. Mr. Maimone asked if they had survey data. The Board responded that the survey is out and they are currently waiting on information to come back to compile the data. They plan on recruiting between 125-130 and in other cases a little higher which they feel is a good target population for them. Additionally, they will recruit based off the reduction of class sizes for K-3 and the potential negative affect to the arts in the upper grade levels due to staffing and budgets in the LEA.
- Mr. Maimone suggested that the board bring back as much information as possible dealing with the survey.
- Mrs. Kakedelis sought clarification around the portion of the application that indicated the school's intent to expose students to the arts through visual, music, dance, and theatre and asked whether they planned on having four different teachers to cover those specials. The Board responded that they have budgeted for two full time arts teachers and will offer weekly classes for the four areas. Additionally, the four classes could easily be covered by four (4) part-time teachers in the first year.
- Mr. Maimone asked whether the board has identified a facility. The Board responded that they have identified two different facilities. Currently, the places they have identified in the downtown area are not yielding anything available. Mr. Maimone asked the board to elaborate on the transportation issues that are unclear for external evaluators. The Board responded that they are looking to develop a pod system with designated pick up locations. In the event the school receives sufficient funding or a grant, they would either increase the number of buses or split the pod system. Mr. Maimone asked questions around child nutrition. The Board responded that they would enroll in the Free and Reduced Lunch program and serve lunch through a program.

- Mrs. Kakedelis expressed that the education plan is all over the place and that the applicant has so many things going on in the plan. The Board responded that the curriculum will be Core Knowledge and clarified that Multiple Intelligences is an assessment used by the teachers to drive instruction. Mrs. Kakedelis asked if the board members have visited a school that is currently integrating the Core Knowledge curriculum with such a heavy emphasis on the arts. The Board responded yes and provided that Northeast Carolina Prep is currently doing this.
- Mr. Quigley expressed that he felt like the education plan was lacking. Mr. Maimone wanted to get an idea for what was missing from fellow members of the Performance Committee. Mr. Quigley responded that it was very brief and consisted of just listing things. Ms. Sutton expressed that it felt like it was surface level and did not contain a coherent description of the strategies and how they were going to be implemented, but rather the application contained a series of lists in the education plan. Ms. Sutton voiced that Core Knowledge is a curriculum and not an instructional strategy, and that schools can do Core Knowledge, but do it in a variety of instructional strategies. For her, they were lacking those instructional strategies that go along with the Core Knowledge curriculum in the applicant's education plan.
- **Mrs. Reeves made a motion that the Performance Committee recommend to the full board to not move the school forward to interview. Tammi Sutton seconded.** Mr. Maimone expressed that he would not support that motion and that they have enough information in the education plan that supports Core Knowledge and how they will do it. **All in favor – 3 (Mrs. Reeves, Mr. Quigley, Ms. Sutton), opposed 3 (Mr. Maimone, Mrs. Gibbs, Mrs. Kakedelis). Motion fails.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion that the Performance Committee recommend to the full board to move the school forward to interview. Mr. Quigley seconded. All in favor 6 – 0.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full board that the Performance Committee recommends inviting the school back for full interview. Mrs. Gibbs Second. Motion passes unanimously.** Mrs. Turner commented that Mr. Maimone really knows the curriculum, but she wants to hear from the board of the charter that they understand the curriculum.

#### Clemmons Stem Academy

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Applicant was assisted by Alliance Education Services and Goodall Consulting and did not make a note regarding payment of any fees.



- Mr. Walker asked the board to introduce themselves.
- Mr. Walker led the Policy Committee on discussion of the application. Mr. Walker commented that starting off as a K-6 school was difficult. He also noted that testing would occur in four grades right off the bat, and this makes it a little more difficult there. Ms. Turner commented about the application and mentioned that since it was written by other individuals the board had an obligation to at least read the final submission. One example cited by Ms. Turner includes that there are parts of the application that talk about meeting the goals of Charlotte and other parts indicated that they would meet the goals of Florida. Mr. Walker felt the mission statement was generic and was not quite unique to the school. Ms. Turner identified that the mission statement does not mention STEM, though they are a STEM school, but in the explanation portion the applicants reference STEM but make no mention of anything included in the original mission statement.
- Mr. Walker referenced the goals section of the application, specifically that they noted a goal of being comparable to the LEA but did not include the actual scores of the proposed LEA. Additionally, he commented that out of all the individuals that reviewed the application, he passed the education plan. Mr. Walker stated that the external evaluators brought up a good point on whether it is a STEAM school or a STEM school.
- Ms. Turner identified that the applicant mentioned a myriad of things in the education plan, for example programs and strategies, and she commented that it could all be integrated but that it would not be easy and asked the board how they plan to accomplish all the programs mentioned in the application. Mrs. Kroeger noted that she did not see evidence that the programs they plan to offer had the support as evidenced in the budget. Mr. Walker thought the board composition was strong, but suggested the school could add more individuals with experience in K-8 education.
- Mr. Walker posed a clarification question to the board asking whether anyone on the board had K-12 education experience. The Board responded that April Broadway was an academic advisor, co-director of guidance and counseling, the COO of a community resource solution.
- Mrs. Kroeger asked the board to clarify the busing of students within five miles of the school. The Board responded that transportation for traditional public schools usually happens in a 1 to 5-mile radius of a school, but the board has discussed that they may benefit from a 4 to 8-mile radius. Additionally, they shared that there is nothing that disqualifies a child from riding the bus, that transportation will be first come first serve, and the routes would be created based on student enrollment. The Board identified that Davie County and Forsyth County are where the school will be pulling from, but that most students will be coming from Forsyth County.

- Ms. Turner sought clarification around the enrollment numbers projecting that half of the students will come from Davie County and asked a question around where most students were expected to reside. The Board responded that at least half of the students will come from Forsyth County with the remaining coming from Davie, Davidson, and Guilford County.
- Mr. Walker identified that there are two facilities budget lines and noted that it is odd to have a debt service line along with a lease/mortgage line. Ms. Turner asked if the board has a lease why they would also have a debt service line. Mr. Walker noted that the budget included a financial services professional contracting around \$35,000 and a full-time finance office for \$40,000 and commented on how these two overlapped, not including the audit. The Board responded that the lease is the facility rent payment while the debt service line would include the debt for a low interest loan to purchase fixtures, furniture, and items for up-fit for the facility.
- Mr. Walker pointed out that the HR services for \$15,000 stuck out. Mrs. Kroeger commented that it appears that the applicant may be overstating or inflating revenues and expressed concerns with the low expenses budgeted around health insurance, retirement, and technology. Mr. Walker commented that classroom technology, including an equipment lease that amounts to \$1,000,000 over five years, seemed high.
- Mr. Walker expressed that the application needed some work, including the fact that Ms. Turner pointed out that the application mentioned both Florida and Charlotte, and he commented that he would like to see the board more involved in the application.
- **Ms. Turner made a motion for the Policy Committee to recommend to the full board not to move the school forward to full interview. Seconded by Mrs. Kroeger. The motion passed unanimously in the Policy Committee.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to full board to not move the school forward for full interview. Mr. Maimone seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### Eminence Academy

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including proposed county, proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. Additionally, the pass/fail ratings from the application rubric were shared. Assistance provided by NC Charter Accelerator and according to the applicant no fee was provided.
- Mr. Walker led the Policy Committee in a review of the application. Mr. Walker commented that right off the bat the school will be testing a new group of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders each year.

- Mr. Walker asked why the board chose the grade structure as presented in the application. The Board responded that it is a very innovative approach. They mentioned that they have spoken to and met with over 300 and they felt the need is to create change as soon as possible in tested grades. The Board believed that with the extended learning day and extended learning year, they can impact change now. Additionally, by focusing on tested subjects right off the bat the school can affect the achievement immediately. Mr. Walker commented that he could not argue with the braveness of the board. Additionally, he stated if the school started with K-4, they are still meeting the immediate need as presented. The grade span chosen is very odd and will make it very, very difficult for the school to be successful.
- Ms. Turner mentioned that the problem with the proposed plan is that if the school is not successful, the students will have you for five (5) years and then you're gone. The Board responded that the grade spans chosen were based on the needs of the community and expressed interest in moving the students already in those tested levels forward.
- Mr. Walker stated that when it comes to the goals, more specifically the academic goals, given some of the data on the highest performing charter schools currently in existence, there is no evidence that we currently have a school that can accomplish what the applicant is projecting to do after 1 to 5 years of operation.
- Mr. Quigley asked a clarification on why the board decided to go with all the grades if they wanted to replicate best practices shown for closing the achievement gap and also cited that the schools listed in their application as model schools actually started with lower grades. He commented that it is urgency bordering on recklessness. He asked the board why they would not just start with one or two grades. The Board responded that they had an extensive conversation around the decision for grade levels. Ultimately, the board looked at the ADM of the LEA, and due to the geographical location of the proposed school the sought to not take too much of the ADM. In addition, they paid close attention to those numbers and projecting how to be financially solvent. The Board expressed difficulties in reaching enrollment numbers with only having one or two grade offerings and the need to have more students in those few grades. Since the application has been submitted, the board is working to start a partnership with the local community college. Moreover, they felt the grade span chosen would be best operationally.
- Mr. Quigley clarified whether they did not feel as though they could get the projected numbers in one or two grade spans. The Board responded that they felt the compelling need to establish the school with good financial backing and foundation. Mr. Quigley commented that the grade span offerings of the applicant are one of the key components here and that coupled with so few teachers and variation of curriculum at each grade level could present a lot of challenges to the school, which could easily be mitigated through the grade span selection.

- Mr. Quigley expressed that he was leaning on the recommendation to give the applicant feedback and have them come back with a fast track application due to there being a need in the proposed LEA. Ms. Turner commented that the passion is great, the need is great, and that even if you have all the great ideas in the world, they can fail without the proper planning in place. Mr. Quigley commented that not many applicants come before the CSAB and state that they are 1 ½ hours away from any other charter school, which shows there is a need here that prior applicants may not have been able to show.
- Mr. Walker commented that if the board plans to be a charter school that will be around for 20 years from now, they must make it beyond the 5-year renewal cycle. Additionally, the SMART goals are not realistic. He expressed that he would like to see them come in for a full interview since the need is so high.
- Ms. Turner responded that the board has relationships with individuals who can really get this application together to a place where the CSAB can support it. She also commented that she would be surprised if any of the mentioned individuals in the application informed the applicant that opening with grades 3 through 7 was a good idea.
- Mr. Walker clarified the acceleration process and notified the applicant that they would need to have a facility secured and make corrections within the application of some of the unrealistic goals and structure, and notified the board that they could still aim to open in the same time frame compared to if the CSAB approved the school right now. The Board replied that they had an update to share with the CSAB. There have been some changes in the educational landscape with Duplin County and they are confident that they would have access to a facility. Additionally, the board would be amenable to making some of the suggested changes from the CSAB.
- **Ms. Turner made a motion for the Policy Committee to recommend to the full board to move Eminence forward to full interview. Mrs. Kroeger seconded. The motion passed unanimously in the Policy Committee.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion on behalf of Policy Committee to the full board to recommend that they move Eminence Academy forward to full interview. Mrs. Gibbs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

- Mrs. Kakedelis mentioned about National School Choice Week and informed the board that the schools are notified via the letter and to invite community leaders and policy makers to their school that week.
- **Mr. Steven Walker made a motion to adjourn the January 9, 2017 CSAB meeting at 2:44 pm. The meeting adjourned via acclamation.**

DRAFT