

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
February 12, 2018
9:00 am**

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

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.
- Mr. Quigley welcomed the newest CSAB, Heather Vuncannon, to the board. Ms. Vuncannon introduced herself to the fellow CSAB members and online listeners.
- Ms. Turner is recusing herself from B.L.U.E. G.R.E.E.N. Academy clarification interview as member of the applicant board is a current Principal Fellow at Sugar Creek Charter School
- **Ms. Reeves made a motion to approve the January 8-9, 2018 meeting minutes with recommended changes sent to Dr. Townsend-Smith. Mr. Walker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

AIG UPDATE

- Ms. Stephanie Cyrus, a representative from the AIG Division, presented on Academically or Intellectually Gifted (AIG) Programming. The consultant provided an overview of program standards.
- The consultant shared charter participation with AIG during the past cycles for plan implementation. 12 charter schools participated between 2010-2013, 12 charter schools (some different from the prior cycle) participated between 2013-2016, 17 (some different from the prior cycle) charter schools participated between 2016-2019.
- The consultant had a representative from Evergreen Community Charter present to CSAB about the benefits of developing an AIG plan for charter schools. Mr. Cameron Brantley, AIG Coordinator, Evergreen Community Charter School, spoke to the CSAB about their school's AIG plan implementation.
- The development of the plan came from a demand from the parents. The school identified that there was a need to provide equity in services for students at the school. AIG students were being served at the school, but then going to high school and there was no "paper trail" in order for class placement (honors classes/AP classes). Having the AIG plan in place has removed some of the hoops that students in the past had to jump through for high school schedules/classes.
- Evergreen's AIG plan holds the school accountable to provide services to these students. The plan allows them to be held accountable to quality and research proven services for advanced learners. They have gone through the process of submitting a plan 3 times now, and they find the plan has gotten stronger over time.
- Mr. Walker asked about the AIG plan implementation and its impact on the school's student attrition. Mr. Brantley clarified that students typically leave at the end of 8th grade, but that having a plan in place to identify students (tagging in PowerSchool/cumulative files) has helped with any transfers prior to leaving 8th grade. Ms. Cyrus clarified that the school was losing students in 8th grade to high school. Mr. Brantley explained that the parent advocacy and the initial phases of implementing the program for AIG learners (if Evergreen did not provide services for AIG learners, they would look somewhere else). The plan greatly benefits the school with attrition of students.
- Ms. Cyrus explained the local AIG Plan Submission timeline and protocol and the reason for the three-year cycle.
- Ms. Reeves asked for clarification on the different standards provided in an AIG plan. The consultant responded that schools address all standards in their plan. Ms. Reeves asked a follow-up question about the procedure in place when a school submits a question or subpar plan. The AIG

division does provide feedback; however, once they have an approved plan by their board of directors, they generally just share feedback and may ask them to resubmit a specific piece. Specifically, there is no approval that comes from the division's level.

- Ms. Cyrus entertained questions, comments, concerns, feedback for future policy. Mr. Quigley commented that the information was very beneficial and he asked for the number and/or percentage of LEA that have AIG plans. Currently, there are 115 LEAs and 17 charter schools with AIG plans. Each LEA is required to have an AIG Plan. There are several charters that are ready to come on board for the 2019. The AIG division anticipates the number of charters participating at that time to be around 20.
- Mr. Maimone asked about the number of students identified at the LEA and charter level. Ms. Cyrus communicated that the state average is 12% gifted students across the state (this is from Powerschool), the lowest number is 4-5% (LEAs), the high end of this is (28%) some districts have a very high percentage of AIG students. She also acknowledged that the number of AIG students in charter schools is reportedly lower, per the PowerSchool report.
- Ms. Reeves discussed with CSAB why the percentage was so low in charter schools. Mr. Quigley responded that a charter school can have a gifted program without submitting an official AIG plan to the state. Ms. Cyrus agreed and provided an example of Metrolina Regional Scholars. All students within this school are gifted per their approved charter application.
- Mr. Machado wanted to know the CSAB's position on requiring schools to submit an amendment request to have a formal AIG program. Ms. Turner responded that because the application addresses how schools will support AIG students an amendment request seems unnecessary. Other members of the CSAB echoed these sentiments. Mr. Walker asked if Mr. Machado wanted a formal motion on this matter to which Mr. Machado responded no.
- Ms. Vuncannon wanted more clarification on what the AIG program looked like at Evergreen Community Charter. The Evergreen representative outlined that the program serves students in grades 3-8. There is a combination of push in and pull out services provided which depends on the needs of that cohort of students. The AIG teacher is the math teacher for a group of 5th graders. During 3rd grade, the AIG teacher is in the classroom during book-read time to work with students. Professional development (PD) is provided to staff when they start at Evergreen. They have ongoing PD that has an aspect of AIG woven into it. They specifically provide PD on differentiation with AIG teachers leading the support and instruction on that portion. "AIG all day every day" is a term they use at the school. One AIG teacher is working directly or indirectly with 60 students to serve the students they have that need AIG services.

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith led the discussion by providing a recap of the application process. Today's meeting marked the last round of clarification interviews and next month will conclude the last round of interviews. After next month, the CSAB will have reviewed all 29 applications submitted.
- The interview and clarification process is slightly different than what has been done in the past. Specifically, there were a combination of clarifications and interviews in one day, when in the past we have done interviews one day followed by clarification on a different day. Dr. Townsend-Smith reminded the CSAB that clarification interviews have a 30 minute window and what should happen within that time. At the end of the clarification interview, CSAB would make a recommendation on which applicant would be granted an interview. She also reviewed the Interview time breakdown and process.
- March application interviews would be pending the results of the four clarification interviews over the next two days. OCS will have recommendations for the CSAB at the next meeting for the 2018 application cycle.

Steele Creek STEM Academy

- 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. Assistance was provided by Alliance Education Services; no fee was paid to the third party for that service.
- The members of the Board introduced themselves to the CSAB. The board of Mallard Creek STEM Academy were also board members on this board.
- Mr. Quigley led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. Mr. Maimone asked about student numbers in the Steel Creek area. He specifically asked them to provide convincing information to be able to confirm that they could enroll 500 students in year one. Additionally, the goals outlined in the application were confusing (Grow +15% higher than the LEA). The partnerships identified were a plus. Mr. Walker asked how many board members were the same as Mallard Creek STEM. Ms. Reeves responded that were the same board. The question was around how they are going to be able to meet growth in math while opening a school at the same time.
- Mr. Quigley wanted to know why the school did not check replication on the application. Ms. Turner responded that Mallard Creek STEM has not been open long enough to officially replicate (schools must have 3 years of data).

- Ms. Reeves wanted the board to expand upon the extended learning program outlined in the Education Plan.
- Mr. Maimone wanted clarification on what the marketing “hook” was going to be and how the school would differentiate itself from other schools with similar names in the area. Specifically, why would students come to Steele Creek STEM.
- Ms. Vuncannon wanted to know what would STEM across the curriculum look like, aside from extracurricular clubs and add-ons to class.
- Ms. Turner had concerns and questions about capacity of the board. Mr. Walker dived into the operations and finances and stated that he did not see any assurance for revenues. Also, the food contract was not clear as the budget did not reflect how it was going to work. He also wanted to know about the breakeven number after cuts and the breakeven number without making cuts. Ms. Kroeger wanted an explanation of the 200,000 each year in other revenue. She had concerns that the budget was identical to Mallard Creek initial application given that the school is currently operating and should have adjustments based on its limited operating experience.
- Mr. Quigley directed questions to the board and opened questioning with the projected student enrollment. The Board responded that when they opened Mallard Creek last year in a similar area and with similar demographic they met enrollment targets (they had a 200 waitlist, 800 applicants for 140 spots) so they felt confident they would be able to reach the projected enrollment. This school would be southwest of Charlotte. Mr. Walker clarified if there would be any crossover between the two schools when getting applicants/enrollment. The Board responded that the schools are 30 minutes apart and that they would not be competing for enrollment. There was already a buzz in the area.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know the grade breakdown in first year. Specifically, the board projected less 6th graders entering than in other grade levels. He wanted to know the reasoning behind that strategy. The board responded that when you create a unique school like this, the culture was a unique component than compared to a Traditional Public School. There were benefits from having more students in K-5, such as planting the culture seed, and other implications with specials/electives that would benefit from having a smaller middle school to start.
- Mr. Quigley asked about another charter school in the same area that was recently approved by the CSAB and wanted to clarify whether the proposed board was concerned. Ms. Reeves asked about the closest charters. Unity classical was 6 miles from one of the proposed locations. There were 3 charters near where the school was proposing to locate.

- Mr. Maimone wanted to know if there was a relationship with another school (recommended in this round for approval) and if there was a chance the schools would open right down the street from each other. The board responded that there was no concern.
- Ms. Vuncannon asked if the builder required letters of intent to follow through with the building plan. The board responded that the developer for Mallard Creek would be the same vendor building this school. Additionally, they had confidence that the school would reach its projected enrollment.
- Mr. Quigley asked about applicant name being very similar to a school just approved to open in the area. The board responded that they were not tied to the name.
- Mr. Walker wanted clarification around the growth goal (15%). He specifically wanted to know if the 15% was tied to growth or proficiency. The proposed board responded that the 15% represented growth over time. The goal was to be 15% higher than the LEA. Mr. Quigley asked if Mallard Creek was 15% higher than the LEA. The board responded no. Mr. Quigley asked if this was a goal for Mallard Creek (the replicated school). The board responded yes.
- Mr. Walker asked if Mallard Creek had the same relationships with the local college. The board stated that the teachers received professional development throughout the school year (ongoing – off site and on site), and they have access to resources through this relationship.
- Mr. Quigley wanted clarification around the education plan and the current instructional model. The Board responded that they have a core literacy block framework - workshop, and some of the components such as “words their way” serves as an additional component. They use guided reading during the workshop model.
- Mr. Quigley asked follow up questions about what was and was not working at Mallard Creek. The board responded that they have high engagement from students. Students get excited about choosing books to read on their level. The teachers get to spend more time with small group instruction. The challenge was identifying where to pull in additional resources when deficits are identified. Mallard Creek currently uses mClass to determine reading levels. They have LLI for intervention and have fully implemented MTSS.
- The board attributed Mallard Creek (replicated school) not meeting growth in math to the variety of students they received during its first operating year. Mr. Walker commented that the school focus was so much on STEM that there should be growth potential in math. Mr. Quigley stated that the school seemed heavily focused on developing literature, and sought clarification on what they were doing to improve instruction and student growth in math.
- The board responded that they use GoMath as a framework for instruction. Mallard Creek uses a workshop model: lot less book time, lot more hands on time. Mastery connect tool, tracking pieces

and resources to use to get real time level rather than for benchmark data. Mr. Quigley wanted to know what was different from last year? The board responded that everyone was getting their “bearings” and they have retained teachers so they are able to build on professional development from last year.

- Mr. Maimone urged the school to measure internal growth models that could show how students are growing based on that model, rather than just the state model for growth (EVAAS).
- The board outlined its Discovery Place partnership. The professional development introduced problem based learning and more mathematical focused content and delivery. They are focused on drone technology, 3D printing and design. The school receives 6 outreach programs within 1.5 months that allows students the opportunity to apply math to real life. They conduct individual coaching with teachers in the program. The proposed board communicated there was no capacity issue in terms of supporting 2 schools. Discovery Place was currently supporting 150 schools across NC and SC.
- Ms. Reeves asked for a clearer explanation on what STEM looks like on a day-to-day basis. Literacy – nonfiction literature on a STEM based topic. Engineering program, engineering concepts – literacy based program. STEM room as a special (1 to 2 times a week). Middle school offers robotics and computer science as an elective. Students are engaging with STEM throughout the day in each block. Guided reading through F&P, which offer non-fiction curriculum. There was a set of non-fiction books that are specifically related to STEM. The teachers have an option to select a STEM book as their guided lesson.
- Mr. Quigley wanted clarity on the STEM elective, what other electives are offered, and if the teacher were required to attend this elective. The Board responded that STEM is an elective, 40 – 45 minutes, and they have a hired certified STEM elective teacher.
- Ms. Reeves wanted to know if there was a requirement for teachers on frequency of nonfiction in literacy. The Board responded that they require teachers to use 50-50 model with fiction and nonfiction.
- The proposed board outlined that they offer PD year-round. They conduct full group PD over the summer on larger concepts. Throughout the year, they do more specialized PD that is responsive to the teachers.
- Ms. Vuncannon asked some specific data questions. Specifically, how many students were being touched in robotics, STEM special, coding (etc). The second question was around whether a STEM component was required in Lesson Plans. The Board responded that all students attend the STEM elective. They elaborated on the curriculum and opportunities in all grades for coding, robotics, and projects that are engulfed with STEM. With regards to the component of lesson plans, the Board

stated that they believed their model was one of the most fully integrated models that the school has seen in the area.

- Ms. Kroeger wanted clarification on some financial aspects outlined in the budget. The board responded that its average budgeted salary was around \$40,000. Ms. Kroeger wanted to know if this was the trend at Mallard Creek. The board responded yes. Ms. Turner sought clarification around teacher salary average especially since the local LEA starting salary was \$40,000. The board stated they were competitive with the LEA and they scale on the NCDPI salary range.
- Ms. Reeves wanted an explanation on the large debt service built into the budget. The board responded that since they are building the school, this is a large debt they would be undertaking. Additionally, equipment, furniture, and technology would be a significant debt. Mallard Creek has around \$400,000 in fund balance, and the rough debt is around \$550,000 a year over 5 years. They were anticipating this same debt scale with Steel Creek.
- Ms. Reeves wanted clarification on the consultant fees. Specifically, what was the fee for student accounting. The board responded there was not a specific line item for student accounting and the consultant fees budgeted would be for services their third-party vendor may provide.
- Ms. Kroeger asked for clarification around the services for equipment and for the building and whether the company is the same (Building Hope) that was used for Mallard Creek. The board responded that they would conduct an RFP for the final financing. There were three different companies that offer financing for charter schools. There were two different companies that financed Mallard Creek for the school's two phases. The lease was developed based on student enrollment.
- Ms. Vuncannon asked questions about the 615-projected student enrollment in year one and wanted information on the year one enrollment at Mallard Creek. She outlined the year one enrollment at Mallard Creek was 500. Additionally, what would be the hook that would attract students to your school rather than the other recommended school. The board responded that 6-10 miles between schools was a far distance. Also, the board did not think there was another program like the STEM workshop they provided. Alliance Education Services would provide initial professional development. Ms. Lucas stated they were not a management group, but provided services as needed. Specifically, when and if they needed the support, Alliance Education Services receives payment for services rendered. Ms. Reeves wanted clarity on if Alliance Education Services was currently supporting Mallard Creek. Representatives from Alliance Education Services responded that they currently provide services from time to time. Ms. Reeves specifically asked the board chair about the services he expected to use from Alliance Education Services at the new school. The board responded that this would vary (case by case basis).

- Mr. Quigley asked how they would only spend \$20,000 on books with the number of students enrolled. The board responded that they do a lot more hands on versus textbooks. They also indicated that there was a large amount of money that encompasses the K-8 reader/writer workshop and LLI texts - FFE&T Debt includes a massive budget.
- Mr. Maimone commented that the strongest thing this group had for them is that the proposed area is large and growing. Additionally, they would be providing a STEM service that was not widely offered.
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to recommend Steele Creek for Ready to Open status to the State Board of Education. Ms. Gibbs seconded.** Mr. Quigley opened the floor for discussion on the motion. Mr. Hawkes was concerned that Mallard Creek does not have a long track record and was wondering if this decision is a little premature. Mr. Walker agreed with Mr. Hawkes sentiments after pulling up the school report card (12% EDS, 59% EOG math score and not meeting growth). Steele Creek elementary a traditional public school in the area (75.4% EDS, 70 in math, met growth). Mr. Walker wonders if they were going too quick, but if they take the vote right now, he would vote against the motion. Mr. Quigley voiced similar concerns and stated that this seems early in the timeline of development for replication, though the school has a good plan and good expertise on their board, it's hard to step back and look at a school operating in one year (did not meet growth and a C school).
- Ms. Turner responded that the size of the proposed school was concerning for a school that is only a year old, that makes starting another large school harder to accomplish. Mr. Maimone stated that they were providing a quality service and they were planning to open in a growing and developing area. Mr. Walker commented that the plan and board was good and if they were voting on the strength of the application alone, he will support the motion. Mr. Turner stated that the school's name needed an amendment.
- **Mr. Walker made an alternate motion to amend the earlier motion to include a stipulation that the school change the name to not include the words Steele and Creek. Ms. Gibbs seconded. The motion passed unanimously (9 – 0).**
- Mr. Hawkes commented that there was a great need in the area which was the reason he supported the motion. Also, he communicated that the CSAB had to conduct its due diligence of this board to scrutinize this application, he hoped this vote was a charge to the proposed school to really do this right.

Tillery Charter Academy

- OCS provided 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. The applicant received assistance from Goodall Consulting; there was no monetary compensation paid to the third party for this service.
- The members of the Board introduced themselves to the CSAB. The Treasurer of the board was absent as the individual was a Pharmacist and was assisting with the flu season outbreak.
- Mr. Maimone led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. Mr. Maimone asked to hear more about the survey data to show that there was a demand for the school. Mr. Walker had one question regarding goals: average of reading and math – proficiency of 44.25- the school’s goal is 6% above the LEA that would put them at 50.25% and wanted to clarify whether this goal was too low. Ms. Reeves wanted to know how they would measure the core values goal. Additionally, Ms. Reeves had a question regarding the core values and why this was not incorporated in the mission of the school. Mr. Maimone asked why there was not inclusion of MAP goals.
- Ms. Vuncannon asked about the innovation of the programs stated in the education plan. Mr. Maimone wanted to know if schools in Montgomery County were using Core Knowledge/Classical, Shurley English.
- Ms. Reeves noted that the education plan was not aligned. Specifically, the plan outlined indicates a class size of 24, the state was mandating a much smaller class size. Also, the applicant quoted a 14-year-old study from Illinois, was there not an updated study or data which was more relevant.
- Ms. Kroeger wanted to know more about Ms. Dillingham’s position with the state Charter School Association. She noted that the proposed board stated they would find two new members and wanted to know if that was done. Additional questions were asked about board training and professional development offerings.
- Mr. Hawkes expressed confusion on the organizational chart. As proposed, the principal had little or no authority which was a recipe for disaster. Additionally, the principal would not have any support for four years (no vice principal until year 4).
- Mr. Maimone sought an update around facilities. Additionally, he asked for enrollment numbers from Anson (1/3 of projected enrollment in February). He wanted the board to elaborate on the connection of this school with Anson, would there be an overlap with the board, what lessons were learned from the process with Anson?

- Mr. Vuncannon asked whether the school was going to address poverty education and training for staff, especially those that are new to the area.
- Ms. Kroeger stated that the internal controls in the application were vague (concerned with having an outside service) and the connection with the amount of checks they would write monthly. Additionally, Mr. Walker did not notice very many board members with background experience in finance.
- Ms. Reeves noted that the breakeven listed was 109 and with the current budget, there were many items that are projected low. Mr. Maimone noted that there was a projected surplus to work with which may make up for the breakeven number. Mr. Maimone wanted to know what areas of the budget the board thought was budgeted too low and how they would balance these areas in the future.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know how the proposed school would attract 14% of the LEA's population. The Board responded that the 15% in the application was incorrect, it should have been 10%, as the Montgomery LEA total number was incorrect. There were roughly 4,000 students in the LEA. Updated statistics are provided on the survey. The board added additional questions to the survey so they could get that information. They had a higher percentage of out of county parents that were interested in the school. If all the parents who indicated interests in the school apply to place their students in the school, they would have 54% of their targeted enrollment. Additionally, they had approximately 30 parents express interest that currently home schooled their children.
- Mr. Maimone asked what about the closest charter school to this proposed location. The board responded that it was about 45 minutes away. Additionally, that school would serve elementary and is scheduled to open 2018 -19. The other closest school would be in Moore County which was about 1 hour away. The board expressed confidence in getting 144 students based on meetings with parents, local businesses, etc.
- Mr. Maimone questioned if the academic goals were aggressive enough. Specifically, what would be the "hook" to bring students and families to the school. The board responded that a goal by the end of year 5 was to be rated a letter grade of a B. Currently, there were no schools in the county that were rated a B. There were no specific MAP goals listed in the application, but they had a goal to ensure students were proficient in previous standards taken on the MAP, they had a goal to have students grow at least 1 grade level; additionally, they wanted each student to meet growth.
- Proficiencies drop when students move on to the middle school level. The proposed board did not believe the current elementary schools were adequately preparing students. They would administer the EOG in Year 2 and were hoping to outscore the LEA and continue to grow. A member of the board stated that the additional evidence of potential need was the construction of 652 new primary residences.

- Mr. Maimone asked a follow up question regarding how the education plan fits into achieving the goals outlined. The board stated that currently Core Knowledge was not being taught in the traditional public schools. Mr. Maimone asked the board to elaborate on that point as Core Knowledge develops the whole child, and most traditional public schools would state that their schools were based on developing the whole child. The proposed board stated that there was a need and they were also providing an additional education option to the families in the area. Additionally, they hope to improve the LEA with leading by example. As far as goals outlined surrounding the core values, they aimed at developing the whole child.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to address the high poverty in the area, and how the board and school would address this. The board responded that the county was an above average poverty county, they would be looking for school leadership with experience and background in a similar area (above average poverty county), and they planned to have an individual come in and speak to the staff on this topic.
- Mr. Maimone asked the board to speak to the class size, which seemed high relative to the area. The board responded that in each K class they would have an assistant, for the remaining grade levels there would be floating assistants.
- Mr. Maimone asked if any updated studies were conducted. The board replied that some of the high performing charter schools in our state were based on Core Knowledge. The board cited a Core Knowledge pilot program and study conducted in 2012.
- Mr. Maimone inquired about the PD plan to implement Core Knowledge. The board responded that there was time during PD at the beginning of the school year that allowed for 3 to 5 days specifically devoted to Core Knowledge training for teachers.
- Ms. Vuncannon asked about the proposed school's marketing and drilled the board's understanding of Core Knowledge and its relationship to Common Core. The board planned to educate the parents on this curriculum. Core Knowledge aligned cross-curricular and it aligned vertically to the Common Core. Middle school students are disconnecting with education because they do not see the value or connections. When the school can layer and overlap what students are creating, they can better engage students.
- Mr. Maimone clarified if there was any movement with expanding the board. The board responded that there were two prospects, but they did not have time to commit to serving on the board. The board was currently selecting members.
- The CSAB wanted to know if there were any conflicts with the board operating Anson. The board responded currently there was not a conflict. Mr. Maimone asked if there were any discussion on the difficulties for enrollment. The board responded there were discussions.

- Ms. Turner wanted to know if a school leader was identified. The board responded no. Mr. Hawkes asked if the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and School Improvement Team (SIT) should be reporting directly to the board. The board explained that the Principal was a part of the SIT. The Principal and SIT would give reports to the board. The teams would be under the leadership and command of the Principal. Mr. Hawkes commented if they were going to hold the Principal accountable, they needed to give the opportunity to have an appropriate chain of command and authority.
- Mr. Maimone asked questions regarding the facility. The board responded that they had identified a facility (prior elementary school) that was currently being used as a church facility. They were ready to sign a lease today pending the recommendation. Mr. Walker asked about the lease terms. The board responded they would be saving money. The lease was for a 1-year term, with a potential 2-year option. The church purchased the building from the school district, and the church would lease the building to the proposed school.
- Mr. Hawkes asked whether the proposed location would allow the school to pull from various counties. The board responded they believed they would pull students from surrounding counties. Ms. Vuncannon stated that the projection for school nutrition was low and asked the board to elaborate on the vendor. The board responded they would potentially use a local restaurant to cater its lunches.
- Mr. Maimone asked the board to elaborate on the transportation plan. The board responded they believed they would provide transportation to 1/3 of the student population. They would have 2 buses (one bus to the east side of the county, one bus to the west side of the county.)
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend the school to the SBE for Ready to Open. Ms. Gibbs seconded.** No comments for discussion. **The motion passed unanimously (9-0).**

Eminence Academy

- Dr. 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. Applicant submitted new information for review. The applicant received assistance by NC Public Charter Accelerator, but no fee was paid to the third party for that service.
- The Eminence Academy board introduced themselves to the CSAB. Mr. Quigley led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. Mr. Quigley discussed the additional submission to the application. After the clarification interview, the CSAB had many things that prompted concerns, but wanted to interview them to hear more about the strengths and weaknesses in the application with the strong likelihood that the group would not move forward, but provide an opportunity to take

provided feedback and make application adjustments for submission next application round. Specifically, material changes to a submitted charter in the review process is not something the CSAB has allowed or approved. Ms. Turner noted the CSAB has never allowed prior applicants to make even small changes to the application. Mr. Walker stated he did not know if the group misinterpreted the message. Additionally, if the school wanted to amend its charter to only serve grades 3-8 it would need a new application. The CSAB sought clarification around why the school would open with grades 3-8 when you must bring in new tested grades (do you understand what you are about to get yourself into). Ms. Reeves reiterated for the CSAB (for the record) comments and ratings on the original application.

- Mr. Quigley led the application discussion. Ms. Turner noted issues with the goals, due to the given grade structure (given the current performance of the students in the county) the goals were not realistic. Ms. Reeves noted that although it was noble, the 8.5 hours in the day may not be suitable for the proposed student population as stamina was a concern. Additionally, the teacher salary was not aggressive, but then they are expected to teach a longer day. Mr. Maimone sought clarification on holistic excellence and how this related to their goals.
- Mr. Quigley was interested in hearing about the school's education plan with regards to the curriculum they choose. Mr. Maimone sought further information on how this sets them apart from other schools. Ms. Reeves noted that Duplin county had a large ELL population and questioned whether the push in model would be sufficient if they had many students at the emerging level.
- Ms. Reeves sought clarification around the board positions in the application (President, Provost, several Vice Provost). The school was also top heavy and she wanted clarification on the roles and what the roles looked like if they were dual roles.
- Mr. Hawkes commented on the mission statement. Specifically, how was the mission different and what was the meaning of holistic excellence.
- Ms. Reeves wondered if two buses would be sufficient. She also wanted more information about the facility plans/contingencies. Mr. Maimone wanted to know if there was enough budgeted for teachers/TAs and salary-wise \$39,000 they may be okay. He asked for clarification on their projection on the number of teachers or number of additional positions needed (assistants, specials teachers, etc).
- Mr. Kroeger commented that the benefits were budgeted low. They report a 5-year surplus of \$600,000, but that was not presented in the budget. Also, the board needed to strengthen internal controls since budgeting and accounting will be "in house." Ms. Reeves stated that the operational budget was low. Specifically, copy paper and curriculum text received the same \$5,000 budgeted amount. Breakeven number was significantly close to the projected enrollment.

- Mr. Quigley asked the board to expound upon holistic excellence. The board responded that the term was chosen due to the population of the students they would serve, which required character development, the whole child, and beyond the academics. Holistic meant to raise a person to love his country and his fellow man.
- Mr. Quigley asked for clarification around what character education component would look like in practice. The board responded that there will be 30-minute block at the end of each day where teachers will use pre-planned lesson plans (measured on list of viewable behavior and actions).
- Ms. Reeves specifically asked how one would measure those values. The board provided an example of stewardship being measured by community service. There would also be opportunities through the school day and after school. The excellence measurement would be tied to student conduct and behavior. The school would develop a specific rubric with actions and behaviors to track progress.
- Mr. Quigley asked for clarification around the 95% goals. If approved, how would the school move forward? The board responded they have identified what they know for sure would be the catalyst for educational change. The one thing they had pinpointed would be changing the thinking of the students, parents, teachers, and the school. They will change how education was viewed in the county through mindset. The board would make no excuse for their lofty goals. The board believed the goals realistic and that they would implement instructional strategies to reach each outlined goal.
- Mr. Walker commented – “I don’t fault you for having lofty goals” one thing we talk about goals is that they are SMART goals; this goal is not realistic. No school in the state, Charter or Traditional Public Schools, has 95% proficiency. Ms. Turner commented particularly in their first year of operation. 95% in year one when you are testing was not realistic. Mr. Hawkes stated that even the iconic Greensboro Academy was only around 87%. However, he applauded the board for being ambitious.
- Mr. Quigley asked questions about the school time. 7:15 am was an early start. The board responded that school would be 7:30 am – 4:00 pm. The data showed that parents supported a longer school day because it reduced the need for extended day care. Mr. Quigley asked a follow up question on the school day (would instruction start at 7:30 am or door opens at 7:30 am). The board was focused on parent needs. Ms. Turner communicated the board would need to extend that rationale to the staff they intended to hire (at the proposed salary, there aren’t many teachers who would be willing to arrive at 6:45 in the morning).
- Mr. Quigley wanted to know the curriculum for the proposed school. The board responded they were looking through a variety of curriculum. They recognized that the simple out of the box curriculum may not work for the students they would serve.

- Mr. Quigley asked about the teacher to student structure (20 students to 1 teacher), two teachers per grade level. Described as roughly the same ratio in middle school – would the school have dually certified Math/Science and an ELA/SS teacher. The board would have more vertical planning: ELA/SS and Math/Science. The board believed they would be able to meet that goal of dual certification. In the long range the board plans to invest in their teachers over time.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know if the board vetted their proposed plan with prospective teachers. The board responded that they have not solicited teacher feedback. Any teachers that have reached out have done so through the website or at open house.
- Mr. Maimone stated it would be troubling for a perspective teacher to hear there is not a curriculum chosen for the proposed school. The Board stated they understood and they were trying to work on a map to build on these things as they go through the ready to open process. They also understand that they were looking for teachers that have skills, rather than just a core curriculum from a box, as many teachers needed to understand the standards that they are teaching.
- Mr. Maimone stated that the proposed board's enthusiasm was infectious. He also asked why the school submitted an alternate response for the interview. The board responded that they respected and internalized that feedback and adjusted accordingly.
- Mr. Quigley asked for clarification around ELL learners and what percentage did the board expect to receive. The board responded they are projecting 20 – 30%. Mr. Quigley wanted to know the school's plan to develop those students. The board planned to use the "Emerging Readers" plan, which may be the same strategies that can be applied to struggling readers. They would have intervention periods (30 minutes every day specific for reading intervention) driven by weekly data, along with small group instruction. Ms. Reeves asked for clarification around the students who were 8th grade and does not speak English, push in was not going to work for that child. The board responded they had budgeted funds to provide support to students with exceptional children needs and they would invest in self-contained classrooms.
- Ms. Reeves stated that if the child was not identified as an Exceptional Child and is just ELL and would not need those self-contained EC services – how the school would handle that issue. The board responded that they would continue to utilize the ELL strategies and ensure they were providing support staff for those students. They were going to bring in literacy from the cradle, going to partner with the community. They were currently working on that problem in Duplin County. Ms. Reeves clarified she was referring to a new family that migrated or immigrated over the summer. The board responded that they had a community member working on building a program.
- The board for the proposed school communicated that they were looking to obtain a community partner in Duplin County. The group being explored would provide PD to teachers to equip them with needed strategies.

- Mr. Walker wanted to know the reason for one of the proposed applicant's board member resignation. The board responded that the member resigned for personal and professional reasons. The board accepted the resignation. Mr. Walker asked for further clarification on whether this was a friendly split as this brings some concerns forward. The board responded that were some connections that may have caused a conflict of interest. The board member thought she would lose her job. While parents were excited, the members of the community may not all be friendly and proactive.
- Mr. Quigley asked for additional clarification around the board roles. The board provided some comparison titles. They selected the board member titles because they related to a college or university. All board members were first generation college students. They were preparing students for language students would find in a college/university (Principal/Provost – academic affairs, Vice Provost/Assistant Provost). The dual teacher roles were developed intentionally for teachers to gain experience. The board believed the terms correlated to realistic roles. Mr. Quigley provided feedback that the board titles were confusing to the public and parents and the board may want to evaluate the pros and cons (trade off) but nonetheless innovative, the CSAB had not seen this before.
- Mr. Quigley stated that the budget could possibly work with such a small school and across several grade levels. It would be expensive to get economies of scale.
- Ms. Reeves asked the board to speak about its facility and location (Kenansville/Warsaw). The board responded that land is cheap in Duplin county, and they had conversations with several landlords and real estate representatives to discuss land options. They were confident they would not have difficulty identifying a facility over the summer, permitting that they are approved to the Ready to Open Process. Additionally, they had options for church facilities. Once they received the ready to open approval and backing they would have a lot of support.
- The CSAB deliberated. Ms. Reeves knew the area needed a charter school but based on the original application this was not ready. Mr. Walker stated the application needed another year to fully develop the plan. Ms. Vuncannon communicated that backward mapping was very important when building out a charter school, and was uneasy that they have not solidified many components. The enthusiasm was infectious, and more planning was needed.
- Mr. Walker could not think of a school that had been approved when they did not have a curriculum picked out by the time of the interview. Mr. Hawkes commented that no one can argue with the enthusiasm and the need for this school, but the proficiency goals can really lead to problems with teacher expectations and parent expectations. Also, he noted that there were too many threads going off in many directions, the application needs to be refined, honed, and expert advice, and come back with a much tighter application so the CSAB can give an enthusiastic thumb up for Duplin County.

- Mr. Maimone concurred that this application as written was not ready for recommendation to the State Board, with revisions and an accelerated type of opening they could possibly still open in 2019. Ms. Reeves commented that the proposed board already started to address some of the things brought up in the clarification interview through the submitted response and requested amendments, but now, the CSAB cannot take that response into consideration during this time as they need to focus on the original charter application. Ms. Turner noted that the biggest issue for acceleration will be that they must identify a facility (as this is a requirement), but if they spend this next year planning like they are ready to open, then they could realistically be ready to open within the same time.
- **Mr. Walker moved that they do not recommend Eminence Academy to the State Board of Education for Ready to Open status. Ms. Reeves seconded. Motion passes unanimously (9 – 0).**

RENEWAL POLICY UPDATE

- Ms. Shaunda Cooper discussed changes made to the renewal process and framework. Changes that were made included a required governance training by OCS (timeline section). Mr. Walker stated the plan was to discuss the proposed changes. He requested that the CSAB read the policy and come prepared next month to make recommendations on changes or updates.
- Alex Quigley asked questions regarding the desire of the CSAB to consider a 5-year renewal in its framework. Mr. Walker stated he was going to make a recommendation for a 5-year renewal term in the framework. Mr. Cooper responded that based on prior renewals there were a few situations where the 5-year renewal was recommended.
- The CSAB discussed a 5-year renewal term being added to the framework and the criteria to include. Ms. Turner stated that met or exceeding growth was a plausible criterion. Mr. Walker stated that they would discuss the policy in more detail next month. Mr. Maimone commented that comparability may be something worth exploring. Mr. Quigley asked if comparability was required statutorily. Mr. Walker commented that this was only in the 10-year automatic, comparable to the LEA. Mr. Quigley commented that there should be a state average comparison. Issue of self-selecting school is radical and difficult to manage.
- Mr. Turner asked whether legislation stated compared to LEA. Mr. Quigley commented that he would like for legislation to change to compare charter schools to the state. Mr. Walker commented that some schools want to be compared at “the street level.” This may be an issue with the virtual charter schools and what they should be compared to (LEA they are located, the state), having schools compared to the state may fix this issue. Alex Quigley communicated that using the state as the comparable provides the largest comparison of students to compare the school with.

- Mr. Walker closed the conversation and stated the CSAB would discuss the renewal policy in depth next month. **No further action was taken following this discussion.**

EVAAS PRESENTATION

- Dr. Tomberlin, NC Department of Public Instruction, presented on Teacher Evaluation and EVAAS. He stated that the presentation focused on why there was EVAAS in terms in teacher evaluation and how EVAAS was estimated for teachers.
- Mr. Quigley stated the CSAB was most interested in how EVAAS was used in the calculation of school growth (met, not meeting, and exceeding).
- Mr. Walker commented on when they get back EOG scores from testing, there was no way to figure out what the growth was due to the formula being so complex. This becomes an issue when a charter school missed growth 3 times, and they come up for Renewal, they are in a mess. They wanted to understand how to increase the growth score because they did not understand how it was calculated.
- Dr. Tomberlin walked the CSAB through the general method of estimation. Students are given assessment statewide -> scores are sent to DPI for value added analysis -> They have achievement levels set and they can see how they scored -> Given a student's history and the data trend for years on average, this indicates what level a student will perform at (example, if in the past a student has scored at the 40th percentile, they will score at that same percentile for this test) -> when the student takes the test they get the actual performance, they attribute the score to the environment (school and teacher) -> on average it exceeded the expectation or did not meet that expectation (estimate and error in those tests a student sits down to take) they utilize the number of students and the variability in testing to come up with a standard of error (estimate divided by the standard error is the number significantly different than the average (0)).
- If the error was 2 or greater, that school is exceeding expected growth, if it is less than -2 they have confidence that the school is not meeting expected growth. Anywhere in between they cannot state that there is difference from average.
- Mr. Maimone wanted clarification around if a school had performed traditionally higher than the Traditional Public Schools or other schools, then are they now starting at a higher average. Dr. Tomberlin states that this is all relevant to where the student is and where they have trended in the past few years. As the child progresses, the expectation is that the growth is higher. If a student is at the 45th percentile, in general does the student hold position relative to what we think they should be doing. Mr. Maimone wanted to know why there was such a statewide discrepancy between 5th grade science and 8th grade science. Specifically, was there a problem with the projection or model scores with the science results. Dr. Tomberlin explained that the model is based on a state average. The model is centered based on what the state average is.

- Proficiency and growth in the 5th grade may not look anything alike because they are two different and completely unrelated. EVAAS and the value-added model does not take proficiency into account at all. Student's don't meet growth – growth is assigned to teacher and schools. There cannot be a situation where all schools do not meet or all schools exceed growth.
- Dr. Tomberlin proceeded to explain the relationship between growth and proficiency. This was a data and the statistical model, you very rarely see a student max a test out in successive years. There is a correction (shrinkage) that tries to pull every student back to the mean (average). High performing and low performing students' progress to the mean. On average, the high performing kids may not all necessarily move up to the 99th percentile.
- Mr. Maimone requested a one-page document that gives the quartile ranges for EVAAS. What percentage of schools in the various percentiles did not meet, met, or exceeded growth. Dr. Tomberlin responded that this information is readily available in the EVAAS site. He posed a question back, have charter schools utilized the resources available for EVAAS. Additionally, he commented that this information can be placed in the EVAAS scatterplot to map out relationship between students/schools/and the growth measure. No relationship between growth and the population they serve. Growth is so important. What is important - need they came to you with, and how you met that need.
- Mr. Maimone would like a break down by quartile to indicate what percentage of schools by quartile (0-25, 25-50, 50-75, 75-100) and whether they met, not met, or exceeded growth. Mr. Walker stated that through playing around on the EVAAS site and the scatterplot, he could break down the percentage composite proficiency compared to growth scores.

APPLICATION CLARIFICATIONS

Liberty Leadership Academy

- Dr. Townsend-Smith shared school overview on proposed LEA location, projected student enrollment and grade levels for years 1-5, no LEA impact or due diligence statements, pass/fail ratings. The board of Liberty Leadership Academy introduced themselves. Mr. Walker led the Policy Committee discussion. The CSAB discussed all sections of the application.
- Mr. Walker sought clarification around the large projected student enrollment. The Mission, Purposes, and Goals contained the word "Happy" and he wanted to understand its meaning. Mr. Walker commented that he was interested in the placement of the paradigm. Mr. Vuncannon was curious how they would assess and monitor the growth of character indicators. Mr. Walker commented that the 80% proficiency in year 1 was ambitious (grades 3-8 in first year), although they were going into an area that already had quality schools.

- Ms. Turner wanted clarification around the need. The need seemed to be based strictly on the fact that there was student overcrowding. The need was based on crowding rather than a need for what the applicant was offering. There also seemed to be misalignment in the application because the student section goals were a little different than in prior sections.
- Mr. Quigley sought to clarify/verify, the applicant statement that there were no K-8 school options in Cary, Apex, etc. area. Mr. Walker asked clarification around what was happening with Cardinal Charter West. Mr. Machado confirmed, the school was approved on fast track, but they came back to state that it would be 2019 before opening. They were in negotiations for the site.
- Mr. Quigley and Ms. Vuncannon wanted to clarify on whether the school would use the “Leader in Me” program.
- Mr. Walker moved to the governance section of the application and stated that the deal breaker for the school was that there were only 3 board members. The charter was going to require the school to have a minimal of 5 members. Three board members make it hard to give an evaluation of the application when they only have 60% of the board that will be responsible for the school present.
- Ms. Kroeger expressed concern about the tight budget along with the large projected student enrollment. Mr. Walker wanted to know how the 700 a year health insurance for the teachers was going to work (this seems very low). Ms. Kroeger brought up the issue of transportation. Mr. Walker commented that the surplus was not realistic. Additionally, what was the true breakeven number prior to any expenditure adjustments.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know why the school decided to open with K-8 in year 1 and the large number of students. The board responded that they decided on the K-8 model based on experience. They tried K-5, K-12, and they found K-8 was a successful model and they could enroll kids quickly and integrate them into the culture and model of the school. Parents are a lot more comfortable that they can bring students to the school in K and that the student will be with school for 9 years (relationship). The group previously opened a school with 670, and ended up enrolling 750 students. This experience is from Arizona. Based on that experience, an elementary K-5 with 500 students, and middle school with 200 students is reasonable in year 1. The board was willing to hear feedback, this is just based on their experience. The board’s prior experience opening boards was directly associated with an EMO/CMO.
- Mr. Walker commented that when there was a large selection of grade levels this makes it difficult for testing. The board responded that it was not unreasonable to have the projected number of elementary students day 1, based on experience.
- Mr. Hawkes wanted to know why there are only 3 board members. The board responded that one board member was out of the country and they had added 2 board members that were not on the

original application. Their goal was to eventually have 7 board members. They did not want to just throw people on the board just to have a number as they wanted to ensure the board members were “truly bought into the mission.”

- Mr. Hawkes asked, if the CSAB did a little bit of sleuthing with Arizona, would they find that you opened and maintained successful charter schools in Arizona? The board responded that they did. The board responded that they love what they do, and want to do it in the state that they live which was North Carolina. Four members of the board lived here, and met after they moved to the state. One individual moved back to NC for family, unrelated to another board member who moved two or more years from Arizona for a job in NC.
- Mr. Kroeger asked them to speak about their experiences. One member was targeted due to the background that this individual had in management of people (sales/sales management for 25 years, worked in education for 6 of those years). Principal for 6 years, middle school and high school level, and even coached principals. One board member had a background in history, taught history, and then moved forward with an education in curriculum development. Another taught history for 1 year and was a charter school director for 3 years.
- Mr. Quigley asked if there was any relationship between American Learning Academy (ALA) and this application. The board responded that they did not partner with ALA. One reason was because the EMO/CMO placed an emphasis on growth and expansion. Mr. Quigley followed up to determine if there was any concern with intellectual property. The board responded that they had good relationship with them and they did not use any intellectual property from ALA.
- Mr. Walker commented that the addition of two board members was very promising for the charter school. There were several parts of the application that received fails from the external evaluators. The applicant group should take the feedback and strengthen the application. Ms. Kroeger agreed with Mr. Walker and stated there were many things that could be improved in the application. Ms. Vuncannon stated that they could struggle getting experienced teachers with their approach to benefits.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion in the Policy Committee that the CSAB not move the school forward to interview. Ms. Kroeger seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion that the school not move forward to the full interview process. Ms. Turner seconded.** Mr. Maimone commented that there is passion from the board and urged the school to come back. **Motion passed, 8-1 with Phyllis Gibbs dissenting.**

B.L.U.E. - G.R.E.E.N. Academy

- Ms. Turner reminded the chair that she was recusing herself from voting on this application. OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including the proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, proposed county, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence.
- Mr. Maimone led the discussion and members of the Policy Committee asked specific questions on items needing clarification.
- Mr. Maimone was curious if anyone assisted with the application and commended the board for putting forth a quality application.
- Ms. Reeves wanted information on the specific curriculum the proposed school would use. Mr. Quigley asked if a specific curriculum had been identified. Mr. Maimone stated that he recalled the application indicating that the curriculum may be scripted curriculum and wanted the applicant group to elaborate on the curriculum.
- Mr. Maimone also wanted the group to elaborate on the child nutrition and transportation plan given that a significant percentage of the targeted population would be EDS.
- Ms. Reeves commented that the school was small and seemed to propose a top-heavy administration. She wanted additional information on the teacher benefits. Additionally, would the school have a weighted lottery to balance the gender as specified in the application. Ms. Reeves asked about the enrollment in year one and the male/female breakdown with 200 students in year one. Mr. Walker commented that the school could not have a weighted lottery based on gender.
- Mr. Maimone asked the board members to introduce themselves. The board introduced themselves to the CSAB. Additionally, he asked the board to address the points brought up and who came up with the acronym and why, what was the motivation behind it. The board responded that the name is an attempt to become creative. Boys learn under excellence, girls receive every educational need.
- The CSAB questioned if the colors for the school were blue and green to match its name. The Board responded yes. Mr. Maimone wanted clarification around what would attract families to the school and would the school need scripted lessons. The board responded that the teachers will be scripting their own lessons. Mr. Quigley questioned the board on its specific curriculum. The board responded they were still looking for a curriculum but they would be following Common Core.
- Mr. Maimone posed the question again about what would attract parents to the school. The board identified that would be a STEAM school as they realize there was a deficit with girls in STEAM and a deficit in minority boys in STEAM. They planned to build leaders and that will make the difference.
- Mr. Maimone followed up and asked how the school would address EDS population with its proposed lunch/transportation plans. The board stated it had identified a catering company that is

certified to cater school lunches and is willing to be cost effective. They plan to apply for the federal grant for FRL.

- Mr. Quigley wanted additional information on the principals for the school. The school will have two principals, one per 100 students, and one dean for all the students.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know how the school would compensate staff for Saturday school and questioned if this was accounted for in the budget. The board responded that they plan to have capital available for teacher stipends and bonuses. They planned to send students to Saturday school for extracurricular opportunities.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know if all board members would be able to attend the full interview. The board responded that there was one member who may not be able to attend and asked whether they can Skype this person in for the full interview. Mr. Maimone responded she would be able to call in to the meeting.
- **Ms. Reeves made a committee motion to allow B.L.U.E. G.R.E.E.N. Academy an interview. Ms. Gibbs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone make motion to the full CSAB to allow B.L.U.E. G.R.E.E.N. Academy an interview. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously with Ms. Turner recusing.**

Revolution Academy

- OCS provided a brief overview of the proposed application including the proposed enrollment for the first five (5) years, proposed county, and if the application had an LEA impact statement and/or due diligence. The board of the school introduced themselves to the CSAB.
- Mr. Walker led the discussion and members of the Policy Committee asked specific questions on items needing clarification.
- Mr. Walker stated that the numbers for enrollment was ambitious. Ms. Kroeger sought clarification between Revolution and Piedmont Classical. Mr. Walker noted that Piedmont classical was a high school and was curious if there would be an articulation agreement down the road between those two charters. Mr. Walker stated that the education plan looked solid.
- Ms. Kroeger noted that class sizes did not seem to be small, there were very few teacher assistants and wanted to know specifically how the school would be different from schools in the LEA. Ms. Turner wanted a better understanding about how the board members fit into this school in relation to past experiences. Ms. Kroeger asked what is the use of technology going to be as there did not seem to be a lot of money allocated to that component. Also, the utilities seem to be far off given the square footage.

- Mr. Walker asked how many board members were present today. The board responded they have 6 members, and 3 did not show. When the board chair steps off as principal, they will add a parent to the board and when they open they will have 6 members again.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know about any relationship between Piedmont classical and this school. The board responded that they planned to be friendly with them and pool resources. Their relationship is more coincidental as they plan for their graduates to fan out across Guilford county and there was no plan to have a formal relationship. Mr. Walker sought clarification on whether Ms. Sauer was a board member on the Piedmont Classical board. She responded that her children were on the waitlist at Greensboro Academy. She also founded Cornerstone and was board chair there for a year. Additionally, as Founder of Piedmont Classical she worked as an interim principal has continued to work with them in a part time capacity. Ms. Sauer is currently a parent at Piedmont Classical but should this application be approved, her role at Piedmont Classical would end.
- Ms. Kroeger asked the board to touch on its instructional technology. The board responded that they did have technology in the budget, however it is not a focus, they would be a classically based school and planned to use textbooks. The NWEA map testing would be done on computers and enrichment keyboarding class. The proposed applicant communicated they were not ignoring technology but it would not be a focus of the school. They believe they have mapped out what they think they need.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion on behalf of the policy committee that they recommend to the full CSAB board that Revolution Academy be granted a full interview. Ms. Kroeger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in the Policy Committee.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to full board that Revolution Academy be granted a full interview. Ms. Vuncannon seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

ADJOURNMENT

- **Mr. Walker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:17 pm. Mr. Quigley seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
February 13, 2018
9:00 am**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Lindalyn Kakadelis- <i>Absent</i> Lynn Kroeger	Alex Quigley Tammi Sutton Steven Walker Heather Vuncannon Kevin Wilkinson - <i>Absent</i>
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Patricia Nnadi-Purvis, Program Assistant	<i>SBE</i> <i>Attorney General</i> Tiffany Lucas <i>SBE Attorney</i> Jason Weber Eric Snider

CALL TO ORDER

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by Mr. Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. He also led the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Quigley reminded the board they would receive a presentation from Woods Charter School later that today.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION UPDATES

- Mr. Machado led the discussion on the State Board of Education (SBE) updates. He communicated that the SBE approved the grade enrollment and expansion requests. The SBE also discussed pilot transportation grant. The SBE will consider another delay request next month.

Office of Charter Schools

- The Office of Charter Schools (OCS) continued to conduct site visits. This month the OCS renewal team visited Wilson Prep and American Renaissance. There were 36 schools up for renewal this year. OCS has a goal to visit all schools in their renewal year. He reported that he and Dr.

Townsend-Smith visited both virtual academies to provide support and gather feedback. They discussed with each virtual school the renewal process. Overall, it was a good meeting and we discussed their withdrawals to gather a comprehensive picture on why students are withdrawing from school.

- There was also a visit conducted at Kestrel Heights Carter school to provide additional support and guidance following the submission of their report and at the school's request. Additionally, Mr. Machado reported he visited Thomas Jefferson and talked about its annual fundraiser where proceeds go to the Jimmy V Foundation.
- OCS has hosted several meetings with schools to address concerns and to provide support to the schools (aligns with our Core Values). Those meetings included meeting with Thunderbird Preparatory Academy about a potential amendment request to partner with and EMO/CMO. Additionally, we met along with FBS with Queen City Stem Academy in Charlotte about its Financial Noncompliance.
- Mr. Machado provided accolades to Union Academy for receiving a prestigious award.

Annual Report

- Mr. Machado communicated that draft version of the Charter Schools Annual report was done. The CSAB received a copy of the report via email and was provided an opportunity to provide feedback. As he reflected on the presentation he made last year he informed the CSAB that he adjusted because he wanted to talk about how charter schools were trending and outline how well they were doing.
- He reported that there were 173 Charter Schools educating over 100,508 students with 55,000 on waiting list. Since 1997, 44 charter schools have closed, 20 schools were participating in Ready to Open, and 29 applications were submitted.
- Mr. Machado stated that 4 schools that are using a weighted lottery and that the diversity in charter schools was trending in the right direction. During this portion of the presentation he provided a breakdown of the student demographics in charter schools.
- The academics of charter schools for 2016-17 were as follows: 43.5% of the charter schools received an A or B letter grade. 25.2% earned a D or F. The percentage of charter schools meeting or exceeding growth was 70%. We still had room for improvement because there were 17 schools identified as low performing.
- Mr. Machado communicated the innovative practices in charter schools included in the annual report and specifically highlighted:

- Henderson Collegiate – Aggressive Monitoring Program
 - Union Academy – School Character Program
 - Community School of Davidson – Occupational Course of Study finance classes
 - KIPP Gaston – Extended school day
 - Lincoln Charter School – Dream Big Program
 - Francine Delany – Student lunch program
- Mr. Machado highlighted the collaboration between NCDPI and the charter school community. There is a plethora of professional development offered to support charter schools. Mr. Machado reported being proud of the charter schools and their performance.
 - Mr. Hawkes inquired what percentage of the student population was now attending charter schools. Mr. Maimone expressed the number is larger than it has ever been. Mr. Machado replied that student attendance in charter schools now represents 6.5% of the student population in public schools.
 - Mr. Hawkes states he never thought charter schools would ever reach that percentage. There was a lot of work to be done, but things were going well.

Performance Framework

- The Performance Framework report is in your binders. Yesterday, Ms. Clark made recommendations to you on how we should categorize the school as to exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations. From the presentation to you yesterday, we took away that you were pleased overall, but noted concerns on the term “compliance” as it relates to student academics. How would you like us to reflect so as not to put labels on students? Mr. Walker stated we could say exceeding targets or meeting targets. She could do two separate charts. He requested that OCS send out to the CSAB one more time to review before she gets the actual report out.
- Mr. Quigley wanted to know how much information was in the annual report that was duplicative of the required audit. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated there were some overlapping materials; however, as we move to web-based system (currently submitted RFP), schools would be able to submit once for the audit and the Performance Framework. Mr. Walker provided some context on the web-based system and what he thought it would provide to the CSAB members from seeing a demonstration of the product. Mr. Machado provided details on the length of the RFP process. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated OCS has a goal to go live soon and hopes to get everything solidified in April or May before the next renewal.
- Mr. Machado stated that Ms. Clark spent a lot of time putting data together on schools meeting targets within the 3-years, 5-years and 10-years of operation.

- Mr. Quigley stated that the web-based system should be easier to do and make OCS more efficient. Dr. Townsend-Smith hopes the system will help with outlining true deadlines. OCS would be able to notify multiple schools immediately and provide deadlines with a year at a glance.
- Ms. Reeves asked would the web-based system interface with EDDIE. Dave Machado stated that he was not sure. She then asked about the interface with PowerSchool. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated there would be interface with a variety of systems at NCDPI.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith stated that she heard that the CSAB wanted academics classified as exceeding, meeting or not exceeding targets and requested a motion.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to classify the academic portion in the Performance Framework Report as exceeding, meeting, or not meeting targets. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Transportation Grant Update

- Dr. Townsend-Smith provided an overview of the Pilot Transportation Grant established in legislation for the 2017-18 school year. She reminded the board that with their feedback and recommendation, the SBE approved the established grant timeline.
- OCS was to reimburse schools by January 15, 2015 that for the grant. However, reimbursement was delayed due to the inclement weather. OCS was currently working to review all applications and supplemental documentation. Our plan is to complete this task by next month.
- There were thirty-nine schools that submitted letters of intent. Forty-one schools submitted a grant application. Of the forty-one submitted, reimbursement requested totaled over 3 million dollars. She reminded the board that the total allotted amount was 2.5 million dollars.
- Ms. Reeves wanted to know if everyone that submitted qualified. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated that OCS is verifying the information to determine all eligible applicants. Dr. Townsend-Smith reported that there would possibly be only one disbursement as there is only a limited amount of funds. Ms. Turner asked if schools were to submit all data that they had since there would only be one disbursement. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated that we will have to see and determine an equitable amount for everyone. Mr. Quigley stated that everyone was eager to get the money reimbursed and wondered if the grant would be given again next year.

APPLICATION UPDATES (CLARIFICATIONS/INTERVIEWS)

Mebane STEM Academy

- Dr. Townsend-Smith shared school overview on proposed LEA location, projected student enrollment and grade levels for years 1-5, no LEA impact or due diligence statements, pass/fail ratings. The board of Liberty Leadership Academy introduced themselves. Mr. Maimone led the Performance Committee discussion. The CSAB discussed all sections of the application.
- Mr. Maimone asked questions about the proposed school operation. He allowed the board opportunity to speak for five minutes on their thoughts about the ratings their application received. The board replied, they moved to NC from Texas which had a large school district and many charter school options. A board member communicated that their children attended traditional public schools for years when moving to NC, but the needs of her child were not being met. The board member reported that teachers try to do the best they can for the large number of students they serve. A board member stated that she has a child with autism, and the needs of her child were not being met. Her other child was bored, not learning anything. There were many groups of students whose needs were not being met in traditional public schools.
- Mr. Maimone stated that the CSAB board needs to be convinced to move the group forward. Specifically, the applicant group proposed starting grades K - 9. The board stated the projected enrollment was from the Mayor and the City board members who wanted another school for the area. The board stated their desire was to have families attend the same school for their K – 12 educational experience
- The board members present reported that they had community backing. Mr. Maimone wanted to know in what way did the proposed school have community backing. Also, he wanted to discuss the surveys that were conducted to justify the proposed need. The board chair stated she had searched and knocked on doors, emailed, and along with social media to come up with many candidates, some good candidates for the board. There is a parent group of about fifteen who were interested in being on the board. Mr. Maimone asked the proposed board to provide an explanation of the external evaluator ratings of their application. The board responded that the questions that were asked of them were valid.
- The board chair communicated they were meeting with different developers for a location site. Mr. Maimone inquired about the budget for modular buildings. The board stated they had decided not to use the modular. With the projected number of students, they were partnering with a company to build a building.
- Mr. Maimone asked the CSAB members about any additional concerns they might have allowing this group to go forward. Ms. Reeves referenced Appendix A1. There was also a concern with starting with the large projected student enrollment.

- The CSAB expressed much concern about the financial plan. There was a question posed as to if this was an NHA school. They broke even in the financial plan however, there was no budgeting in the transportation plan. There were also areas of misalignment in the submitted charter application.
- Mr. Maimone stated there were a lot of inconsistencies with the application. He also stated that since there are no longer caps on charter schools, they would be able to apply again later. Mr. Maimane reiterated that there were too many inconsistencies in the application to move forward.
- **Ms. Reeves made a committee motion not to move Mebane STEM forward to interview. Ms. Sutton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB not to move Mebane STEM Academy forward to interview. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Hawkes encourage the group to think about opening K-8 instead of K -12. He also indicated they needed to tighten up their application before submitting again.

Rising Above the Stars Academy

- Dr. Townsend-Smith shared an overview on the proposed LEA location, projected student enrollment and grade levels for years 1-5, no LEA impact or due diligence statements, pass/fail ratings. The board of Rising Above the Stars Academy introduced themselves. Mr. Quigley led the discussion and stated that the CSAB would take a couple of minutes for discussion before hearing from Rising Above the Stars Academy. He led the discussion by starting with the mission purpose and goals.
- Mr. Walker was concerned about the goals of being only 5% higher than the LEA the charter was seeking to locate. Ms. Turner wanted to know where the proposed applicant was getting its data indicating student disengagement. Ms. Reeves wanted to hear more about the current after school program. Specifically, would the afterschool program have affiliation with the school. Mr. Walker wanted to hear about the Economic growth in Pitt County (a tier 2 county). He indicated there was high economic growth in tier 3 counties.
- Ms. Reeves wanted to discuss the strategies outlined in the application and wanted to know how the dozen strategies worked together. Mr. Maimone stated he did not understand the curriculum plan. It was difficult to understand how these strategies would work together. Mr. Maimone wanted to know how would the curriculum would incorporate Common Core, and how the school would recruit its students.

- Ms. Reeves wanted to know how would be divided at the school. Mr. Quigley was impressed with the group taking time to write down and view the 21st century skills. Mr. Quigley appreciated having a proposed schedule. He also wanted to see more schedules presented with applications. He was interested on how the 21st century skills would be initiated.
- Ms. Vuncannon stated there were many different strategies listed in the application. She also stated that project based learning was a viable option for teaching students. The board would need to provide great training for project based learning. She echoed the earlier sentiments of Mr. Quigley and would like to see how this would be implemented. The proposed board outlined that they would use differentiation in the classroom. Ms. Vuncannon stated that teachers differentiate every day in learning.
- Ms. Kroeger expressed concern about the Governance section in the application. Specifically, the board was requiring only a minimum of three required meetings for the board. Also, members only needed to be present for 3 meetings.
- Mr. Quigley had questions on the Operations section of the application. He wanted to know how the school would make a clean transition from the after-school program to a charter school. Mr. Quigley stated that the after-school program was run more like a “mom and pop program”. The afterschool program would not be a part of a charter school (if approved).
- Ms. Reeves was concerned about the Finance of the electricity, computers and the expenses. This line item was listed under professional contracts as \$2400. Ms. Reeves stated that she was not sure about the professional contracts as \$2400. Also, the school would be operating with less than a million bucks. She was concerned that there may be a conflict of interest between the two (charter school and after-school program. Ms. Vuncannon echoed the sentiments of Ms. Reeves about the high number of expenses listed in the application.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know why the board decided not to have any interim goals. The board replied that they have interim goals of five percentage points for the year.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know about exceeding growth for each year. The board replied they believed their growth goal was attainable. The board stated that they would use various technologies to create RTI, small groups and to create various benchmark assessments to reach the desired goals.
- Mr. Maimone wanted the board to outline the daily schedule of the school day. He also stated he wanted to know what will be seen in a daily school schedule that would help the students reach the benchmarks. The board replied having a rise and shine morning meetings, the seven habits and motivation and leadership and the students having a love of school. The board also indicated

the seven habits and their daily five with community partners coming in to work with students on their entrepreneur skills.

- The board stated the format for the daily schedule. The board talked about how it would use guided instruction and independent practice with the I Do, and We Do Model (Lorraine Monroe Model). The board stated they would integrate science with math skills. The board also indicated they would have “break-out” in corrective learning group. The students would then transition into independent practice. The students would be on different levels in which differentiation would come into every grade and subject level. The Read Aloud Period incorporates the Leader in Me.
- Mr. Quigley wanted to know how the board would pay for the Leader in Me program and communicated that the cost would be expensive. The board stated that they could/would implement the program. The board stated that they would research the read aloud program. Mr. asked the applicant group about the scheduling of guiding reading in the afternoon. The board replied the schedule was tentative.
- Mr. Quigley asked the board to explain their STEM methodology. The board responded that students would be divided by ability level. Additionally, they would need to conduct Professional Development for implementation. The Board needed to increase their budget in technology given they were a STEM school. The Board communicate that they have an integrated approach to STEM as they did not want STEM to stand alone. The STEM period would be based on higher order thinking and was something that students would work on throughout the week.
- Ms. Sutton stated that there would be programs that come and go and you want to know at the end of the day what’s most important. What’s governing the school is most important.
- Ms. Sutton asked a question about the many different programs outlined in the application. She specifically asked the board what program outlined would be the non-negotiable once a principal was hired and what would happen if the principal decides against the non-negotiable. The Board replied STEM was a nonnegotiable. The board desired to be a 21st century learning community school and wanted to work on student leadership skills.
- Ms. Turner asked the board about their mission since it defines the school. The Board replied they were building and organizing the school at the same time. They were building up instead of out. The Board said they were starting with vocational training. They believed their board and executive director were strong. The Board planned to bring other professions to help drive the program. The board stated they would start small and later grow into a larger scale.

- Mr. Quigley questioned the board on the success of its currently operating before and after school program. The Board replied the strategies with the students in the program proved successful as the students showed growth. The students made growth just in the 3 hours a day participating in the program. The board said there were a lot of students in the program that needed concrete learning and they helped them. The board stated they made academic gains through this model by looking at the student learning gaps.
- Mr. Quigley stated there were a lot of different pieces, which is fine and good but wanted understanding on how the board arrived at the constructivism model. The Board communicated they would need curriculum specialists planning with teachers and staff development. The board stated when working with students that are disadvantaged, teachers must allow students to explore learning. Students needed an opportunity to work and learn from other students.
- The board stated that children work better together with a stronger student and are creative together. Mr. Maimone asked if the board had considered age appropriateness. The Board responded they were amazed at what the students could do. Age was not appropriate but a student's grade readiness was more important. A board member says the school/ her school was in Virginia and the model outlined in the application is working well. Mr. Quigley voiced continued concerns about the constructivism theory.
- Mr. Quigley asked about the \$250,000 balance. Mr. Maimone asked if the board treasurer was a retired accountant. The board provided limited responses to the finance questions. The salaries for the school were appropriate now (per the proposed board). The salaries would be \$37,000 for teachers, \$60,000 for a principal with no experience and \$65,000 with experience. The Board stated that as they develop the charter school and attain more students, they would increase salaries. An office manager could be combined with clerical. Additional adjustments that could be made would be taking a part time salary from clerical and placing the salary difference in supplies and instructional support.
- Mr. Maimone communicated that the budget was tight with the projected enrollment and the proposed board would need outside services to make the program work. The Board replied they have started conversations with Walmart and other private donors to help support the tight budget. Mr. Maimone wanted to know if payroll would be outsourced. The board replied the payroll would be outsourced. Mr. Walker wanted to know who on the board would be employed at the school. The Board replied the no one from the board would work for the school. Mr. Maimone asked the board how the board would make the budget work. The board replied they would partner with ECU, have parent transportation clusters. Also, transportation would not be an issue because their current community partners own buses.

- Ms. Reeves wanted to know if the community partner buses were “yellow busses.” The board stated the buses were true school buses and there would be no connection between the afterschool program as the grant for the afterschool program ends this year.
- The board informed the CSAB that there were 400 survey responses expressing interest in attending the charter school. Mr. Quigley wanted to know if the survey were uploaded. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated no additional survey data was uploaded prior to the meeting.
- Ms. Vuncannon stated she was still concerned about the proposed budget. There were many things that could happen in a school’s first year. Mr. Maimone wished he had heard more about community support given the budget constraints. He did not want to set the school up for failure where the budget was concerned.
- Mr. Quigley stated the application was well written. However, he was not going to vote in favor of the school. The board needed to work on improving its proposed budget and apply next year. Mr. Walker concluded that the application needed more work. **Mr. Walker made a motion to not recommend Rising Above the Stars Academy to the State Board of Education for Ready to Open.** Phyllis Gibbs suggested the school apply for acceleration next time. Mr. Quigley stated they could apply for acceleration if they met the criteria. Mr. Maimone felt torn because he liked the group and the application was well written. Mr. Maimone stated he would rather give them a shot and would not support the current motion. He stated he thought the group was dynamic. Mr. **Quigley called question on motion to not recommend Rising Above the Stars Academy to the State Board of Education to begin Ready to Open. The motion was approved Motion carried 7 – 3 with Mr. Hawkes, Ms. Gibbs and Mr. Maimone dissenting.**

Wilmington School of the Arts

- Dr. Townsend-Smith shared an overview on the proposed LEA location, projected student enrollment and grade levels for years 1-5, no LEA impact or due diligence statements, pass/fail ratings. The board of Wilmington School of the Arts introduced themselves. Mr. Maimone led the discussion. The Board members decided to provide a brief statement about why they wanted to start the charter school. The Board believed strongly that students would do well, and we believed they would have strong community involvement.
- Mr. Hawkes questioned if members on the board were retired from New Hanover County. Two board members were retired and have a connection with New Hanover County School System.
- Mr. Maimone informed the board of the interview protocol. He advised the board to take some notes and be prepared to answer those questions when prompted.

- Mr. Maimone led the discussion and outlined question around goals as some were not smart goals. For example, the application stated that 100% of its students would be proficient. Ms. Vuncannon had questions about the arts, mission statement and curriculum. Ms. Reeves wanted to know the type of arts curriculum and its relation to the mission.
- Mr. Quigley noted that the applicant projected 50-60% of its student would be low-income. He wanted to know if the board had considered a weighted lottery to ensure its recruitment to meet that targeted number. A weighted lottery was not requested in the submitted application.
- Ms. Reeves stated that multiple intelligences was listed as key component in the mission. She was curious to know how the arts and multiple intelligences meshed. She wanted to be sure the board knew what was in its proposed application. Ms. Vuncannon wanted to know how the board would correlate benchmarks to student achievement.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know if any of the board members would be staff members. Ms. Reeves asked if the school would bring students from Pender County. The CSAB had questions about the number of charter school in the area. Dr. Townsend -Smith replied 6. Mr. Walker wanted to know who would conduct the school's finances. Ms. Kroegeer stated the facility cost was 14% of the revenue.
- The Board replied to the CSAB questions. Of the 300 surveys sent out, the board received 80 responses and stated they were still building awareness about the school. They have started to use Facebook as a marketing tool. The board also stated this was a community that valued charter schools. The board communicated they had plans to schedule a parent / community involvement meeting and had several people volunteer to host the meetings. They added that Smart Start was interested in being involved with their school.
- Mr. Maimone questioned the detail of the survey sent to stakeholders. The board communicated that the questions asked included the age range, middle school interest, interest in attending a school with integrated arts and position in the community.
- Mr. Maimone asked for a description of integrated Arts. A board member replied she had over 20 years' experience in the arts. The goal was to integrate the arts into all aspects of the school programs. They would incorporate 3 pieces: elementary (no elementary school in NC with arts), theater arts, with music, and pull out classes.
- Mr. Quigley wanted to know if the arts coordinator would be an elective teacher. The Board replied the arts coordinator would be an elective teacher and would provide support to the classroom teacher. The board stated there would be 4 Part time and 2 full time staff for the arts.

- Mr. Quigley wanted to know if there would be individualized lessons for students. The school planned to individualize by conducting multiple intelligence testing to see how the student learned.
- Mr. Quigley asked if the school planned to purchase the Core Knowledge program because the budget did not reflect that cost. The Core Knowledge materials are at least \$3,000 per set. The board stated they would be purchasing Singapore Math. The board response detailed Cooperative Learning and Mr. Quigley asked why that component was not indicated in the application. Mr. Quigley asked the board to describe what Cooperative Learning looked like in the classroom. The Board replied students rotating from table to table and interacting with each other.
- Ms. Sutton asked the board about recent research which indicated that the multiple learning styles had no link to student achievement. A member of the board replied that based on going back to No Child Left Behind, this program would work. Board stated there were many aspects of Cooperative Learning that is effective.
- The board said there were things they could purchase to use as benchmarks. They would track students from the begin to the end. The teachers would need to be on board with the training, whether MI or Core Knowledge.
- There was a lot of training that must take place before opening the school. Mr. Maimone wanted to know where they would get the Core Knowledge Training. The board stated someone would come to their school to train the teachers.
- The CSAB provided the opportunity for the board to provide additional information about its lunch program. The board communicated that they realized there would be no free/reduced for the first year because of a cash flow program. To determine if a student would receive free lunch the school would most likely require the completion of a free/reduced lunch form.
- Mr. Quigley asked the board if they expected the school to be diverse and if so, why diversity was not reflected on the board. The board stated they expected the school to be diverse and they are working on their board diversity.
- Ms. Kroeger asked the board if they had any concerns about their proposed budget. The board replied yes and they would talk to banks if a cash flow issue presented itself. She also asked the board about the square footage amount for the facility per student. The Board replied, 75 sq. ft per student; \$15.00 per sq ft. was the annual facility cost. Also, one member of the board would be employed as an Advisory Board Member. The board wanted to keep an odd number of board members.

- **Ms. Reeves made a motion to not recommend Wilmington School of the Arts to the State Board of Education to begin Ready to Open. Ms. Sutton seconded.** Mr. Maimone and Mr. Hawkes stated that the board was strong. Mr. Hawkes said the superintendent would not be happy if this group moved forward because the LEA would lose a lot of students. Mr. Maimone asked the CSAB to outline what it needed to see to move the group forward.
- Ms. Reeves stated the application included many lists (Cooperative Learning, Multiple Intelligences, and Core Knowledge) and the application was not clear as to how each of these pieces would go together.
- Mr. Quigley stated that while there are some strong board members, he was not ready to move the applicant forward to Ready to Open. There were too many questions remaining and not answered.
- Ms. Kroeger stated that the educational plan was not clear. Ms. Sutton added she had concerns about the targeted student population in the application and the board response to the weighted lottery and racial diversity was lacking. Mr. Maimone encouraged the board to reapply and to be more concrete with their application and responses. **The motion passed 6 to 4 with Mr. Walker, Ms. Gibbs, Mr. Maimone and Mr. Hawkes dissenting.**

SCHOOL PRESENTATION

- Mr. Cotton Bryan, Executive Director, Woods Charter School presented to the Charter Schools Advisory Board on the steps the school has implemented to help receive a ten-year charter.

MARCH 5 & 6 CSAB PLANNING MEETING

- The CSAB discussed potential meetings dates and topics for its March 2018 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

- **Mr. Walker made a motion to adjourn the meeting.** The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm via acclamation.