

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
March 6, 2017**

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

CALL TO ORDER

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 8:31 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Quigley led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- The question was asked if there were any conflict of interest with respect to any matters coming before the board. **Mr. Joe Maimone and Mr. Helton recused from any discussion or voting regarding the application review process of Carolina Charter Academy and Davidson Charter Academy.**
- **Ms. Sherry Reeves made a motion to approve the February 6-7, 2017 minutes, as amended. Ms. Cheryl Turner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

APPLICATION UPDATES/REVIEWS

- The CSAB continued application reviews. The CSAB made recommendations on which applicants would receive an interview. Dr. Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS), led the discussion by providing an update on the application review process.

- The CSAB commenced with Policy and Performance Committee application reviews for the remaining 11 of 38 applicants proposing to open in August 2018. Following each review/clarification opportunity, the CSAB made recommendations on applicants to be recommended for an interview opportunity before the full CSAB at its regularly scheduled April 2017 meeting. Dr. Townsend-Smith provided a brief overview of each applicant group including its evaluation feedback, proposed enrollment over five (5) years, proposed county, and mission of the proposed school.

Carolina Charter Academy

- Five (5) board members and one (1) member from CFA were present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Mr. Quigley led the discussion and members of the Policy Committee asked specific questions on items needing clarification. One member of the proposed board discussed the reasons three (3) new board members were added. Specifically, the new members were added to strengthen the board based on the comments discussed in the application evaluation rubric. Mr. Stoops, member of the board, discussed he had a resignation letter ready to eliminate the conflict of interest currently on the board. Mr. Quigley questioned the role of CFA and if Mr. Sinderson would be the CFA board member on the board. A member of the proposed school discussed the reason the board choose to partner with CFA and that they would determine, at a later date, the team CFA board representative. Additionally, the board member discussed the CFA schools visited which were currently operating in NC.
- Mr. Walker asked questions on the CFA agreement/relationship and its responsibility regarding hiring etc. The board member presenting discussed she may be the school leader and would resign from the board should the proposed board choose to hire her as the leader. Ms. Reeves communicated the discrepancies between the bylaws and the narrative of the application. Mr. Walker addressed the proposed board and asked which was correct based on the questions posed by Ms. Reeves. The proposed board member discussed they had made adjustments. Ms. Reeves communicated she felt it was a pretty good application and during interview the CSAB could drill other questions.
- Mr. Quigley asked specific questions on the lunch plan discussed in the application. Mr. Stoop discussed that the plan was to budget monies and have other areas subsidize if a student could not afford lunch. Mr. Walker provided the Policy Committee his understanding of the requirements of charter schools providing lunch and there may need to be another way for the board to consider meeting this component of the plan. Ms. Reeves asked questions about the organizational chart discussed in the application. One proposed member, explained the role of the board and the employees.

- Ms. Reeves asked questions on the line item books/supplies in year four of the budget. The proposed board member discussed the specific line item was to help build the library of Core Knowledge resources. Additionally, Ms. Reeves sought clarification on the contracted services discussed and the board member responded that it was to provide a padding to help accommodate for the needs of all students.
- **Mr. Walker made a committee motion to invite Carolina Charter Academy for interview. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Helton recusing.**
- **Mr. Quigley made a motion to the full CSAB to recommend and interview for Carolina Charter Academy. Ms. Parlér seconded.** The CSAB discussed the Team CFA relationship and Ms. Parlér questioned the CFA member on the board. **The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Helton and Mr. Maimone recusing.**

Infinite Hope Preparatory

- Three (3) board members were present for the clarification/review opportunity and three (3) board members were not present. There were seven (7) members discussed in the application and information was submitted to withdraw one board member.
- Mr. Maimone led the Performance Committee discussion. Ms. Parlér wanted clarification on the mission statement and had concerns about the discrepancy in the enrollment discussed in the application. Ms. Turner had questions regarding how the school would measure resiliency.
- Within the proposed Education Plan, Mr. Maimone questioned if the group had given consideration to a weighted lottery and the proposed board's understanding of its targeted student population, if it only proposed one Exceptional Children (EC) teacher. Ms. Turner discussed the educational plan was not fully developed. Mr. Hawkes discussed his concerns with the EC teacher within future years.
- The Performance Committee questioned the governance structure and wanted to know how many of the board members would eventually become employees of the schools. Ms. Parlér wanted to understand the co-owner relationship discussed in the application. Mr. Hawkes expressed his concerns of the proposed organizational structure based on the committee structure in the organizational chart.
- The Performance Committee discussed its concerns in the operations component of the plan. Ms. Parlér wanted to know if the plan was realistic. Ms. Turner discussed the inconsistency of the student/teacher ratio discussed in the application. Mr. Sanchez had concerns that the group had not

appropriately budgeted for school lunch. Mr. Maimone discussed the discrepancies with the proposed budget.

- A proposed board member discussed its proposed student population and what they meant by resiliency – faced different challenges and adversities and have the skills to overcome their challenges and adversities as discussed in the clarification submitted via the portal. They would measure resiliency by looking at achievement and surveys. Mr. Maimone questioned the proficiency/growth as discussed by the academic goals in the application. The proposed group communicated they believed in a balance between the two, but the 60% is proficiency and students must achieve between 1 – 2 years of growth. Mr. Maimone also questioned the discrepancy in the enrollment numbers discussed in the application. The proposed board discussed it submitted information the morning of the application review and changed its enrollment projections to 160 students. The proposed applicant group confirmed the budget was based on 160 and not 180, as that was an error.
- Mr. Maimone asked direct questions on the Chinese language immersion concept and if targeting struggling readers was an appropriate model. The proposed board member discussed the immersion program would start in Kindergarten and they would not have struggling readers in second grade. Mr. Maimone explained the legalities of not being able to give enrollment/lottery preference for Chinese immersion. The proposed board discussed it clarified that information that morning in the online application system and a random lottery would be submitted. Also, the proposed applicant group communicated it would have two lotteries (one for Chinese immersion and one for the regular program).
- Mr. Maimone asked direct questions on the relationship of the board/staff and how it would hire/fire the director. The proposed board member discussed that was a typo which was adjusted. Also, the proposed board discussed they did not conduct surveys for the targeted population and were willing to adjust the budget based on the needs of its potential students. One board member discussed that the director would be employed in the school and sit as a non-voting member. The proposed board member discussed they added items to the budget and would provide all funds and lunches for the children. Additionally, the proposed board communicated they had spoken with vendors to provide the food services.
- Mr. Maimone discussed that he had concerns with the application as written as we must hold the proposed applicants to the written product it had submitted. At the moment he does not see the application as viable. Ms. Turner discussed the application needed more due diligence. **Ms. Turner made a committee motion not to move Infinite Hope Preparatory forward to interview. Mr. Sanchez seconded. The motion passed 5 to 1 with Mr. Hawkes dissenting.**

- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to deny an interview for Infinite Hope Preparatory. Mr. Sanchez seconded.** Mr. Hawkes discussed the school would be needed in Guilford and he would like to see the applicant clean up the application and hoped the board would not get discouraged. Mr. Maimone reiterated that the CSAB's responsibility was to recommend the current application to the SBE. He wanted the group to come back and discussed a potential future process. Mr. Sanchez discussed there were resources available to applicant groups such as previously approved applicants/applications and other external evaluators across the state. He discussed the current application was not close to meeting expectations and needed real repair. Mr. Maimone concluded the proposed applicant could have a much stronger program if due diligence was done to bring forth a better application that addresses the questions. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Carolina Experimental School

- Two (2) board members were present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Ms. Reeves discussed the vagueness of the mission statement and wanted to know the purpose of the school. Mr. Walker discussed that the governance goal was to have two (2) Chinese board members on the board. Ms. Corenetto discussed there may need to be revised wording on that component.
- Mr. Walker discussed he had concerns with the legalities of Exceptional Children (EC) plan as student had to check a box indicating their EC status. Additionally, he pointed out that the external evaluators had a lot of comments regarding that component. Also, Mr. Walker wished to review the due diligence for the proposed applicant group. Mr. Helton reiterated it was illegal to check for EC prior to a lottery.
- Ms. Reeves wanted clarification between the comparison of NC and Florida students. Mr. Walker discussed his concerns about the proposed school's lunch plan and how students may not be able to afford the meal provided by the school.
- Overall the Policy committee was concerned about the vagueness of the plan and its potential legalities. Board members present discussed there were a total of five (5) members on the board. Mr. Helton discussed he welcomed alternative thought; however, the group does not have a firm understanding of the requirements to run a charter school in North Carolina.
- **Mr. Helton made a committee motion not to allow an interview for Carolina Experimental School. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB not to allow an interview for Carolina Experimental School. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

- After the vote, the proposed applicant group questioned why they were not provided an opportunity to respond to any of the CSAB questions. Following the question, **Mr. Walker made an alternate motion to provide an opportunity for the applicant to respond to the CSAB concerns. Ms. Turner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- The applicant was allowed to speak about the identification of EC students and the proposed board member discussed the credentials of its board members and felt that the application questions on identifying EC students asked the wrong question. Additionally, he discussed the fundamental issues of American education and the inflated and fraudulent grades of students in America. Also, the board chair for the proposed school, pointed out the proficiency of the students in NC and that there were flaws with the education system in NC. He further discussed the way the Chinese educate is the way the proposal is written. Also, more research between American and Chinese students was recapped by the proposed board member to the Policy Committee.
- The proposed board member discussed why he included the Florida information in the submitted application and the information was provided since the NC data was not available upon submitting the application and he wanted to provide a comparison.
- Mr. Walker asked direct questions about the differences between Chinese education and US education based on the research conducted. Also, the research provided was not an apples to apples comparison. Mr. Walker also questioned the rational of the proposed applicant group tearing down a system it proposed to open a school within.
- Mr. Walker referenced another Chinese immersion application submitted this round and the differences in quality between the applications. The proposed board member provided an anecdotal of his scores on the Praxis II exams. He discussed natives of America did not perform as he did on the assessment which points to the problem in American education – and the CSAB can choose to ignore it. Mr. Helton discussed we have a system we must work under and regardless of how you agree or disagree – you must outline a legal application based on educating students in NC. Also, charter applicants must follow the rules and work within the system if you want them changed. The applicant group concluded that “everything in American education, including EC, is broken.”
- **Ms. Reeves made a committee motion not to grant an interview for Carolina Experimental School. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed 4 to 1 with Ms. Gibbs dissenting.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB not to grant an interview for Carolina Experimental School. Ms. Turner seconded.** Mr. Maimone communicated he appreciated the passion and encouraged the board to rewrite and come back with a better proposal. Mr. Walker discussed the board may want to consider opening a private school. Mr. Sanchez communicated that some of the research discussed by the applicant group had validity. He discussed he would love to

see the applicant group return and outline clearly how they would invest in the students it hope to serve. Mr. Sanchez encouraged the group to submit a revised plan in the next application round. Mr. Hawkes communicated he thought the CSAB may be a bit defensive and could learn a lot from the applicant group. He encouraged the proposed applicant group to come back with a better plan. **The motion passed 8to 2 with Mr. Hawkes and Ms. Gibbs dissenting.**

Monroe Charter Academy

- Four (4) board members and one (1) community member was present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Ms. Parlér questioned the Core Knowledge curriculum. Ms. Tuner discussed the CSAB had approved the same application with an earlier application in this application round and her concern was about the capacity and a new board receiving a second school.
- The Performance Committee discussed there were no fundamental issues with the application and wanted to know the distance between the two (2) proposed school (Anson Charter Academy and Monroe Charter Academy). Mr. Hernandez discussed it was about 20 minutes between the two (2) campuses. Mr. Quigley questioned the analysis discussed in the application to which Mr. Hernandez responded. He discussed the board had done its research and that the Hispanic population would be more in the proposed Union campus. Another board member provided additional information on the Hispanic population and what it needed do to connect to the demographic. Also, she discussed her past experiences in education and her passion for the model.
- Mr. Sanchez questioned the targeted student population and the reason the board decided not to have a weighted lottery. Mr. Goodall and Mr. Hernandez discussed the reasons the board did not think they would need the weighted lottery. Additionally the relationship with community members and providing transportation eliminated the need for a weighted lottery.
- Mr. Goodall discussed the one member added to the board that represented Union County. Additionally, the difficulty with Anson standing alone, was it was tough financially to have a charter school sustain itself. A sister school using efficiencies of scale would be beneficial for both the Anson and Union campuses. Mr. Goodall referenced the Lee and Durham school applications and the reason the CSAB declined those applications. He pointed to the need in Union County with some data to support his stance.
- Mr. Maimone questioned the board on the challenges of opening two (2) campuses. Mr. Hernandez discussed the contract with Goodall Consulting would assist the school with handling a timely opening and hiring, and purchasing Core Knowledge resources etc. Additionally, he discussed his role and the role of other board members to help the board reach its goals. The board already had the

buildings and had already held a fundraiser. Mr. Goodall discussed how the board would recruit using a system from NC Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI). He discussed the board is new but not new to the work.

- Mr. Goodall discussed the business support he would provide for the schools. He discussed the Ready-to-Open process is much improved and he would step down from the board if approved. Mr. Quigley questioned the conflict of Mr. Goodall being the board chair and the contract the school was planning to enter into with Goodall Consulting. Mr. Goodall referenced General Statue regarding conflict of interest and his willingness to guide the board. He assured the CSAB that he would step down and be in the contractor role should the applicant be approved.
- **Mr. Quigley made a committee motion to allow an interview for Monroe Charter Academy. Ms. Turner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Quigley made a motion to the full CSAB to allow an interview for Monroe Charter Academy. Mr. Helton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Davidson Charter Academy

- Two (2) board members did not attend and three (3) board members with one (1) Team CFA representative was present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Mr. Walker discussed the glowing components of the application. Ms. Reeves discussed the enrollment was aggressive and not supported by the survey conducted by the school. Mr. Walker discussed that if approved this would be the only charter in Davidson County. Ms. Reeves questioned the discrepancy of the instructional calendar proposed in the application.
- A board member provided clarity on the evidence of need. She explained the unique design of the school system in Davidson County and the distance of the proposed location. The proposed board member discussed the dispatch conducted the survey and was not requested by the proposed applicant group which discussed 70% were in favor of a charter school being located in the county. Also, the board member discussed they received positive questions on bringing a charter school to the area.
- Ms. Reeves questioned the intervention plan discussed in the application. One board member discussed they wanted to provide flexibility to the teachers and wanted them to have options to explore. Also, the board member discussed the typo with the instructional hours discussed in the application. Mr. Sindors discussed the group had worked on the application for 5 years and had monies (\$200,000) in the bank. Additionally, he discussed the need and how many students leave Davidson County to go to a private or charter school. Mr. Sindors discussed CFA worked with group

for two (2) years and CFA support would be in addition to those monies the proposed applicant group had already secured. Ms. Reeves questioned the experience of the board members and one board member solidified the role and expertise on the board.

- Ms. Reeves discussed that overall she was impressed with the application and commended the board on its persistence. **She made a motion to invite Davidson Charter Academy for an interview. Ms. Gibbs seconded. The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Helton recusing.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB to grant an interview for Davidson Charter Academy. Ms. Reeves seconded.** Mr. Maimone questioned the group on what they learned from reapplying. One board member discussed the changes made to the application and the commitment the board made to adjust based on feedback previously provided. **The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Helton and Mr. Maimone recusing.**

The Experiential School of Greensboro

- Two (2) board members for the proposed school were present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Mr. Maimone led the discussion and Ms. Parlér commended the group on its mission statement. Mr. Sanchez wanted clarity on the Personalized Education Plans (PEP) in the at risk component of the application. Ms. Parlér wanted more information on the proposed EC decisions and how that influenced the promotion from one grade to the next.
- The board chair of the proposed schools responded to the questions around need and the work done to support the proposed plan. She discussed they would use a universal approach to education and plan to meet the needs of all students. Mr. Sanchez probed on the exact number of Economically Disadvantaged Students (EDS) the school projected to serve as the proposed applicant group budgeted 30% for lunch. The proposed board member responded that board decisions had to be made around that component and adjustments would be made concrete by using fundraising, etc. to supplement components of the program.
- Mr. Maimone questioned the ability of the board for its financial and legal expertise. The plan was to expand the board and current board members had some expertise through their work with other boards. The CSAB questioned the health care benefits not extended to teachers. The proposed board members discussed their proposal.
- Ms. Turner and Parlér discussed that the application was well written. Mr. Sanchez echoed the sentiments of Ms. Turner and Ms. Parlér. The committee commended the group for not cutting and pasting its scope and sequence. Mr. Sanchez commented that the financials were concerning and demonstrates a lack of know-how as charters often fail for financial reasons. Additionally, the child

nutrition component was not adequate which indicates one of two things, the proposed applicant group would or would not aggressively make this happen or the proposed applicant group would or would not fall in line with its proposed mission.

- **Mr. Sanchez made a committee motion to allow an interview for The Experiential School of Greensboro. Ms. Parlér seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to allow an interview for The Experiential School of Greensboro. Mr. Sanchez seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

East Voyager Academy

- Four (4) board members along with two (2) advisory board members were present for the clarification/review opportunity. Three (3) board members were not present; however, reasons were provided.
- Overall the Policy Committee discussed the application was well written. Each component of the application was discussed regarding any items needing further clarification.
- Mr. Helton questioned the goals discussed in the application and wanted more information on how the proposed board chose to create/decide on the goals as the proposed goals were ambiguous. One board member discussed the Chinese immersion would allow them to meet curriculum goals. Overall the academic goals needed to be more quantifiable to ensure they were rigorous.
- Ms. Reeves asked questions on the proposed grade structure of the school. One board member discussed the reason for the model and how it was successful in other places. Additionally, Ms. Reeves wanted clarification on the Foundation and the school. One board member discussed it was not an EMO/CMO partnership. The foundation allowed independence while tapping into resources the foundation could provide. The proposed board appreciated a 3rd party review of its performance and after a few years the foundation would go away and they would be able to sustain themselves.
- **Mr. Helton made a committee motion to allow an interview for East Voyager Academy. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB to recommend an interview for East Voyager Academy. Ms. Reeves seconded.** Ms. Parlér sought clarification on EMO relationship and the termination clause. Mr. Hawkes responded that in theory it was a practical matter. Mr. Maimone expressed concern about the name and discussed that, if approved, a name change would be necessary as there is already a charter school with a similar name. Additionally, he needed more clarity on the demographics should the group move to interview. Ms. Turner responded that the projected enrollment was concerning, especially in the Charlotte Mecklenburg area. **The motion passed unanimously.**

The Paideia Academy

- Three (3) board members and three (3) advisors were present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Ms. Parlér questioned how intellectual autonomy was measured. Mr. Quigley communicated his base issue was that the goals were not SMART and too broad. Mr. Sanchez discussed the targeted population was not clear. Mr. Maimone questioned the need and the evidences the proposed group provided.
- Mr. Hawkes discussed his financial concerns and the structure of the proposed organizational chart. He also wanted clarity on having an EC coordinator and director. Ms. Turner discussed her concerns with the projected enrollment given where the group was proposing to locate and current enrollment trends.
- Ms. Cook, lead applicant, provided a response to the enrollment discussed in the application. The group chose its location as it borders (2) other counties and students would most likely attend from Mecklenburg/Union/Cabarrus counties. Additionally, Paideia does not target a specific population and was good and sound for all students and was why they chose not to target a particular population. Mr. Sanchez questioned the expected targeted student population. Ms. Cook responded that the elementary students in Mecklenburg County embraced Paideia and there was not a feeder school for those students.
- The proposed board discussed how they would rewrite the goals to make them SMART. Mr. Sanchez questioned the end in mind to determine if the school year was successful and how the board would judge success. One proposed board member discussed there are three (3) columns of instruction in the Paideia model which lens to intellectual rigor which was difficult to measure. Mr. Sanchez further questioned the board's numerical goals to measure success. One board member responded they have corrected the organizational chart and the two (2) co-writers have a relationship and the proposed structure would ensure no conflicts.
- Mr. Maimone questioned the salaries discussed in the application and a board member provided clarification to respond to the inquiries. One of the consultants discussed how the lunch program participation would depend on the demographics the school would eventually attract and the budget would be changed accordingly. Also, student support services discussed in the proposed application would communicate the needs of the student to inform the lunch program.
- Mr. Maimone discussed that there are Paideia certified people on the board and there were still questions that needed to be answered. Mr. Sanchez communicated that no direct answers were provided to the targeted population questions asked of the group and he had concerns based on the discussed goals, lunch program, and other deficiencies discussed in the budget. Ms. Turner had concerns about the goals and as currently proposed the goals are not quantifiable. She was not adverse to an interview, and would be interested in hearing more. Mr. Maimone indicated the interview would not be easy, if granted.

- **Ms. Turner made a committee motion to offer an interview to the Paideia Academy. Ms. Parlér seconded** and encouraged the group to do their homework prior to interview. **The motion passed 4 to 2 with Mr. Quigley and Mr. Sanchez dissenting.**
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to the full CSAB to grant an interview for the Paideia Academy. Ms. Parlér seconded.** Mr. Walker commented that he would vote for the applicant group to receive an interview since a majority of the committee voted to grant an interview; however, he had concerns about the organizational chart as it looked like a recipe for disaster. **The motion passed 9 to 1 with Mr. Sanchez dissenting.**

Eldred Montessori Secondary School

- Four (4) board members were present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Mr. Helton discussed his concerns with the enrollment and its impact on financials given the expenses at the high school level. Mr. Walker discussed the applicant explained the Montessori model well in the written application. Ms. Reeves questioned how the occupational course of study would work with the proposed Montessori Plan.
- Mr. Walker questioned the weighted lottery because as currently proposed it was more of a proxy on race instead of being based on the allowable socio-economical guidelines. He discussed the parameters/legalities of conducting a weighted lottery and the correct way to conduct one. Mr. Walker wanted to know how the school would ensure the parents were not benefiting from the lunch gift cards proposed for the lunch program and wanted to know more about what the board's plan was to handle parents who may abuse the lunch gift cards.
- Mr. Helton questioned the transportation plan and the budgeting of the bus drivers. Ms. Reeves questioned the relationship between two (2) board members and the proposed bylaws. The requirement of Montessori was a big ask and how would the proposed applicant attract and retain teachers. Ms. Reeves sought clarification on the board's understanding of lottery preference regarding board members and if the proposed board understood that only a certain percentage is allowed.
- Mr. Walker discussed his concerns with the budget section, which he failed, while passing all other sections. He specifically pointed to particular budget line items and discussed the specific concerns. There were many issues with the budget discussed in the application. Ms. Reeves echoed Mr. Walker's sentiments and pointed to the numerous deficits in the budget. Mr. Walker discussed that the budget needed to be redone.
- The proposed applicant group discussed the idea for the proposed lunch plan discussed in the application came from an established charter school, Francine Delaney. She communicated she discussed with Ms. Fowler, Head of School, Francine Delaney, the specifics of the proposed

lunch program. Also, the school planned to use a farm to school method for lunch once it was up and running as it currently projected 20% poverty.

- Mr. Helton discussed his concern with the projected enrollment and questioned if the school would meet the specific enrollment given the 80 student requirement discussed in statute. The proposed board member discussed her past experience and that the board had given consideration to this scenario. Mr. Walker hoped the group would apply next year and correct the budget discussed in the application. One proposed board member discussed most of the issues were a line placement error.
- **Ms. Reeves made a committee motion to not grant an interview for Eldred Montessori Secondary School. Mr. Helton seconded** because of the many financial concerns. **The motion passed 4 to 1 with Ms. Gibbs dissenting.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB not to allow an interview for Eldred Montessori Secondary School. Mr. Quigley seconded.** Mr. Hawkes responded that the problems with the organizational chart needed to be corrected as well if the school applies next year. He hoped the group brings back the plan as he loved idea. **The motion passed 9 to 1 with Ms. Gibbs dissenting.**

Doral Academy

- Dr. Townsend-Smith provided a brief overview of the proposed application including the enrollment over five (5) years, proposed county, and mission of the proposed school. No one was present for the clarification/review opportunity.
- Ms. Reeves discussed her concerns with the relationships discussed in the application. Mr. Quigley was concerned with the proposed student enrollment.
- Ms. Reeves communicated that there was not a clear model and it was a hodgepodge of strategies. Mr. Walker indicated that the Florida schools discussed in the application seemed to perform well and wished someone would have been here to address the CSAB concerns.
- Mr. Quigley questioned the benefit of the board for the management fee charged, as the school would still be responsible for a lot of other expenses.
- **Mr. Walker made a committee motion not to grant an interview to Doral Academy. Ms. Gibbs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

- **Mr. Quigley made a motion to the full CSAB not to grant an interview for Doral Academy. Mr. Walker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Global Achievers School

- Four (4) board members were present for the clarification/review opportunity. A new member joined the board in November and submitted information in the system the morning of the clarification/review opportunity.
- Mr. Walker led the interview and questioned if the school had selected its leader. Ms. Lisa Swinson, proposed board member, would ultimately become the leader at the school.
- Ms. Reeves asked questions about the conferences discussed in the application and how the school would work around the requirement if a parent was not able to attend.
- Mr. Helton questioned the square footage discussed in the application and if it was appropriate as proposed. Mr. Walker discussed the facility piece needs to be further explained during the clarification opportunity. Ms. Reeves had concerns about the breakeven number projected in the application.
- Ms. Swinson discussed the board was correct and large classroom sizes are needed for project based learning. A realtor was looking at different properties for the group to lease in the Middlesex area. Mr. Walker provided information/advice that the board should give consideration to improving its proposed budget by including Wake County students in its projections. Ms. Swinson discussed there is documentation available to support success provided by its relator.
- Ms. Reeves asked about the transportation plan and if the school would purchase or lease its buses. Ms. Swinson responded about the APCT model research completed and her passion for its use in the proposed school.
- **Mr. Helton made a committee motion to recommend an interview for Global Achievers School. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to the full CSAB to allow an interview for Global Achievers School. Mr. Helton seconded.** Mr. Hawkes communicated his pleasure with the clarity of the organizational chart discussed in the application. **The motion passed unanimously.**

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION UPDATES/SCHOOL UPDATES

- The CSAB received an update on the March State Board of Education (SBE) items that were approved. Mr. Dave Machado, Director, Office of Charter Schools led the discussion.
- At the March 2017 SBE meeting, all consent items were approved. The SBE also approved the CSAB recommendation for Kestrel Heights School.

Kaleidoscope Charter High School

- At the February CSAB meeting, Mr. Walker stated that he would review the Kaleidoscope application that had not been recommended for an interview by the CSAB. After review, he decided that the application did merit an interview before the CSAB. **Mr. Walker moved to rescind the previous motion to not move Kaleidoscope forward for an interview and to reconsider the decision. Mr. Maimone seconded the motion.**
- Mr. Sanchez asked that if the motion is rescinded, if Kaleidoscope would need to go back to the committees for approval. Mr. Walker clarified that if the motion to rescind the previous motion was approved, he would make a motion to bring the school in for interview and not before the committee. Ms. Turner expressed concern that voting to rescind the motion could send a message to other schools that if enough contact is made with the CSAB either in person, by phone or email, then the CSAB would change their minds from their original recommendations and allow the schools to interview. Mr. Walker concurred with her concern but stressed the amount of time he took to review the prior discussion of the school and the actual application and still agreed that the school deserves an interview. Mr. Helton discussed he agreed with the sentiments of the group; however, he would vote in favor of the motion.
- Mr. Sanchez expressed strong concerns about going back over a decision that was made by the board with no new information being added, especially since the first decision was appropriate considering that the only difference was correspondence from local officials. Mr. Sanchez further commented that the full board has never voted against the opinion of the committee and this decision would be a blemish on the CSAB's record of not going against the committee vote. Ms. Tuner expressed concerns that the work of the committee members was not "worth anything" if the decision was made to rescind the earlier vote. The only thing that could be concluded from rescinding is that the CSAB made a mistake. She further communicated that in this instance the CSAB was valuing the work of the external evaluators over the work of the CSAB committee members. Mr. Quigley discussed he felt better about balance and quality of external evaluators as he was confident in the coaching of OCS with developing external evaluators.

- Ms. Turner expressed that during the next application review process, the entire board should perhaps read the applications instead of the committees. Mr. Reeves commented that seventeen groups have been denied an interview in front of the CSAB. If this motion is approved, these seventeen groups would then feel inclined to petition the board to have their motions rescinded regardless of the quality of the applications.
- Mr. Maimone commented that close consideration must be paid to the external evaluators who are paid to review the applications. Kaleidoscope had a vast amount of passes by the external evaluators, compared to the other ones who were denied having a vast amount of fails for parts of their applications.
- Ms. Gibbs expressed her confusion that the CSAB voted seven to three to recommend Kaleidoscope's application to be approved by the SBE last year, which was denied, with the external evaluators failing more parts of the application. This year, there are more passes from the external evaluators, and the board decided not to recommend Kaleidoscope's application to be approved by the SBE.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to invite Kaleidoscope for an interview. Mr. Maimone seconded the motion.** As a point of discussion on the motion, Mr. Maimone commented that as the policy committee chair, he admittedly did not give enough credence to the outside evaluator opinions and that is why he is in support of the current motion to invite Kaleidoscope for an interview. **The motion failed with a 5 to 5 vote. After further CSAB discussion, the motion passed 6 to 4 with Ms. Turner, Mr. Sanchez, Ms. Reeves and Ms. Parlér dissenting.**

Exceptional Children Occupational Course of Study Presentation

- Mr. William Hussey, Director, Exceptional Children, Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and Ms. Carol Ann Hudgens, Section Chief, Policy, Monitoring and Audit, DPI, led a virtual presentation for the CSAB on the Occupational Course of Study for students with disabilities in charter schools.
- Mr. Hussey explained that the Occupational Course of Study is a program option that an Individualized Education Program (IEP) team can consider for their students with disabilities. Although charter schools does not offer the Occupational Course of Study program this does not exempt the IEP team from using the program as an option for students with disabilities.
- If a student, enrolled in a charter school, has a disability and requires an Occupational Course of Study, as determined by the incoming IEP, the charter school must follow the policies regarding in-state transfers, which includes adopting the student's IEP from the previous Local Education Agency (LEA).

- Mr. Maimone commented that discussion was held earlier by the CSAB on the topic of the occupational course of study program and the matter came up about the affordability of these courses offered by a relatively small charter school. Mr. Hussey emphasized that most of the programs can be absorbed by the resources already at each school without incurring any additional financial cost to the school. Ms. Turner gave examples of how Occupational Course of Study was implemented at her school and outside of paying the cost for the NC Virtual Public School courses, there was not a significant financial burden.
- Mr. Hussey explained that even though a charter school is not required to offer an Occupational Course of Study outside of an IEP, by state law they would be required to if an IEP determines that course of study is the best course of study for a student to get a diploma.
- No further action was taken by the CSAB.
- **Ms. Sherry Reeves made a motion to adjourn the March 6 meeting. Ms. Turner seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned via acclamation at 4:08 pm.**

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board Assumption Committee
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
March 16, 2017**

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

CALL TO ORDER

- The Assumption Committee meeting of The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Quigley led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- **The purpose of the Assumption Committee meeting of the CSAB was to evaluate charter school assumption proposals for Community Charter School, and to make a recommendation to send to the full CSAB. The full CSAB made a final recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval at its April 2017 meeting.**

COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL ASSUMPTION

- The CSAB began assumption reviews/interviews to make a recommendation on which applicant, if any, received a recommendation to assume Community Charter School. Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS) led the discussion by providing assumption updates to the CSAB.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith informed the CSAB subcommittee that Community School of Davidson withdrew from the application process and that Global Education Resources, LLC would be the only group to interview in front of the CSAB subcommittee.

- Three members of the board, Mr. William Cherry, Ms. Stephanie Walker and Mr. Grant Morgan, were present and provided brief introductions to the CSAB committee. Mr. Don McQueen, Torchlight Academy, Mr. Simon Johnson, Quality Education Academy and Eugene Slocum, Alpha Academy, were also present on behalf of Global Education, Resources, LLC, a new Educational Management Organization (EMO).
- Mr. Walker questioned if the new board of directors had founded a non-profit corporation. Mr. Cherry explained that the name of the established non-profit corporation was Northside Community Outreach. Northside had been an established non-profit corporation for at least three years. The mission of Northside was to “impact the lives of the community by way of service.” Mr. Quigley questioned if the board members present were the board members of the established non-profit. Mr. Cherry answered that the board members present would be board members of the school and were not currently members of the established non-profit.
- Mr. Quigley questioned how the board came to know about Global Education Resources, LLC. Mr. Cherry explained that he had a personal relationship with Mr. Johnson. Mr. Quigley then asked for clarification about the structural relationship between the Education Management Organization (EMO) and the non-profit board that would operate the school, if assumed. Mr. McQueen explained that a lot of the confusion between the two parties involved the initial misunderstanding of how the assumption process would work. This was the first time that an assumption process had occurred, and it was unclear if the management company would be assuming the existing non-profit or if a new non-profit would need to be established. Mr. McQueen explained that the board members of the existing 501(c)(3) would resign in transition to the non-profit entity that would assume the charter.
- Mr. Quigley questioned why the existing board members of Alpha Academy, Quality Education Academy and Torchlight did not apply to assume the charter and contract with the management company. Mr. McQueen stated that he believed that it would create a liability issue and it was in the best interest of the management company to create a new entity not associated with the existing schools which were not managed by the newly formed EMO.
- Mr. Quigley asked the management company about what prompted them to assist a new entity to apply for assumption of Community Charter. Mr. McQueen stated that it was their desire to have successful charter schools in North Carolina. Whenever a charter school failed, it was a collective failure for the charter school movement in the state. It was important for the management company to collaborate experiences and resources to potentially save a charter school, and also serve the children in the community. The management team believed that they could create a great turn around for the school by increasing enrollment, attendance, and test scores.
- Ms. Hilda Parlér questioned if the board had signed a management contract with the EMO. Mr. McQueen stated that a written contract had not been signed, but the board had agreed to the terms and conditions of what the management company would be asking for, “in principal.” Mr. Walker asked for clarification on what terms and conditions have been agreed upon. Mr. McQueen explained that the contract is similar to a NHA agreement. In discussion about the school, the management company saw that most schools close due to lack of financial management and compliance. The non-profit board felt that it would be in their best interest to contract with a group that has demonstrated responsibility with public funds, managing those funds and delivering a service to students and the community.

- Mr. Walker questioned if Global Education Resources, LLC had the appropriate funds and resources needed to complete renovations for the school to prepare it for opening. Mr. Johnson explained that the management does have enough resources to complete the renovation for the school. Mr. Johnson explained that the total cost of the renovations should be around \$80-90,000.00 to prepare the school for opening.
- Mr. Walker asked Mr. Cherry to explain his understanding of the relationship between the non-profit board of directors and the management company they would hire. Mr. Cherry explained that he understood that the management company would spearhead the school operations, giving the directions on what it should do to help advance the students in the school. Mr. Cherry explained that he understood that the board would have the ultimate authority over the charter and the charter school.
- Mr. Walker asked if the teachers currently at the school would be retained upon assumption. Mr. Cherry explained that it would be best to have a complete new start at the school, if assumed. It would be great to start with all new teachers and staff. Mr. Parlér suggested that teachers who have made a positive impact at the school could transfer to the newly assumed school. Mr. McQueen stated that they had the ability to hire talented individuals to help their vision come to light for the new school.
- Mr. Quigley questioned legal about the religious and educational aspects of the Articles of Incorporation. Mr. Walker added to the discussion that the Articles of Incorporation can be adjusted to remove any religious verbiage.
- Mr. McQueen questioned the CSAB subcommittee about the financial standing of Community Charter School and the funds that would be available after assumption. Mr. Walker explained that when a new entity assumed a charter, they assume everything with that charter, including any financial debts or fund balances. Any contracts currently being honored by Community Charter School must continue to be honored by the assuming entity.
- Ms. Walker explained that free and reduced lunch would be available along with a full kitchen at the school. The board further believed that transportation would not be an issue, but would also be determined by the transportation need of the students in the area. The board would focus on advertising to the community that transportation was available to the school to hopefully increase enrollment.
- Mr. Walker explained to the board and management company that his concern is not with academics, but with the governance of the new entity applying to assume Community Charter. It is important that the board is knowledgeable of its roll to hold the EMO accountable. In order for the CSAB to feel comfortable with making a recommendation to the full CSAB, they are requesting the following items to be submitted to the OCS by Wednesday, March 22:
 1. Amended Articles of Incorporation for the Northside non-profit corporation;
 2. Board meeting minutes showing that new board members have been installed to Northside with the appropriate vote;
 3. Copy of the IRS documentation indicating your 501(c)(3) status;

4. A one page resume for the board members added and outlined in the original proposal;
 5. Copy of the proposed management agreement; and
 6. A 100 day plan outlining the steps the board and management company will take to ensure a successful opening in August 2017
- After further discussion, the CSAB subcommittee decided that the recommendation would be postponed until Thursday, March 23, via conference call. This would allow time for the requested documents to be received by the OCS and dispersed to the CSAB for further review.
 - **Mr. Steven Walker made a motion to adjourn the March 16 meeting. Mr. Helton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned via acclamation at 3:33 pm.**

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
March 23, 2017**

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

CALL TO ORDER

- The Assumption Committee meetin of The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) was called to order at 7:05 a.m. by Chairman Alex Quigley. Per Chairman Quigley's request, Dr. Deanna-Townsend Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS), read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Quigley led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- **The purpose of the Assumption Committee meeting of the CSAB was to evaluate charter school assumption proposals for Community Charter School, and to make a recommendation to send to the full CSAB. The full CSAB made a final recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval at its April 2017 meeting.**

COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL ASSUMPTION

- The CSAB Assumption Committee continued their assumption review of Global Education Resources, LLC to decide what recommendation would be sent to the full CSAB, and then to the State Board of Education (SBE) for final approval on the assumption of Community Charter School. Dr. Townsend-Smith led the discussion by providing assumption updates to the CSAB committee.

- Dr. Townsend-Smith informed the committee that the additional information requested by the CSAB committee was received and available for review and continued discussion on the assumption recommendation.
- **Mr. Quigley made a motion to go in to closed session to discuss certain items with legal counsel. Mr. Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Steven Walker made a motion to go back in to open session. Ms. Hilda Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Quigley commented that after review of the documents that were submitted to the CSAB subcommittee, he is confident in the leadership of the management company. The management company has proven themselves to be proficient leaders through the current status of the schools that they currently operate. However, the concern of the CSAB committee was with the viability of the non-profit board that the charter would be granted to, and the ability of the board to hold the management company accountable for their services.
- **After further CSAB committee discussion, Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend to the full CSAB to not recommend assumption of Community Charter by Northside Community Outreach Inc. Since there are no other entities requesting to assume Community Charter, their charter would expire on June 30, 2017. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to adjourn the March 23 meeting. Mr. Quigley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned via acclamation at 7:35 a.m.**

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
March 24, 2017**

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

CALL TO ORDER

- The special meeting of The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) was called to order at 10:02 p.m. by Chairman Alex Quigley. Mr. Quigley read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Quigley led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- **The purpose of this special meeting of the CSAB was to make a final recommendation on the assumption of Community Charter School to submit to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval at its April 2017 meeting.**

COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL ASSUMPTION

- The CSAB began discussion on the assumption review of Community Charter School to assist with making a final recommendation. Dr. Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS), led the discussion by providing assumption updates to the CSAB.
- Mr. Quigley provided a brief summary to the CSAB regarding the interview that was conducted with the Global Education Resources, LLC, and three members of the non-profit board of directors. Following the first interview, there were some critical issues that needed to be

addressed before a recommendation could be made. More information was needed about the management contract. There were also questions and concerns about the viability of the non-profit that would receive the charter, and how effectively the board would be able to work with the management company to make sure the school runs properly.

- Mr. Quigley asked the OCS about the status of the current students that are enrolled at Community Charter School. Mr. Dave Machado, Director, OCS, explained that in his communication with the board members of Community Charter, all but eleven students have been placed in other schools in their area. Mr. Joe Maimone also asked about the status of the building that was housing the school. Mr. Machado explained that the facility is not available, due to Community School of Davidson not being able to make an arrangement to keep it, so the building would be sold.
- **After further CSAB discussion, Mr. Maimone made a motion to support the CSAB Assumption Committee recommendation for no assumption of Community Charter School, resulting in the charter expiring June 30, 2017. Mr. Helton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **The March 24 meeting adjourned via acclamation at 10:20 a.m.**