

**Minutes of the
North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
March 5, 2018
9:00 am**

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner Lindalyn Kakedelis 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 Shaunda Cooper, Consultant Stephenie Clark, Consultant	<i>SBE</i> <i>Attorney General</i> Tiffany Lucas - <i>Absent</i> <i>SBE Attorney</i> Eric Snider – <i>Absent</i> Jason Weber

CALL TO ORDER

- The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by Chairman Alex Quigley who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Mr. Quigley led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- **Mr. Steven Walker made a motion to approve the February 12-13, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Joe Maimone seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith led the discussion by providing a recap of the current application process. She provided information about the March interviews and the CSAB's pending recommendations to the State Board of Education following the March meeting. Information was provided in the presentation about the 2018 Timeline and Process. Today's meeting marked the last round of interviews. After today's meeting, the CSAB would have reviewed all 29 applications submitted.

- She reported that there were no clarification interviews for the month and only two (2) one-hour interviews remaining. Dr. Townsend-Smith reminded the CSAB of its established interview process. She reported that two schools were notified about interviews on February 20, 2018.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith went over a chart which detailed the recommendations to the SBE. Specifically, 3 applications were recommended and approved by the SBE – one was fast track replication, two approved through acceleration (one of the approved acceleration application was also a private school conversion).
- There were seven (7) pending recommendations to the SBE for approval. There were two pending recommendations based on the CSAB decision during today's meeting. Two (2) applicants withdrew this round and there were 15 schools that were not recommended to the SBE for its approval.
- Mr. Maimone asked a question around how many they have ended up approving in the prior years. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that they approved 15 last year, and the year prior the CSAB approximately approved 12-15.
- Mr. Hawkes asked a question about Cardinal Charter West and whether they had their zoning and construction issues resolved. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that they may not be ready to open using fast track and may ultimately come back to request a year delay.

Revolution 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.
- Mr. Walker led the interview and had the board members of Revolution Academy introduce themselves to the CSAB. Following the introductions, he guided the CSAB through the application to determine their interview questions.
- Ms. Turner had questions about the enrollment numbers within the first few years. Ms. Vuncannon was curious to see about Cornerstone's (currently operating charter school) demographics, and how closely the two schools' demographics would align.
- Mr. Maimone was curious about the name Revolution, as the name itself was not associated with a classical Core Knowledge education.
- Ms. Turner wanted specific information about the class sizes versus the available staff. Specifically, would there be 3 assistants for the entire school. The ratio outlined in the application was 1 – 27, and she questioned how students would get individualized help.

- Ms. Reeves wondered about teachers specializing and teaching in three (3) core subject areas. Also, the EC estimation proposed in the application was based on the charter school population and not on the county population. Additionally, the graduation exit requirements lacked detail.
- Mr. Hawks questioned the proposed applicant's exclusive use of Saxon Math and Shurley Grammar and wanted to know about the alignment with the NCSCOS.
- Ms. Reeves pointed out that the applicant proposed to use differentiation to target AIG and wanted to know the specific reasoning behind the decision. The Special Programs, 504 and EC components of the application lacked detail. She also wanted to know if it were a requirement of the board of directors for substantial financial contributions to be a board member. If so, this would potentially exclude a community member or parent from becoming a board director.
- Mr. Hawkes was concerned about the initial projected student enrollment. He questioned if the school would achieve the 565-number outlined in the application.
- Ms. Reeves raised questions about the governance, projected staff and commented that Ms. Turner had already mentioned the teacher to student ratio. Specifically, there were only 4 specials teachers to serve 600 students, only 3 EC teachers and 3 assistants. Projected staff was short for the enrollment number projected.
- Ms. Kroeger asked specific finance questions. The utilities were budgeted extremely low for proposed facility size. Also, the technology budget seemed low based on the number of students projected. As a follow-up, Ms. Reeves wanted to know about the facility contingency plan and questioned why the applicant would build a new facility. Ms. Kroeger stated that the projected student enrollment was aggressive.
- Ms. Vuncannon wanted to know more about Guilford County's diversity. From the application it seemed the transportation and lunch budget would need to be higher to not present a barrier for student enrollment. Mr. Walker wanted to know what breakeven number was without any budget cuts. Ms. Turner stated she was not sure about the idea, but charging people who do pay for lunch to pay for the students who cannot afford lunch was concerning. Ms. Reeves asked about the anticipated EDS population especially if the plan proposes to match the LEA.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know more about the proposed marketing plan and how they would attract 500 students. The board responded that they have set aside money in the budget for marketing purposes. They will use social media advertisement such as Instagram, LinkedIn, Twitter, and Facebook ads. The most effective marketing would be word of mouth. Mr. Maimone followed up on how the high school marketing would be different. The board responded that they understood that targeting high school grades was more difficult. One unforeseen marketing tactic was – Cornerstone (currently operating charter school) offering high school grade levels as well as a program from

Guilford County called “Say Yes” where students can essentially take free college classes. The board chair (employee at Piedmont Classical) state they made enrollment adjustments and were doing very well at Piedmont Classical.

- Mr. Maimone asked about the ADM for Piedmont’s first month, the board responded it was around 412. They stated that historically charter schools opening in Guilford County have large openings. Cornerstone and Summerfield opened with 500 students. The Guilford county demand was not close to being met. There are charter schools in Guilford county with over 1,000 students on the waitlists. The model of the school is very similar to the Cornerstone model so it is reasonable to associate that success with this proposed model.
- Mr. Maimone asked about the name of the school “Revolution” and how this connects with Classical Core Knowledge. The board responded that there was a theme and history of Revolution in Guilford County. There are aspects of the community that have that name.
- Ms. Vuncannon wanted to know the proposed school’s proximity to Cornerstone. The board responded that the target area is close to where Cornerstone started. Guilford County has enough students to go around. They are specifically turning down land that is close to Cornerstone. She then followed up on the demographics of Guilford county. The school’s goal was to increase the level of diversity. They are close to 45% African American at Piedmont Classical. They would target a similar area and expect a pretty diverse population. From a parent’s perspective (board member presenting was a Cornerstone parent), diversity had been a focus. There was a very diverse group, the students have all races and ethnicities in their classrooms. Additionally, with regards to the marketing, they planned to have an early release for Kindergarten which would be another aspect of the school they could provide. They would work with realtors so that families coming to Greensboro would be aware of the available school choice options.
- Mr. Walker discussed the Education plan. Ms. Turner asked a question about meeting the needs of all students given the ratio of 1:27. The board responded that students need to be aware of classroom expectations, and they would practice those expectations daily to set the tone for learning. They would build positive attributes for the children. They would have a full time instructional coach for staff support. The staff would know their curriculum, have strong planning and classroom management which would increase the amount of differentiation and the ability for teachers to reach all students. They would utilize manipulatives, groupings by levels, EC push in and inclusion support, and the assistance of volunteers. The teachers would use structured groups. They have moved up math in the plans, where students can (through attendance, ability, and teacher recommendation) qualify for math a grade or two ahead. The math was scheduled at the same time (90 minutes) throughout the grade levels so that student learning was not interrupted.
- Mr. Walker asked about the exclusiveness of curriculum. Specifically, would teachers be locked into this curriculum or would they have flexibility. The board responded that the foundation of the math

was Saxon Math, but there would be a chance to supplement. Teachers could do more than what was outlined in Saxon Math. Mr. Quigley asked a follow-up question about any additional programs the school would use to supplement the Math curriculum. Mr. Walker asked for the board specifically walk the CSAB through how they would supplement. The board responded with some examples: measurement was a standard that did not align with NCSCOS/Common Core and the teachers would take a break from Saxon Math and create their own unit on measurement, then pick up with the curriculum when the unit was finished. Additionally, they used Problem Solvers to supplement the math curriculum, as they found the Saxon Math curriculum did not have that much.

- Ms. Reeves stated that legislators are pushing for smaller classroom sizes. She wondered how the proposed school would attract parents to a program with such large classroom sizes. 27 students in middle school was huge. Teachers would specialize in each of 3 core subject areas. Requiring middle school teachers to all three core subjects was concerning. The board responded that when they get to middle school, they would rotate classes. There would be one teacher assigned to teach science and history and a teacher assigned to ELA and math.
- Mr. Maimone asked questions about the outlined finances. He questioned why the school would not put more resources in the teacher's hands and more personnel. The board believed in conservative budgeting, they had a \$600,000 surplus the first year at Cornerstone. With Piedmont Classical, they are at a good place at this point, though they started off rocky with enrollment. They realized they would likely have higher budget expenses with regards to utilities and construction. The board had intentionally budgeted this way to have flexibility with allocating funds where needed. The answer to the class size questions was they planned on having high quality teachers. This would allow the teachers to manage and service students, even with a large class sizes.
- Mr. Hawkes provided reasoning to the Revolution board as both Greensboro Academy and Summerfield Academy have class sizes around 26 students. This was contingent upon a dean model, the culture of the school, and the moral focus.
- Mr. Quigley asked for additional clarification around middle school teaching model. The Board responded they would find teachers certified in Science and help them attain certification in Social Studies. They were budgeting for 4 specials teachers, but would like to have 5 (budget permitting).
- The Board responded about its exit requirements. The idea was that students promoted to the next grade level would meet the requirements in the prior grade. One guiding principal was that no one would be surprised as they would notify parents when they identified first signs of struggle (9-12 weeks). There would be support in place to help students throughout the school year to meet grade level expectations. There would be many ways a student could demonstrate grade level mastery – EOGs, grades, samples of work and NWEA. They would work hard to ensure students met grade level expectations.

- Ms. Reeves wanted more information about the school's plan when referring students to the EC program (clarified before and after school tutoring). The board responded they would have before and after school tutoring. The board clarified its process, when a student was struggling the teacher would reach out to the parents. If the student continued to struggle then they would recommend the student to the support team to recommend interventions. The interventions would be implemented for a specific time span and if they were not working the support team may select different interventions. The guiding principal was that not every struggling student needed to enter the EC program. Ms. Kakadelis wanted to know who would make up the school support team. The board responded they would have administrators, EC teachers and teachers on the support team.
- Mr. Quigley publicly thanked the legislator for his role in the transportation grant. He then focused on the lottery and admissions at Summerfield, Greensboro, Cornerstone, Piedmont and basing the projected enrollment solely on students from those waitlists. All these schools were below 10% EDS while the state average was 47%.
- Mr. Maimone was frustrated with the over reporting of free and reduced lunch. Schools that do not participate in FRL are under reported for EDS. Mr. Quigley countered that the school was not providing transportation, no weighted lottery and questioned the need for the school in its proposed county. If this proposed school was depending solely on the waitlists of the established charter schools, then this would be another upper to middle-class school when they are reporting to reflect Guilford County.
- Mr. Quigley asked the Board how would they focus more on making the school accessible for all students. The Board responded that in the beginning the parameters would not established, they would use the Guilford County forms. The director would screen the turned in packets. They would have a formula with regards to the cost for lunch. There would be a percentage markup used as a fundraiser for the PTO which would for the lunch. The school would be transparent about this information with families. There are families that may not qualify for FRL, but cannot afford to move to a great district. There are many people who needs options. Ms. Sutton commented that given those limited options from should not the school reach further for families that have even less options. She wondered how are charter schools ensuring that our schools reflect the state average.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know why the proposed applicant decided to build a \$9 million dollar building in the first year rather than renting. The Board responded that the backup facility was close to Cornerstone. They believed it was easier to market and gather families with a permanent home.
- Mr. Maimone stated that the board was strong and had experience running successful schools. He was confident they would be successful when they opened. Ms. Turner expressed her concern about the 565 students projected. Mr. Maimone countered that the area has the demand. Mr. Walker wanted to hear from the CSAB members in the Greensboro area. Ms. Turner would particularly like to hear their thoughts on the feasibility of the numbers. Mr. Hawkes responded that individuals on

the Summerfield list, are probably on the Greensboro Academy list as well as the Cornerstone wait list. The demand was high. Ms. Reeves asked about the demographics for northern Guilford. Mr. Hawkes stated that Summerfield is more diverse than Greensboro Academy as they pull from various areas. Guilford County was below the state average on school performance. The county was growing with student enrollment, not to mention the number of students in homeschool or private school. Ms. Vuncannon would have liked to hear more about the transportation plan, but with the budget surplus there seems to be limited funds to provide transportation. A more robust transportation plan would speak more to the vision to serve a diverse population. Mr. Hawkes stated there are many advantages with K-8 back to basics schools.

- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to recommend Revolution Academy to the State Board of Education for Ready to Open Status. Mr. Hawkes seconded the motion.** The CSAB discussed the motion. Mr. Quigley commented that he would not vote for the motion. He does not see in the application showing the school would be focused on serving a diverse population. Also, as stewards of state dollars, CSAB should think strategically on how we invest that money. If the applicant reapplies with an aggressive plan in that matter, and more depth on the education plan they might possibly be approved. Ms. Sutton asked a question to Dr. Townsend-Smith. She specifically wanted to know the number of schools approved this round in Guilford County. In this application round, one was approved and it was the all-male school. Additionally, the CSAB approved, Next Generation in the 2016-2017 slate of schools and The Experiential School of Greensboro. Essentially, there would be 3 that would open prior to this one, if approved. One was highly specialized with the male academy. Experiential had a language focus.
- Ms. Turner expressed concerns about the education plan – somehow the CSAB had sent the message that if an applicant states they are going to use Saxon Math, Core Knowledge, Classical Education, and NWEA Map, they would likely be approved without fully explaining their plans.
- Ms. Kroeger expressed concerns around the Revolution board stating that they would use the budget surplus for flexibility to address some of the items the CSAB brought up as deficient as those should already be addressed.
- Ms. Turner wanted to see more in the application that provided an explanation on how they would use these curricula. Ms. Kakadelis commented that the waitlist schools surrounding the area use the same core or classical knowledge model. There was an identified need for the curriculum type in the area. She also stated, there was a need for these types of schools around the state. Mr. Hawkes commented that there were 6 legislative purposes for public charter schools and that we get fixated and obsessed with the idea serving the underserved; we have all types of public charter schools that we have approved. These are some of the innovative things we need to remember when approving charter schools. **The motion failed 4 to 6 with Ms. Turner, Ms. Vuncannon, Ms. Kroeger, Ms. Sutton, Ms. Reeves and Mr. Quigley dissenting; Ms. Gibbs recused.**

- **Ms. Turner made an alternate motion not to recommend Revolution Academy to the State Board of Education for Ready to Open. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed 6 to 4 with Mr. Walker, Mr. Hawkes, Mr. Maimone and Ms. Kakadelis dissenting; Ms. Gibbs recused.**

B.L.U.E.-G.R.E.E.N. 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.
- Mr. Maimone led the discussion. The applicant board of directors introduced themselves to the CSAB.
- Mr. Walker commented on the proficiency of the local counties/districts – Forsyth and Winston-Salem. He thought the proficiency goal was low given the counties’ performance. He wanted to know how the school would achieve with its targeted population. Ms. Kroeger commented on the goals. Also, the school proposed to requiring community service hours increase yearly; however, they did not start with a targeted number. Mr. Maimone asked additional questions about the subgroup performance. Mr. Walker found the mission statement odd, given that it was more about the stakeholders, rather than the students and wanted to know why that mission statement and the school’s focus.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know the specific hook of the education plan. Specifically, STEAM was mentioned as the focus. Ms. Reeves commented that there were many components, adopt common core, steam focused, 21st century learning, PBL, blended learning, cooperative learning, how are we meshing these components into a cohesive education plan. Mr. Maimone wanted to know what a typical day would look like. Ms. Reeves questioned the impact of the education plan on teacher recruitment and professional development. Ms. Vuncannon wanted to know about the professional development provided for PBL and how this aligned with state assessments. Cross curricular was mentioned often and that requires a great deal of training and ongoing professional development. She wanted to know the fidelity of the training and PD.
- Mr. Walker commented on the submitted bylaws. Specifically, the bylaws did not include open meetings law. The bylaws allowed a minimum of 3 board members and he communicated this was not allowable with the charter as the agreement has a minimum of 5. Also, the Articles of Incorporation called for members and the bylaws did not mention members.
- Mr. Maimone had a question about the required board member training and evaluation. He wanted to know the requirements and the anticipated training. Ms. Kakadelis discussed the even number of members (10 members) proposed in the application and wanted to know the protocol the board would adopt if there were ever a tie.

- Ms. Kroeger commented that the proposed applicant outlined that they would terminate at will. She wanted information on if the school would offer contracts. Also, the application outlined an annual bonus for staff that outperform peers; she wanted to know where this was budgeted and the plan to make this happen.
- Mr. Maimone was concerned about the school not having a counselor in year one. Mr. Walker communicated that the transportation plan was unclear (wording) and wanted an explanation. He also stated that the facility cost per square foot seemed high and wanted to know if the school had looked around the area for facility options. Ms. Reeves wanted to know if the applicant would participate in National School Lunch Program and had the same sentiments as Mr. Walker regarding transportation. Mr. Maimone also wanted clarification about the facility plan. Ms. Kroeger stated that the mortgage seemed to increase each year but no narrative was provided about the yearly increase.
- Mr. Maimone wanted information about the number of teachers. Mr. Walker stated there would be difficulty attracting a quality EC teacher making \$3,000 less than the general education teacher. He also stated the numbers for benefits were low which would make it hard to attract staff. There was not a line item for the audit. The proposed applicant outlined a \$46,000 surplus for year one, when the school would likely have to cut into that surplus for staff benefits. There was not a real breakeven number provided. Ms. Kroeger stated that there was not a budget for an internal financial person, but also no budget for 3rd party assistance. Additionally, there was not a narrative for internal budget controls.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know the reason the Board projected performance goals lower than Winston-Salem/Forsyth counties. The Board responded that the application was created in 2016, and the values had been submitted in alignment with the district performance from past years. The district was at 57% for math and reading, they would work to exceed the district performance. They were targeting at-risk students. Mr. Maimone asked whether they were familiar with those subgroups. The board responded those subgroups perform much lower than the district. Mr. Walker commented that 57% and 58% are not great percentages and would like to see the school do better.
- Mr. Maimone commented that the mission statement seemed to be more about the school than students. The Board responded they would be a community school and they understood that students were the number one customer and number one goal. They noted they also understood community impact.
- Mr. Maimone asked the Board to explain its day-to-day program. The board responded they would infuse Science and Math into all curriculum. Students would be given tasks to complete based on learning in a class. They would use those learned skills to complete given tasks. They may have local businesses come into the school to provide information around marketing, etc.

- Mr. Maimone asked the Board to describe a typical day. The Board responded the first portion of the day would be a leadership/business acumen. After that 30-minute block they would have three core block classes. They would stretch the STEAM throughout the week. Student would also be involved in 30-minute cultural awareness block. The core classes would be ELA, STEM and Math; however, the business acumen and cultural awareness would be in co-gender classrooms. They would end the day with academic enrichment or intervention. Specific targeted learning practices for students to interact with – meet with mentor teachers and have conferences.
- Mr. Quigley wanted the Board to expand on blended learning. The Board responded they would use PBL strategies to give students several opportunities to master learning. Projects would be strategically designed to ensure students mastered certain points. Mr. Maimone asked how would teachers receive professional development to help them understand what students should accomplish. The board responded they would have professional development set from key stakeholders to provide opportunities to have more robust professional.
- Ms. Sutton wanted to know if the applicant group planned to visit schools that incorporate business, PBL, blended learning, etc. and how would they explain to parents which subjects are single gender and the reasoning for the decision. The board had visited Henderson Collegiate, Sugar Creek Charter School and the Ron Clark Academy. They stated that all these schools were using the PBL strategies, innovative open classroom techniques and these schools were thriving.
- The Board supplied an answer about the single gender classroom. They had not seen this done by any other charter school. Their research showed that African American females make more progress in single gender math classrooms. Also, African American and Hispanic male students make more progress in single gender reading classrooms. There was a school in Florida that targeted 4th – 5th grade, when using single gender, they had 75% and 86% passed the test.
- Ms. Vuncannon wanted additional information about the proposed STEAM model. The Board responded that the STEAM model was something new they were testing and while they have visited other schools, this was not something that was incorporated in those visited schools. Ms. Vuncannon stated that in an integrated STEAM school it takes intentional leadership and planning to make it happen the way envisioned. She wanted to know how the board would be intentional. They planned to train their teachers through a pre-service week, which would allow teachers to grasp an understanding of curriculum expectations. They would also have one PD day each week where they would analyze data.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know the schedule structure to ensure teacher collaboration. The Board responded they would implement with partners (mentoring groups). Teachers would be able to freely collaborate and interface at this time. The EC and ELL teachers would be able to collaborate during this time as well. There would be common planning during the school schedule. The bulk of training and collaboration would happen during the Friday schedule.

- Ms. Kakadelis wanted the Board to explain its year-end project. The Board responded that the project starts at the beginning of the year. This experience would be culminating, almost mirroring the show “Sharks” where students would present to a panel. The scale would be smaller, and it would be an ongoing process. The PBL they engaged with all year would prepare students for the project.
- Mr. Maimone wanted the Board to address the issues with the bylaws communicated by Mr. Walker and talk about governance training for board members. The board responded that the mistakes and omissions were an oversight. They would go with the standard 5 board members. Mr. Maimone then asked where the board obtained the draft bylaws. The Board responded they worked with a company and used their template. Mr. Walker commented that bylaws and Articles of Incorporation errors were easy fixes. The Board discussed their board training. They planned to have various consultants come provide board training periodically. Also, one member had expertise in training boards. Everyone on the board has a background in the various areas needed to run an effective school and board.
- Ms. Kakadelis wanted to know if any members would resign from the board and work for the school. The Board responded that two members (chair and co-chair) would work for the school to serve as the two school principals.
- Mr. Hawkes wanted an explanation on the Dean of Students role and if there would be one dean of students for the entire school. The Board responded that the dean would primarily focus on behavior management and the school climate and culture for both sections (BLUE and GREEN). The board expressed they were working on adjustments if they do not receive an equal amount of boy and girl students. Mr. Maimone followed up to determine if the staffing model was the reason they would not have a counselor in year one. Ms. Kakadelis wanted to know if the school planned to target male teachers for male students and vice versa. The Board responded they would target based on how students learn and the understanding that relationships are not gender based. They would entertain outside programs that would enhance the boys and girls and cater to their needs.
- Mr. Hawkes wanted to know what the board would do with girls who identified as boys and boys who identified as girls? The board responded they had taken this into consideration and would be handling each case on an individual basis.
- Mr. Maimone wanted additional clarity on the transportation and facility plans. The Board responded that with transportation, they would partner with the Winston-Salem transit and purchase vouchers. The facility selected would be close to the bus line to ensure that students could get to school. They had budgeted for 140 of 200 students to receive vouchers for public transportation. Mr. Maimone asked about the school’s location. The board responded they were looking at a 20-mile trip along the transit. They also planned to have community stops.

- Mr. Maimane wanted to know the reasoning behind the high facility cost per square foot. The Board responded that they had two locations identified. They had a second location that would save the school \$100,000 for the facility budget. They have also talked to several churches to occupy their building the first year. Mr. Maimone cautioned the group and outlined that the proposed facility lease/mortgage budget line did not include building up-fit. The board responded that the cost provided included up-fitting costs.
- Mr. Maimone had questions about the internal controls questioned earlier. The Board responded they had relationships with several individuals who could provide financial assistance/support. They did not budget for the audit, but would with the facility savings, as well as the teacher bonuses at the end of the year. They were aware that they needed to have funds in place to allow the school to service the whole child.
- Mr. Maimone questioned the breakeven number for year 1 as the difference was eight (8) students. Mr. Walker commented that the first year was really going to make or break the school and the budget. The Board responded that they were in conversations with third-party capital funding groups for rainy day funds.
- Mr. Maimone questioned if the survey data supported the school's ability to fill seats. The Board responded that they targeted the survey on families that had students that would meet the age/grade level requirements for first year opening. They had received positive responses.
- Ms. Kakadelis commented on single gender classrooms which was the least important to the parents according to the submitted survey data. The board responded they were intentional on their single gender research and felt strongly about creating the environment.
- Ms. Kakadelis also wanted to know the expected EDS population. The board responded that 60% would be minority students (around 95% EDS). They understand that their proposed location reflected a majority EDS population.
- Mr. Quigley stated that the application talked about many different things (STEAM, blended learning, single sex classrooms). He asked the board to prioritize two things. The board responded that their primary focus was building the whole child. Their goal was to focus on single gender education. Cooperative learning strategies were additionally a nonnegotiable. They would base the PBL and inquiry on the content the teachers were learning. Mr. Quigley commented that they listed three things. He added, schools that are not super clear on their mission and what they uphold sacred, fail. The board identified that their focus was on single gender education and cooperative learning. Ms. Sutton commented that the applicant group should visit schools that do those two things prioritized well.

- Ms. Vuncannon was curious on who would be responsible for the day-to-day financial piece as that was important to the operations of a new charter school. Mr. Maimone commented that there were several accounting firms the school was looking to work with. Mr. Quigley commented that he had reservations around how they would incorporate so many things and sought clarity on the mission and focus of the school. Also, the transportation plan seemed more complex than just having buses – shuttles to drop off at bus line. Mr. Walker commented that innovation was provided in the application, the vision behind the school was there, but his biggest concern was the budget. Ultimately, it is easier to amend the budget than to change an education plan.
- The board responded that they would have an internal operations manager as a liaison for the contacts. They would have Acadia to manage the budget – this was under the other contracted services line item contracted. With the new proposed building and savings on that facility budget, they could shift funds to the contracted services.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend B.L.U.E. G.R.E.E.N. Academy to the State Board of Education to begin Ready to Open. Ms. Gibbs seconded.** Mr. Hawkes commented that the application was so novel and innovative which was worth an opportunity. Ms. Gibbs commented that charter schools should be innovative – reason behind charter schools. **The motion passed 10-0; Ms. Turner recused.**

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 CSAB's recommendation to allow a 2-year delay for Discovery Charter School. Additionally, the transportation Grant was approved. His goal was that by the end of the week have FBS review information to hopefully disburse funds by the end of the month.
- Mr. Machado informed the CSAB of Capital Encore's request to delay its high school offerings due to its current performance status.
- Additionally, OCS visited several schools for the month: Gray Stone Day School, Haliwa and IDYL
- He informed the CSAB on the RFP process to obtain the web-based system outlined in recent statute. We have also finalized interviews for a summer intern.
- Because of the tragic shooting in Florida, OCS was emphasizing the importance of school safety. We plan to survey schools to determine what are they doing to increase school safety.
- Mr. Walker had questions about the office needing more consultants and the applicant quality. Mr. Machado commented that we had identified 3 great candidates for two open spots. We sent these

qualified applicants to HR. Due to the length of time between one individual receiving the offer from HR, the person had accepted another opportunity.

- Mr. Quigley wanted to know the lag time from sending to HR and the offer letter getting back to OCS. Mr. Machado responded that information was sent to HR in December. He explained the process of HR reviewing the resume and relevant experience to ultimately provide a salary amount. Mr. Walker commented that something needs to be done to speed up getting qualified. He emphasized the delay with the RFP process. Ultimately, a budget was approved in June and we are just getting around to the evaluation process. Speed and efficiency, allows you to get great candidates. Great people are going to have great opportunities.
- Ms. Reeves asked Mr. Machado if he personally went to Haliwa-Saponi. He responded that an OCS consultant went as part of the standard renewal visit.
- Mr. Quigley highlighted the earlier sentiments on school safety. Charter schools should hold themselves to the same standards as any school with regards to intruder drills, lock down drills, resource officers or on-site duty officers. Mr. Hawkes stated that since last Monday, Rockingham county – sheriff and board agreed to have armed volunteers in every school in the county. This could be an opportunity to build relationships within the LEA.
- Mr. Walker commented that there was money for SRO officers (SRO grants). Many charter schools are taking advantage of this opportunity. Mr. Machado explained that information was provided in the newsletter about this opportunity. Mr. Maimone commented on facility funding and fair funding. Facility funding for locking down the facility, cameras, etc. A lot of schools are operating out of mobile units and multiple units due to facility funding being so limited. He hoped that legislation considers fair or equal funding when issuing new requirements.
- Mr. Maimone requested the report from accountability. Communication was vetting the report so that they can get that information to the CSAB. **The report was delivered at approximately 2:30 pm and was distributed to CSAB members.**

RENEWAL POLICY UPDATE

- Mr. Walker led the Renewal Policy Committee discussion. He asked Ms. Shaunda Cooper to present proposed changes to the renewal process and any trends.
- Ms. Reeves stated that the renewal pool was stronger this year. Ms. Turner added that the CSAB had discussed several times adding a 5-year renewal to the Framework. Mr. Walker commented that he would like to see a 5-year renewal option in the framework.

- He added that the 5-year renewal criteria could be comparable to the LEA two of the last 3-years or met growth three of the last 3 years. He believed this would be the trend if they looked at the schools that received the 5-year renewal terms in the past. Subsequently, he asked Ms. Cooper to provide information regarding the schools the CSAB granted a 5-year renewal and if there were any stipulations.
- Ms. Cooper responded that Guilford Preparatory received a 5-year, because they had significant financial compliance issues for some time and the compliance issues were removed moments before the CSAB made its renewal recommendations. Mr. Walker clarified that school would most likely had received a 10-year renewal if it were not for those financial issues (pattern over multiple years). Ms. Cooper offered that Guildford Preparatory may have received a 10 or 7-year renewal.
- Charlotte Secondary was the second school that received a 5-year renewal. Mr. Walker wanted to know the specific reason the CSAB granted a 5-year renewal term. Ms. Cooper responded that it was likely due to similar reasons as Guilford Prep and additionally commented they might not had been comparable to the LEA.
- Ms. Reeves noted that the document provided indicated an included attachment. Dr. Townsend-Smith commented that it was to be provided in the binder. She checked and the document was not included for the CSAB review. Ms. Reeves also commented that the CSAB had contemplated removing the language from the Framework which stated a 3-year renewal could only be granted once. Mr. Walker commented the language was removed from the updated policy/framework.
- Ms. Cooper detailed the changes to the renewal policy. Specifically, the framework was placed within the renewal policy, the language offering a three-year renewal was removed, an explanation of “comparable” clearly defined in the policy, and required governance training by the Office of Charter Schools. Ms. Kakadelis wanted to know how often board would need to participate in governance training. Ms. Cooper responded that OCS plans to offer the various training. The current plans were that renewal training would be one day. We will need to consider the OCS resources when making final decisions about format and training offerings.
- Ms. Turner commented that board training during the day may prove difficult as most of board members may not be available. Ms. Cooper responded we would hope that the Board Chair and treasurer of the board would be in attendance (minimum requirement). She stated OCS would consider all stakeholders when doing planning for these trainings. Ms. Kakadelis wanted to know if the Governance Training would be conducted annually or only during the time of the renewal. Ms. Cooper stated that this governance training was specific to renewals.
- Mr. Machado responded that OCS would be willing to do the training virtually, during the evenings, and even during regional huddles. OCS has found that boards change frequently (so much that new

boards are coming on and they have not been trained). Training by our office was needed so we can ensure they are getting the proper training.

- Mr. Hawkes commented - a year or two ago CSAB recommended that Crossroads Charter be revoked. The board had turned over so much that there was not knowledge of its mission, goals, or assets. There is a lack of continuity with boards, this seemed to be a big problem. CSAB must address the issue or we may see more schools like Crossroads in Charlotte that tank.
- Ms. Cooper added that the renewal process has improved. Specifically, the process is consistent and we have quality measures in place from beginning to end. When schools are visited we ask the tough questions and address any information provided in and outside of the self-study. OCS has found that most charter school boards do not understand the governance issues. Mr. Hawkes stated that a lot of the time the newest board members just do not know the history of the school.
- Ms. Cooper provided an overview of the current renewal process and provided updates or changes that were made to the process over the last two years.
- Mr. Walker instructed the CSAB to look at the changes to the policy on Eboard. He wanted to know if these changes should begin with the 2020 renewal cycle. Ms. Kroeger wanted to be sure that governance training would only be required during the renewal cycle if the school was granted a 10-year renewal.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion that a note be added to the required governance training that the requirement would begin with the 2020 renewal year. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Ms. Turner made a motion to remove SIMS from the policy. Mr. Maimone seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Walker pointed to page 6 of the policy and commented that for clarity was the CSAB using the CCR of GLP composite score. Ms. Reeves commented that we most often use GLP but have information available on CCR. **Mr. Walker made a motion that they change the composite score to identify that comparable would include GLP. Mr. Maimone seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Maimone made a comment about being comparable to the LEA and allowing flexibility for schools that serve minority or EDS populations and exceeding performance of the subgroup proficiency.
- Mr. Walker suggested that maybe the CSAB needed to get away from the word Framework and use the word General Guidelines. **He made a subsequent motion to remove the word framework and**

replace it with General Guidelines. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

“These are general guidelines used to make recommendations.”

- Mr. Walker asked if the CSAB would like a 5-year renewal term placed in the general guidelines. He added a 5-year renewal term would be 2 out of 3 years comparable or met growth the last three years and the financial audits/compliance issues should be the same as the 7-year renewal. Mr. Quigley commented that they have never used criteria “3 out of 3 years.” Mr. Walker commented it is used for 10-year renewal schools not comparable but have exceeded growth 3 of 3 years. Mr. Walker communicated the criteria of comparable all three years for the 7-year, but comparable 2 of 3 years places you between getting a 3-year renewal or 5-year renewal. Mr. Maimone commented that it was good the CSAB uses these as guidelines.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion that the 5-year renewal criteria include: No significant compliance issues last 2 years, financially sound audits last 2 years and academic outcomes comparable to the local school administrative unit in the immediately preceding 3 years or has met/exceeded growth last 2 of 3 years. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Walker wanted to know if the CSAB desired for the 3-year renewal language say with or without stipulations. There was consensus. **Mr. Walker made a corresponding motion to delete the phrase “with stipulations.” Ms. Gibbs seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Ms. Reeves wanted to know if the comparable definition remained the same as discussed. Mr. Walker commented that it was the same. The policy needed to reflect the change to the verbiage around comparable being the GLP performance composite score.

PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE UPDATES

Application Timeline, Process and Charter Agreement

- Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith presented on the 2018 Application Timeline, Process and Proposed Changes.
- She detailed the proposed changes to the charter agreement. The first proposed change was the date. The Charter Agreement needed to be updated for renewal schools and any schools approved. Ms. Reeves commented that dates around the notary also needed updates.
- The second change was with the grade enrollment and expansion language. Dr. Townsend-Smith proposed changing from a specific percentage to the statement “the amount allowed in statute.” The final change made to the charter agreement, was toward the end detailing amendments. The revised language aligns the Charter Agreement with the policy approved last year which detailed what OCS could approve and what needs to go before State Board for its approval.

- Mr. Maimone wanted clarification on the 5-mile radius or approved LEA. Ms. Turner wanted clarification on the outside the 5-mile radius portion. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that schools have requested changes to locations that move them from their proposed targeted population and ultimately changed commitments in the original charter.
- Mr. Hawkes sought clarification on a school that has not solidified the location and is near other LEAs. Dr. Townsend-Smith identified a school that applied to open in Char-Meck and they submitted a request to temporarily locate in the neighboring county. Their funding would have been on temporary county location versus on where they located if the move was beyond the proposed year. Ms. Turner confirmed that the group submitted a request to be in the other county for one-year and then they had to relocate back into the original county.
- Mr. Walker reminded the CSAB that these things were reflected in the policy and this was just to update these items in the charter agreement. **He made a motion to recommend the proposed changes to the charter agreement to the SBE. Ms. Reeves seconded.** Mr. Maimone stated that it may be worth thinking about how to simplify this document. Dr. Townsend-Smith offered the opinion, that the application provides flexibility and creativity for schools. The Charter Agreement provides minimum requirements for schools to hold them accountable, and when you consider schools we have recommended for revocation – the charter agreement is the binding document. Mr. Maimone asked if legal had gone through the agreement with a “fine tooth comb.” Mr. Weber stated that each revision goes through legal. Ms. Kakadelis asked if the Charter Agreement was based on application. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded there was a part of the agreement that stated the application was binding. There are parts in the charter agreement that hold schools accountable to other portions such as providing EC services. These are the minimum things that a school must do. No further discussion. **The motion passed unanimously.**
- Dr. Townsend-Smith presented the 2018 timeline and process. She outlined clarification was decreased from 30 minutes to 20 minutes. She encouraged the board to consider keeping the clarification at 30 minutes. The CSAB still had the ability to end it when they saw fit.
- Mr. Maimone asked whether they had received a sense of what the next round of application process would look like. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that OCS has received approximately 20 inquiries from potential applicants. She shared the sentiments of Vice Chair Walker that they would likely have around 25-35 people apply within the next few cycles. During the training provided, OCS has provided frank information and have allowed individuals interested in applying to take the time to construct a good application over time. The \$1000 application fee has also been a deterrent to just anyone applying. Mr. Walker commented that he was fine leaving clarification at 30 minutes each. Clarifications, when we get up here, we know that the school is not going forward. We still are required by statute to allow them to address the advisory board. With a strict timeline to start off, 5

minutes to explain why this school is needed. After allowing them that time to present that information CSAB could then make a recommendation on moving the school forward to the interview process.

- Mr. Maimone stated the CSAB had discussed that instead of having the 30 minutes, changing the language to up to a 30-minute clarification opportunity. Mr. Quigley agreed with Mr. Walker to open the clarification interview with the opportunity for the board to state their case to the CSAB. The groups have clarification questions in advance and they have time to address concerns.
- Ms. Reeves would like the removal of the clarification portion that states writing. Mr. Maimone wanted to know if there would be any issue with removing the written clarification statutory wise. Dr. Townsend-Smith commented that applicants have time to correct or provide any missing information. Ms. Reeves believed they still had the opportunity.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to change the language to reflect “up to 30 minutes” and remove the Clarification Request paragraph completely. Change “may” offer to “will”. Ms. Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Replication Policy

- Dr. Townsend-Smith proposed removing the verbiage of “Fast Track” and just make the policy Replication of High Quality Charter Schools. She provided a history of applicants that were approved that may have qualified as replication. Examples include Steel Creek STEM that had the same application as Mallard Creek STEM but did not check the replication box. Ms. Gibbs asked if the boards were the same. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded in some cases it was the same board and in some cases, it was not.
- Mr. Walker was fine if it was the same board and they wanted to use the same model. It is different when you are with an EMO/CMO as that model will look the same. Mr. Maimone commented on whether there needs to be components section-by-section that states whether the information was copied from another application.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith commented that historically in the 2016 round there was a replication application submitted and the only thing that was changed was the name and proposed locations: Emereau, ALS schools with the same board and associated with an EMO, Anson and Monroe charters are the exact same charters, Ascend had two applications in that round - CSAB only approved one Ascend application.
- Mr. Walker commented that he liked Mr. Maimone’s idea that at the end of each section have the applicant group certify if any part was taken from a prior application. He asked why the restart model applications were not online.

- Ms. Turner communicated that once you have a school, you should be replicate yourself. The trend was schools stating they are replicating a school that has been around longer because there is no data to support the replication. Mr. Maimone questioned would the CSAB delay opening of great school by four years with these limitations.
- Ms. Reeves asked why would it be different for a management organization versus a mom and pop school. Right now, we have loopholes and these things are slipping through the cracks. They must have 3 years of data to replicate. Mr. Walker wanted to be careful to ensure that CSAB does not slow down replication of great charter schools. If they are K-2 the first year and we need 3 years of data, they will need to have alternate testing data.
- Ms. Reeves asked what about a group that is not Movement. Mr. Walker commented the CSAB group was smart enough to smell a rat. We should not say that the CSAB has no idea on whether a board has the capacity to open a new school or not. Strong board, strong application, know what they are talking about, have brought in the right people. That would be a seismic shift from how they have been operating for 20 years. Ms. Turner did not want to have schools wait four years, but there should be some piece of accountability.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith stated the current issue was that you have the same board (some of which are in their first year of operation and some of which are in their planning year). The applications are the same.
- Mr. Maimone liked the idea of one year of data. He stated we would slow individuals down from copy and pasting by checking a box of whether the section was copied from another application. Ms. Turner commented that there are people writing applications for schools, and that application was being replicated repeatedly. The concept was not being written by the board. Ms. Reeves commented that this was evident when we CSAB drilled down on questions, it was very clear that the applicant does not fully understand. We must hold the boards “to the fire.” It was concerning to her that during this application round that when one person does all the talking and then states they are going to step off the proposed board.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith made a recommendation of things to consider: maintain policy as it was, or change to reflect the CSAB discussions. Ms. Sutton had reservations about only having one year of data. Ms. Reeves brought up Dr. Townsend-Smith’s point that applicant groups are not saying they are replicating to get around the policy. Schools should tell the truth about replications and she wondered how the CSAB could get them to do so.
- Mr. Machado questioned if the boards were the motivating factor to start the school, or was application writing the motivation because they want to collect funding. Ms. Sutton stated that was what made her nervous, we don’t push hard enough on that.

- Mr. Walker suggested that we not have replication, and we only have fast track replication. You get nothing for replication. Get rid of replication, just have fast track. We measure each applicant on the merits.
- Mr. Maimone stated that if you get rid of replication, you lose information whether they have copied an application. Mr. Walker questioned if we could call it anything besides fast track replication. Dr. Townsend-Smith stated that verbiage was in statute. Ms. Reeves was not opposed to receiving outside help to write the application, but a lot of times the board is just having someone write the application for them. The board should be the driving force behind crafting the application and could utilize someone else to help write the components.
- Mr. Quigley stated that one of the differences with the Movement application was that Movement is an organization that was formed with an executive director and everything. Ms. Vuncannon stated some of the contractors are looking for opportunities and gather people together.
- Mr. Walker stated that as lawyers there are strict guidelines on when you can and cannot have contingency fee. There are multiple examples of contingency fee for consultants with applications. Maybe the solution was Mr. Maimone's idea of checking a box. Mr. Hawkes commented that there was something to say when you indicate that you are replicating a great performing charter school.
- Mr. Walker commented that applicants should also indicate which board member led the draft of each application section. Ms. Vuncannon wanted to know what we would do with that information once received. Mr. Maimone stated that we take that information and drill into the board members to see if they are knowledgeable and have a clue on what is going on. Ultimately it boils down to deciding if a board is worthy. Mr. Walker commented that this was why the interview was important.
- Mr. Walker made a motion to make the policy Fast Track Only and remove the replication portion. Ms. Turner seconded. The CSAB discussed the motion. Mr. Maimone agreed with Mr. Hawkes that it speaks volumes when an applicant group wants to replicate a great model. Ms. Reeves stated that Mr. Hawkes use a key word in his statement, "successful", for example KIPP, Henderson Collegiate, Thomas Jefferson, Greensboro Academy. Mr. Quigley commented that it was hard to vote against a board that comes back to open a school, have a building, have a backing, and were successful, give us another school. But stating that really discredits how hard it was to do this work.
- Mr. Walker commented that there was a difference with being a school leader and a board member. There was no way a school leader could open two schools at the same time, sometimes a board has more capacity than a school leader. Mr. Maimone would prefer another month to go over the section "Overview." They could potentially throw out that whole section. It may be easier to have 2 policies—one is simply replication and the other is fast track. Mr. Walker worried about putting

aspirational statements as policy, for example all of this relates to fast track. **Mr. Walker withdrew the earlier motion.**

- Mr. Maimone requested that the policy be placed in a google doc version to allow CSAB to make edits for the discussion at the next meeting. Mr. Weber suggested that may have an open meetings implication and suggested a Word document for each member to mark up.
- Ms. Reeves asked questions about the acceleration piece. Dr. Townsend-Smith replied there was a specific policy on acceleration with the main sticking points in acceleration was having a facility solidified and expressing the need. Mr. Machado noted that the acceleration policy was clear. Ms. Kakadelis clarified, fast track had to be in the policy due to statute. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded yes, it is in general statute. Ms. Turner asked if when applying for acceleration that there was not copying and pasting but wanting to get started faster.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to table this to the next meeting. Mr. Maimone seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Management Organizations

- Dr. Townsend-Smith led the discussion and proposed definitions of EMO/CMO/other. During the application process they must select this indicator. Ms. Turner indicated that when we have CSUSA and NHA schools, we are aware of their portfolio of schools and who they may be opening. We are not aware of some of these other organizations or individuals helping schools open. We may see an increase in delays as there may be difficulties to successfully open a handful of schools. This information may help bring forth that information.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to exercise caution that this does not turn into all contracted vendors. Ms. Turner stated we may not get the contract until we get the charter, and we may not even get into contract with them. Consultant or contractor are at the podium.
- Mr. Walker wanted to know the definition of significant services that are equivalent where you are operating at the level of an EMO/CMO. The definitions on a/b need to be clearer. Mr. Maimone wanted to work on cleaning up those definitions for the next meeting.
- Ms. Turner stated this was also a way to hold boards accountable. Currently, it was a material change if they select an organization to be an EMO/CMO and then elects to part ways or partner with a management organization.
- Mr. Walker stated we skipped over one thing on application changes about the criminal background check. Dr. Townsend-Smith responded that they may not be able to get a consistent vendor. Mr. Walker suggested changes, as a part of the completeness check that they are national and state

background checks. If it is not a national and state background check it is deemed incomplete and they have five days to get that submitted in. He referenced a question in the application that says has anyone on the BOD been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor other than a minor traffic offense, DWI is not a minor traffic offense. Explain in narrative form. Footnote that if they are found to be untruthful on that portion of the application, the application is disqualified.

- Ms. Kroeger wondered if we could provide a list of recommended background checks. Mr. Walker commented that every board member would have to get finger printed. Teachers for licensure and for board members. Maybe the legislature would provide help but for the mean time that required portion of the application would be helpful.
- Dr. Townsend-Smith stated there was a piece that does require that the criminal background policy to mirror the LEA.
- Ms. Turner had question regarding finger printing, at some point if you were handling money at the school, you must get fingerprinted and keep that up to date. Dr. Townsend-Smith thought it may be in some of the financial guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

- **Mr. Walker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:21 pm. The meeting adjourned via acclamation.**