

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

The North Carolina Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting was called to order at 9:00 am by Vice Chair Steven Walker who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Ms. Sherry Reeves 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. Tony Helton and Mr. Joseph Maimone recused themselves from any discussion or voting regarding the application process with Carolina Charter Academy and Davidson Charter Academy.**

Ms. Reeves made a motion to approve the March 6-7, 2017 minutes, as amended by Ms. Hilda Parlér. Mr. Joseph Maimone seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- The CSAB conducted one-hour interviews for applicants proposing to open in 2018. The CSAB made recommendations on which applicants it would recommend to the State Board of Education (SBE) to begin the Ready-to-Open Process. Dr. Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director,

Office of Charter Schools (OCS), led the discussion by providing a recap of the current application process.

- Following the presentation, she provided a brief overview of each applicant group including its evaluation feedback, proposed enrollment over five (5) years, proposed county, and mission of the proposed school.
- The CSAB commenced with interviews for 9 of 38 applicants proposing to open in August 2018.

Carolina Charter Academy – A CFA

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 7 proposed board members and 1 Team CFA representative introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors for Carolina Charter Academy - A CFA.
- Mr. Walker led the interview and the CSAB outlined specific questions/concerns it wanted the group to respond to during the interview. Specifically, the board of director's organizational chart, its conflict of interest, school calendar, and the purposes for the charter school.
- Ms. Parlér asked a direct questions about how the board worked to determine the purposes outlined in the application. Ms. Stoops (proposed board member) outlined the board visited several schools and how the chosen purposes aligned to its chosen curriculum and best practices in education.
- Ms. Sutton wanted information on how the proposed applicant would meet the needs of its “at-risk” population. Dr. Stoops responded that the recruiting would focus on a 3-county radius and it would be difficult to determine the specific student make up the school would ultimately serve. Ms. Stoops communicated to the CSAB the marketing efforts the proposed board had made to target and recruit students from the at risk population. Ms. Sutton asked additional questions about the lack of diversity on the board and its impact on recruiting students from a diverse population. Another proposed board member outlined the ties the board had to the community and the outreach completed into various areas. Also, the proposed board of directors communicated they had done a lot of work to diversify the board and student population.
- Ms. Stoops stated the school proposed to adopt the hour requirements with its school calendar instead of the days. Specifically the school would conclude the school year with 186 x 7 hours – 6 hours 15 min per day of instructional time excluding lunch.
- Ms. Reeves asked about the promotion criteria from year to year – benchmark testing, proficiency on EOG and the promotion standard with intervention if a student did not perform

well on End of Grade (EOG) testing. Dr. Stoops outlined that the school would also utilize the NC check-ins to help determine promotion from one year to the next. While this was not included in the plan, the school plans to take advantage of this opportunity. The school also plans to use MAP testing to assess students throughout the year.

- Ms. Parlér wanted specific information on how the school would handle discipline regarding its Exceptional Children (EC). One board member responded there would be an intervention plan to determine the appropriateness for EC students. Another board member enforced positive reinforcement would be his recommendation and the positive reinforcement would be pushed based on his experience with students in charter schools.
- Ms. Reeves questioned at what point Mr. Stoops would resign from the board. Dr. Stoops responded he would resign after approval and would hopefully be replaced with a parent representative as the board continued its work to diversify the board. Dr. Stoop also clarified who would report to the administrator of the school and the board's responsibility to hire/fire employees.
- The proposed board planned to participate in the NC state health plan but not the NC state retirement system. Dr. Stoops informed the CSAB that the figure quoted by Mr. Walker was an error on their part and that they would be adjusting the figures.
- Ms. Reeves questioned the transportation plan and the budgeted amount and to which a proposed board member responded that transportation would not be a barrier. Additionally, Dr. Stoops communicated the specific budgeted amount for the proposed transportation plan and detailed that additional stops and buses may be added should need dictate. Ms. Reeves questioned how the lunch program would accommodate for students who may need lunch. Dr. Stoops outlined they would shift budgeted staffing salaries and would use a lunch program and fundraising opportunities to help ensure that no student is denied a lunch.
- **Mr. Hawkes made a motion to move the school forward as the board was strong with a good application. Ms. Gibbs seconded the motion.** Ms. Reeves communicated that the purpose of this interview process was to make the applicant group aware that items needed to be tweaked as they go through the Ready to Open process as some areas were not as flushed out as they should have been. Mr. Walker echoed the sentiments of Mr. Hawkes that the board was strong and the group would have the support of Team CFA. **Mr. Maimone and Mr. Helton recused. The motion passed unanimously.**

Davidson Charter Academy – A CFA

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 5 proposed board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and

explained their respective role on the board of directors for Davidson Charter Academy. 1 proposed board member was absent due to health issues and had not participated in the process since the clarification opportunity.

- Mr. Walker led the discussion and asked board members about each section of the application. Ms. Reeves asked questions in the Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section about student diversity plan and the three areas in Davidson the school proposed to pull its students. Also, Ms. Reeves wanted to know about the minimum number of board members as all other areas appeared to be solid. Mr. Walker outlined this is a situation where you know when you got it and this application was well written.
- A proposed board member outlined that Davidson County was unique in that it has 3 systems in the county. Additionally, the board make up (diversity) will help with ensuring the student diversity proposed in the application. Also, Davidson is rural and has a lot of poverty. Davidson is not diverse in ethnicity, but is diverse in poverty. The proposed board member outlined the exact location the school was proposing to attract the students outlined in the application.
- Another proposed board member outlined the board plans to have between 5 – 11 members and would hopefully have a parent position on the board. Ms. Reeves sought clarification on the role Team CFA representative that would be on the board. Mr. Hawkes sought clarity on Mr. Bigham's continued role on the board which Mr. Walker responded that was unlikely based on current medical condition. Another board member affirmed Mr. Walker's response and reported that others were seeking to join the board as they got closer to obtaining approval.
- A proposed board member outlined the conversations the board had with a proposed catering company for its lunch/catering needs. Also, monies from the lunch provided to students who would pay full price would offset the cost for students who qualify for free and reduced lunch.
- **Ms. Gibbs made a motion to move the school forward. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. Mr. Maimone and Mr. Helton recused. The motion passed unanimously.**

Kaleidoscope Charter High School

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 5 proposed board members, one of which was newly added to the proposed board and 4 of their advisory board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors for Kaleidoscope Charter High School.
- Mr. Maimone reaffirmed the exact prior application submissions for the Kaleidoscope Charter High School applicant group and the reason additional consideration was provided. Mr.

Maimone led the discussions and recapped each section of the application. Mr. Maimone reported that the goals in the application were not improved from the current and last application.

- Additionally, it was unprecedented to invite a group back for interview when not originally approved. Mr. Maimone stressed the importance of information in the application and applicants being accountable to the information in the application. Specifically, he questioned the board on the reasons why the goals were not changed and questioned the appropriateness of an amendment to goals at this point, if an recommendation was given to begin Ready to Open.
- Ms. Reeves outlined she failed the Mission, Purposes, and Goals section as the goals were not specific and measurable according the CSAB established standards. Ms. Turner outlined that considering the schools around the proposed location, the goals were not ambitious and she was disappointed that the component was not changed from the prior application submission.
- Mr. Maimone recapped the student centered schools in Wake County and urged the board to fully explain its definition of student centered. Ms. Sutton outlined the proposed school had inputs but did not clearly outline outputs in the goals. Mr. Helton specifically communicated that the goals stated in the application over 5 years were projected low.
- Mr. Walker responded that while approved last year, feedback provided clearly outlined the goals were not rigorous and the applicant group did not make any adjustments. Ms. Parlér asked about the many different curriculums proposed in the application. Ms. Reeves communicated that she had difficulty truly understanding the proposed education plan and had to read that portion several times. She asked specifically for the proposed board to explain the plan as it relates to credit recovery, EC, Occupational Course of Study, etc.
- Mr. Maimone asked direct questions on the facility given the number of times the group has applied. Additionally, the school had proposed no principal but two other positions, and he wanted to know the specific reasoning. Ms. Reeves questioned the health benefits proposed in the application and the meal cost rationale. Ms. Parlér wanted to know about the vendor identified to provide transportation for the EC student population.
- Mr. Maimone asked about the surplus and the rationale for the significant drop in year four. Additionally, Ms. Reeves talked about the expenses of operating a high school program and addressed her concerns with the budget as currently proposed. Additionally, she stressed the misalignment between the budget and the budget narrative.
- A proposed board member outlined they are keenly aware of their conservative goals and are in the process of trying to come up with some goals of 5% better than Wake County Schools. Mr. Maimone wanted to understand why this was not a priority. The proposed board member outlined it was an oversight. Also, the board was under the impression that since approved

previously – it was not a priority. The proposed board member outlined his research and their hope to reach at-risk students under the student centered approach.

- The proposed board member communicated that all the core subjects would be a part of the proposed school, but the student centered approach would help them determine how to motivate a child to accomplish their goals. Also, the proposed board member communicated they would be following the state standards and that the relational component would be a major part of what the school would accomplish.
- Ms. Turner questioned what was specifically changed between this and last year's application and what would specifically be taught since the school proposes to follow the NCSCOS. The proposed board member responded that the teacher would drive the content and there would be direct instruction from the faculty. Additionally, there was some changing of goals; however, the changes were not significant. Not revising the goals was simply an oversight. Mr. Maimone confirmed that this model would be an extension of what one of the proposed board members was doing at Sterling Montessori. The proposed board member outlined the existing choices in the proposed location to which Mr. Maimone reiterated providing that strength and evidence would have strengthened the application.
- One proposed board member outlined that the school was not marketing itself as a Montessori for a variety of reasons; however, some of the concepts would drive what the school would do and the proposed intercession sessions would support that point.
- Mr. Helton asked specific questions around the goals of being college ready and what that meant for the school. The proposed BOD member outlined while they had not changed it in the application, they based their change on applicant groups who proposed rigorous goals who were not able to meet them. Mr. Maimone asked again about having a proposed goal of 1% to 4% being college ready. The board member outlined their strategy was to set the goal low and then "blow it out of the water." Mr. Walker outlined that the response given was a bad answer and communicated the mission of the CSAB to the applicant group. Mr. Walker asked a direct question on what a rigorous goal would be for the school. The board member responded that maybe 1% not going to college but would not put that in writing. Mr. Maimone again questioned what the exact goals were and another board member outlined that it would want to be 5 percentage points higher than Wake County.
- Mr. Walker outlined that the goals after 5 years were low especially with a school that was proposing to be college prep. How would the school sell this plan to the public? Also, there were strengths with the application; however, the goals are disappointing given the proposed mission/focus of the school. The proposed board outlined that maybe they needed to rethink their information. Ms. Turner reiterated the performance of Sterling Montessori and placed context on how her first year students at Sugar Creek performed on the ACT comparatively to Mecklenburg County.

- Mr. Maimone directed the board's attention to page 42 of the application and the job descriptions outlined to determine who would be the school's education leader. A proposed board member read from the application that the educational person would be the Head of School. Also, student achievement would be measured beyond test scores.
- The Mayor of Mooresville, proposed board member, outlined the facility questions posed by Mr. Maimone. He outlined that the market changes quickly and that there was a great deal of flex space in line with the proposed square footage outlined in the application. He was confident that the space would not be a problem. It would take a minimum of 6 months to obtain a facility. He also addressed the surplus concerns and the drop in the last year. Mr. Maimone reiterated his concerns with the proposed budget and the message it would communicate to the future stakeholders. Additionally, Mr. Maimone outlined what the board could potentially be sacrificing with the current financial plan.
- Ms. Reeves questioned the technology plan. The Mayor outlined that the goal was to have a one to one initiative and the work they had done with a consultant in the area. He also outlined a proposed plan for those students who may not be able to afford the technology for the one to one initiative. Ms. Parlér voiced concerns about the students bringing personal technology and a proposed board member responded the student would sign in using the school's website.
- Mr. Walker asked if the board would be amenable to making the changes as a stipulation. The board member outlined that they got the message. Mr. Hawkes reiterated many of the CSAB concerns to the applicant group. Mr. Maimone stated the group had the opportunity to make proposed changes before submitting – he did not feel good about the onus of correcting this information being on OCS. This should be on the proposed board. Specifically, the proposed board needed to prepare a better application to open in 2018-19 under acceleration.
- Mr. Walker stated the potential reasoning to approve the board. Ms. Turner outlined the board continues to justify the goals as written and that was concerning. **Ms. Reeves made a motion not to move the applicant group forward to begin Ready to Open. Ms. Sutton seconded.** Mr. Maimone stated what the motion meant and that the group would have the opportunity to reapply under the revised acceleration policy. Mr. Helton communicated he will vote against the motion, but an applicant group would lose a lot of support when you propose goals as written in the application. He stated we were not putting charter schools in place to be equal to traditional public schools. Mr. Maimone stated he would support Ms. Reeves' motion and he felt the acceleration process would allow the group to open on its originally proposed timeline. Ms. Gibbs asked Mr. Walker what his alternate motion would be if the motion failed. Mr. Hawkes outlined he understood the reasoning, but would vote against the motion. **The motion passed 5 to 4 with Mr. Hawkes, Ms. Gibbs, Mr. Walker, and Mr. Helton dissenting.**

Monroe Charter Academy

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 5 proposed board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors for Monroe Charter Academy. 1 advisory board member for the proposed school was present for the interview.
- Mr. Maimone led the discussion and questions around the goals for the application were raised. Mr. Helton stated he thought that the outside evaluator comments lacked merit. Mr. Maimone outlined concerns around 1 board proposing to open 2 schools in the same year given the difficulties with accomplishing this task.
- Ms. Reeves questioned the number of board members who would remain on the board once approved. Ms. Parlér asked questions on the parent involvement as outlined in the application. Ms. Reeves had concerns about the budget surplus and the drop in years four and five. Additionally, it seemed that there were there 3 members of this board that were also on the board for Charlotte Classical board, Union Academy, and Union Day.
- Mr. Rodriguez provided an overview of the proposed student population and where the school proposed to attract students. Specifically, the school would pull from the surrounding counties to reflect the student population in Monroe for grades K – 5. Additionally, he had conversations with prominent leaders from the area to inform their targeted student population. Mr. Rodriguez communicated the plan was to use MAP testing to measure student progress and goals would be adjusted if needed. He also explained the role the Bill of Rights organization would have on the proposed school's professional development. While free, the teachers would need to pay travel costs. Mr. Maimone questioned the tenure of Mr. Rodriguez on the board since he was out of state to which he responded having no plan to roll off the board and he planned to attend board meetings via skype, etc.
- Mr. Goodall outlined approximately \$60,000 was assigned in the budget to help with the Core Knowledge training. Mr. Helton asked if the school planned to use the Core Knowledge Reading program and Mr. Rodriguez responded that would be the plan.
- Mr. Goodall responded to questions on the capacity of the board to successfully open 2 schools in the same year. He outlined the impetus of his firm and outlined no relationship existed between this board and the aforementioned schools. He responded the principal would be the leader and face of the school to assist with recruiting and day-to-day operations.

- Mr. Helton asked specifically when the board would hire its proposed principal. Mr. Rodriguez outlined the school had already held its first fundraiser to be ready to hire the future leader. Mr. Goodall responded he hired the Headmaster at Union and Union Day and the salaries those people accepted from previous 2 processes. Additionally, it would be beneficial to go through the hiring process once for finding the Principals for the schools.
- The facility was questioned by Mr. Maimone to which Mr. Goodall responded the prospective had been presented and they were willing to work with them as well as outlined the modular companies the board had worked with. The proposed property was around \$80,000. He also outlined the student population for Monroe and that it would be the first property to embrace the “at-risk” student. With the buses – the plan was to lease the transportation service – Eagle Bus Service – in the first year to not have to invest time in the first year.
- Ms. Sutton asked a question on the board choosing not to use a weighted lottery given its proposed student population. Mr. Goodall outlined he did not think they would need one in this situation given the people they choose to work with although Union Academy has not reached that specific population historically. Mr. Rodriguez communicated a weighted lottery was not needed because the Hispanic population had not been tapped in the area; so therefore, he did not see the need.
- Mr. Walker asked specific questions on the location between the established Union Academy and the proposed school to gain a better understanding of the demographics. Mr. Maimone asked a direct question on the ELL teacher not originally outlined in the application. Mr. Jim Stegal(sp) provided limited information on the ELL population in the proposed area. Mr. Rodriguez outlined the contracted services covers the lack of an ELL teacher and the plan was to hire an ELL teacher in year 2. One proposed member outlined that he was from Anson but works in Monroe and disadvantaged students would be equally balanced.
- Mr. Maimone outlined he originally came with concerns with 2 schools being proposed by one board. Ms. Sutton asked questions on how this application did not fit the definition of replication. Specifically, should not the board wait the two years when results are in to truly judge effectiveness and appropriateness of this decision? Mr. Walker reminded the board of the prior Emereau approvals. Ms. Turner reminded the board that the Emereau board subsequently withdrew. Mr. Walker responded that he had no concerns. Ms. Turner outlined as a matter of principle it was not a good idea given there will be no data to support granting 2 charters in the same year.
- **Ms. Gibbs made a motion to move the group forward to begin Ready to Open. Ms. Parlér seconded.** Mr. Hawkes outlined the economies of scale and experience speaks to many advantages for this board. Mr. Wilkinson added comments on urgency and urged the board to

support the motion. **The motion passed 6 to 3. Ms. Turner, Ms. Reeves, and Ms. Sutton dissented.**

The Experiential School of Greensboro

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 2 proposed board members were not present and 7 other proposed board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors for The Experiential School of Greensboro.
- Mr. Walker led the discussion and reviewed each component of the application. He stated that it may be difficult to achieve K – 6 in year one. Ms. Reeves commended the group on its rigorous goals and outlined the problem with the school calendar with not observing Veteran’s Day as charters must comply.
- Mr. Maimone outlined his concerns with the financial plan and not offering health benefits for the teachers as this may impact future recruitment efforts. Ms. Parlér asked questions on the proposed lease. Mr. Helton outlined the budgeted financials were possibly significantly lower than they should be. Ms. Reeves had questions on the break-even number outlined in the application.
- One proposed board member outlined the plan and rationale of opening with K – 6. Additionally, they felt that there was a need for an elementary and middle school option in its surrounding area as parents are looking for options. Mr. Walker asked how many students per grade level and another proposed board member provided a breakdown of the numbers and the survey it had resurrected following the clarification opportunity.
- The board chair stated that the Veteran’s Day component was an oversight and it would be included on the revised calendar. The questions asked by Ms. Reeves were responded to by the board chair and how the standards were translated into “I Can” statements to be used by all stakeholders. Other assessments would be determined at a later time in conjunction with other stakeholders.
- One board member responded that while there would be 4 formal teacher observations, there would be other informal opportunities to observe based on the nature of experiential learning.
- Mr. Helton communicated his concerns with the emphasis on administration versus resources being spent on teachers, especially given the scope and size of the school. Mr. Walker asked specific questions of one board member on the budget based on governing a museum nonprofit – there was not a lot of financial experience on the board which was concerning. The proposed

board member outlined the specifics around the growth in the proposed area where the school sought to locate.

- Also, Mr. Walker asked specific questions on the plan for the facilities and operations manager the school should hire to support the board in its weaknesses. A board member responded that it had revised its budget based on the information received in the clarification interview. Also, the board planned to hire a CPA and increase its board with 2 additional positions. Mr. Walker urged the group to contract with a firm to assist with these services.
- One board member responded that the board planned to recruit from 5 universities since they had access to the pipeline based on their professional backgrounds. The board chair outlined it was a desire that the teachers conduct home visits but it is not a requirement. The idea was to engage with the community in their suggested space.
- Mr. Hawkes outlined his concerns with the board not being diverse as the board is primarily made up of academia members. He suggested that the board diversify in gender and other professionals. One board member told the CSAB about her experience and governing in financial matters.
- Ms. Reeves questioned the breakeven number based on the 200 plus student enrollment. The board member outlined there was no a breakeven number included as they looked into what the board could cut instead of revamping the entire plan. Ms. Reeves strongly suggested the board comes up with a breakeven number. Mr. Walker outlined the break-even number would be minus 9 students which would make things extremely tight. Mr. Walker told the group it needed to start with listing its order of priorities to ensure financial viability.
- Ms. Reeves outlined she was intrigued by this application and it was one of the most innovative applications reviewed today. She is however concerned with the finances as well as Ms. Parlér. Mr. Walker commended the group on acknowledging the issues with its proposed budget and felt they would work to correct the issues.
- **Mr. Helton made a motion to move the group forward to begin Ready to Open. Ms. Reeves seconded.** Mr. Maimone strongly urged the proposed board to add legal and financial expertise to its board of directors. Mr. Hawkes reinforced the importance of diversifying the board. **The motion carried unanimously.**

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION/OCS UPDATES

- The CSAB received an update on past and pending State Board of Education (SBE) items. Mr. Dave Machado, Director, OCS, led the discussion.
- At the May SBE meeting, Discovery Charter School in Durham is requesting a one year delay due to zoning and permit issues. Montcross Charter School in Gaston County is requesting a one year delay due to the inability to secure a location. UpRoar Charter School is requesting a change to their transportation plan. In the original application, UpRoar stated they would provide free breakfast lunch. UpRoar is now requesting that their charter to be amended to reflect a charge of \$1.50 for breakfast and \$3.50 for lunch.
- **Ms. Reeves made a motion to recommend to the SBE that they approve Discovery Charter and Montcross Charter's request for delays. Mr. Maimone seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- The CSAB is concerned with recommended the approval for UpRoar's change in their lunch plan. During UpRoar's application review, it was highly commended by the evaluators that everyone would be provided free lunch. The offering of free lunch was such an integral part that differentiated this school from all the others. **Ms. Reeves made a motion to have UpRoar come before the CSAB at the May meeting to explain their reason behind the amendment request and to provide an updated budget report. Ms. Parlèr seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- At the April SBE meeting, the decision on Twin City's charter relinquishment was tabled until the June SBE meeting. The SBE voted not to renew the Community Charter School. Youngsville and Phoenix Academy's amendment requests were approved. CSAB's recommendation to the SBE for Kestrel Heights was approved, with two additional stipulations.
- OCS is currently in the process of applying for the 2017 Charter School Program (CSP) State Educational Agency (SEA) grant. Mr. Craig Tucker, Education Consultant, OCS, led the discussion by providing the CSAB a presentation of the summary, timeline and explanation of the grant.
- The grant is available to state entities. These state entities allows them to issue sub-awards. The design would be that the grant would be awarded to DPI but then sent out as sub-awards to existing or new applicants.
- The purpose of the CSP grant includes, but is not limited to:
 - Expand opportunities to all students, specifically underserved students

- Provide financial assistance for the planning, program design and initial implementation of public charter schools
- Increase the number of high quality charter schools available
- Support efforts to strengthen charter school authorization process.
- Mr. Machado ended the discussion by providing the CSAB of current OCS workflow updates. Appreciation rewards were presented to Mr. Eric Sanchez and Ms. Cheryl Turner for hosting the OCS' first annual training camps for low-performing and continually low-performing schools.
- No further action was taken by the CSAB following the updates.

SCHOOL PRESENTATIONS

- The CSAB received a presentation on the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Implementation Progress. Ms. Amy Jablonski, Director, Integrated Academic and Behavior Systems, led the presentation.
- In a traditional classroom setting, when a student is struggling, they are sent out of the classroom to get "help." A lot of time and resources are used to move these children all around the school, ultimately leading to disconnected educational experiences. Then the children are asked to use those experiences in the classroom setting and outperform their peers who are not at risk with no help from adults.
- Within a MTSS, help is still given to students, but from a supplemental support system. The focus is to supplement the education given, not to counteract what is being taught in the classroom. MTSS also focuses on finding students who need supports early in their education. It has been found that the gap is not big between students who need additional help and those who don't, but when the correct intervention is not implemented, that gap will grow as the student gets older.
- It is important that evidence based practices and programs are in place that fix the context, culture and climate of that school to help all students be successful. Core instruction is the largest and greatest allocation of resources for staff, curriculum choices, and professional development. Focus on core instruction can change the trajectory in schools, ensuring that all students are getting high quality instruction, including students who need additional help while in the classroom. One of the top MTSS goals when implementing the program in a school is developing a system that holds the adults accountable for creating a curriculum that will help all students in their schools. Evaluation of MTSS is through a self-assessment, which allows schools to evaluate their own implementation to better problem solve around the components of MTSS.

- Ms. Beverly Sikes and Ms. Tiffany Mocerri, MTSS coordinators, Lincoln Charter, presented a summary of how their charter schools implements MTSS. The reason they chose the MTSS program was the desire to focus on the whole child. They began by defining their core at Lincoln Charter and the infrastructure that had been built and how it could improve to help the whole child.
- No further action was taken by the CSAB following this presentation.
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to adjourn the April 10 meeting. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.**

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

Attendance/NCCSAB	Alan Hawkes Joseph Maimone Phyllis Gibbs Sherry Reeves Cheryl Turner - <i>Absent</i> Hilda Parlér	Alex Quigley - <i>Absent</i> Eric Sanchez - <i>Absent</i> Tammi Sutton - <i>via conference call</i> Tony Helton Steven Walker Kevin Wilkinson - <i>Absent</i>
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Dave Machado, Director Deanna Townsend-Smith, Assistant Director Craig Tucker, Consultant Shaunda Cooper, Consultant	<i>SBE</i> Martez Hill - <i>Absent</i> <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 8:30 am by Vice Chairman Steven Walker who read the Ethics Statement and CSAB Mission Statement. Ms. Sherry Reeves led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPLICATION UPDATES/INTERVIEWS

- The CSAB interviews continued. The CSAB made recommendations on which applicants it would recommend to the State Board of Education for Ready-to-Open. Dr. Deanna Townsend Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools (OCS), led the discussion.

East Voyager Academy

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 6 proposed board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors for East Voyager Academy. 2 members from the East Voyager Academy Foundation were present for the interview.

- Mr. Walker led the discussion and reviewed each section of the application. Mr. Maimone stated that the board was impressive; however, the enrollment figures are concerning given the trend with enrollment numbers over the last few years. Mr. Helton was concerned that the mission statement as currently written could be limiting. Ms. Parlér wanted to know more about the strategies the school would use to transition students into its program. Ms. Reeves echoed those sentiments along with raising questions about how the school would meet the needs of Exceptional Children.
- Ms. Reeves outlined the break-even was a bit low and the teacher salaries were projected low given where the school was proposing to locate. Mr. Maimone had questions about the proposed name to which Mr. Walker outlined previous concerns about the similarity between the chosen name and potential confusion with an already established school – Voyager Academy.
- One board member responded to the questions about the name and the board’s willingness to change its name if approved. He explained the reasoning and outlined the board may be willing to change the name if approved. The board members committed to changing the name to East Voyager Language Immersion Academy.
- 2 board members responded to the board’s plan on attaining the proposed numbers outlined in the application. Information was provided about the language immersion programs in the surrounding area and the expressed interest in the school in their minds provided support to the enrollment numbers proposed. Additionally, while the school was language immersion, they would market to all students and not just Chinese students. The other board member provided information about their detailed marketing plan with the key message of the first public charter school with a Chinese immersion program. She also outlined the different media outlets the school would use to advertise and fundraise to ensure the school met its projected enrollment. Mr. Walker believed that the school would not have difficulty achieving its projected student enrollment with the proposed marketing plan and the Chinese immersion focus.
- Mr. Hawkes wanted clarification on the percentage of Chinese who speak Mandarin or Cantonese. One board member provided historical information on the different dialects and informed the CSAB that there was only one language in China which was Mandarin.
- Ms. Gibbs wanted to know how the school would hire the teachers for the immersion component of the program. A board member responded that there would be 2 teachers. Additionally, the school would follow the NCSCOS and the ideal candidate would be licensed K – 6 and bilingual. In lieu of finding a dual certified teacher, there would be a licensed teacher and a native Chinese speaker for the language immersion component.
- Ms. Gibbs and Mr. Walker stressed again the concerns about the proposed teacher salaries given the proposed location. A board member explained that with the incentives and bonuses the

school would offer, it would be an attraction to a number of candidates. Mr. Walker asked a direct question on how the bonuses would work to which a board member responded it would be based on performance.

- Mr. Walker inquired about the role of the foundation and it providing finances for the proposed applicant group. A board member outlined that the current budget was based on the revenues the school would receive from state and local funds only. The foundation and other support would come from the foundation; however, the group wanted to provide information based on revenues it knew it would receive.
- Mr. Maimone wanted information on the EFA partnership and the fee of approximately \$70,000. A board member outlined the fee of the group at each phase of the proposed contract and outlined the 44 items in Appendix A-1 that detailed the support, but not day to day operations. The foundation would be support to the principal and the board. Mr. Maimone questioned if the group was a CMO or EMO to which the board member responded that they were not and provided historical information about the purpose of the foundation. Additionally, the board member outlined 3 distinct reasons why it was critical for them to have the foundation support. Most importantly, the board would have more control with the partnership relationship versus having an EMO or CMO. The foundation would help establish consistency and help the board fulfill their mission. Various CSAB members asked additional questions to better understand the foundation and board relationship.
- **Mr. Helton made a motion to move the proposed school to the ready to open process. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion.** Mr. Hawkes outlined that this was a strong board and commended the group. Mr. Walker offered comments on the innovation presented in the application. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

The Paideia Academy

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 7 proposed board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors The Paideia Academy. 3 board members were not present for the interview but provided letters to support their absences.
- Mr. Maimone led the interview and questioned the goals outlined in the application. While rigorous, was 100% realistic and he wanted to gain more clarity into the rationale for the goals and the reason 100% was chosen. Ms. Reeves wanted more information on need based on the need as evidenced by the survey responses outlined in the application.
- Mr. Maimone directed attention to a statement on page 9 of the application and the link of a statement to maintaining high academic standards. Ms. Parlér wanted information on the

trimester schedule proposed in the application. Ms. Reeves wanted more information on the at-risk component in the application; specifically, how would the school choose to serve its students who may be identified as AIG.

- Mr. Walker asked questions about the lunch plan proposed and if the amount budgeted was appropriate. Mr. Maimone asked questions about the current bylaws and the board's understanding of open meetings laws. Ms. Reeves wanted to know about the administrative structure for the school with the 21 teachers proposed in the application. Mr. Helton and Mr. Maimone had questions regarding this component as well. Mr. Hawkes also had questions about the organizational chart and wanted additional information.
- Mr. Maimone reminded the group of common pitfalls with applicant groups with enrollment and facility and asked the group to provide more detail on its progress on obtaining a facility. Ms. Reeves pointed out that there was no monies budgeted for transportation while the applicant stated they would provide transportation to and from school. The concern of the group was that the focus on heavy administration and not enough monies to other staffing could be problematic. Mr. Maimone commended the group on the 10% surplus planned each year in the proposed budget.
- A board member responded to the CSAB questions on why it chose to set the goals it outlined in its application and truly believed its students could and would achieve the goals set. Mr. Maimone questioned the comparability of the goals to other Paideia models. Another board member provided information on the various models and limited summary data on the academic numbers. Specifically, the academic numbers vary depending on many factors. Much research in the current years was qualitative. Mr. Maimone asked questions on the Paideia Model and student writing. The board member responded that in Paideia schools, instruction was based on a Socratic model and students own their learning. Mr. Maimone then wanted to understand the link between Paideia and classical learning. The board member outlined there were some links and provided commentary about the links between the Paideia model and Classical education.
- One board member responded to the CSAB questions on the ED population the school proposed to attract. In looking at a 5-mile radius, the ED population would be about 15% and that was the best guess. Another board member addressed why the school would not have a specific AIG program. Specifically, the proposed school would provide differentiation; however, a good education for one, is a good education for all. Students would create an individual learning plan to help teachers target their instruction. The seminar training for the school would be conducted by the Academic Dean and Principal who are Paideia certified and would provide the training at no cost.
- One board member stated the school planned to contract with a vendor to address the lunch needs for students. While not outlined in the application, the school was open to contracting and

would use the lunch program as a fundraising mechanism to meet the needs of students who are economically disadvantaged.

- Mr. Helton asked specific questions on the 85% ACT goal outlined in the application. A board member outlined that the board set the goal because it sets the target high and if they do not have it as a goal they would not reach for it. Mr. Helton reminded the group that the group would be held accountable to the goals that it set, to which the board member responded that possibly setting a goal 5% above the average may be more appropriate.
- Mr. Walker outlined that if the group moved forward that it must amend its bylaws and that Open Meetings Laws would have to be followed. The bylaws as currently written are not in line with charter school requirements.
- The treasurer of the proposed board outlined the proposed facility the group was looking to obtain. The CSAB urged the board to use the monies designated for taxes to reallocate those monies to the lunch program. The proposed board outlined that the current budget is a tool and would be adjusted as needed. The CSAB asked about the areas the proposed board could cut should the need arise and the board treasurer outlined a plan of action to ensure financial viability of the school.
- The transportation plan was questioned by the CSAB and the treasurer outlined that field trips, etc. would be funded by the parents during the first 3 years. Additionally, the board planned to conduct carpool as its transportation plan.
- Mr. Maimone opened the floor for other board members to outline their passion for the proposed school since they had not spoken during the interview. The board members shared their passion and other statistical points on the reasoning for the Paideia model and the proposed school.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend the school for Ready to Open; Ms. Reeves seconded the motion.** Mr. Maimone outlined he was impressed with the board and the area was a high needs area that needed a charter school. Mr. Helton outlined he would vote in favor of the school; however, the goals were a bit concerning. Mr. Hawkes was pleased that there was a CPA on the board. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Essie Mae Kiser Foxx Charter School

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. Proposed board members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective role on the board of directors for Essie Mae Kiser Foxx Charter School.

- Mr. Walker led the discussion and stated that the purpose of this conversation was to focus on the board's understanding of its proposed EMO agreement.
- Dr. Nan Lund outlined the EMO would be responsible for business services. Additionally, the board would jointly hire the teachers with the board being the ultimate decision maker. The EMO would provide the facility and the board would pay a lease to the EMO.
- Mr. Maimone questioned the EMO fee and the budgeted line items for the other items outlined in the agreement. Dr. Lund stated that any funds remaining would be rendered to TAS outside of the 3% the board would retain to build a fund balance.
- Following the continued interview discussion in a prior meeting, **Mr. Helton made a motion that the school move forward for approval. Ms. Gibbs seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Global Achievers School

- The Office of Charter Schools provided a brief update on the proposed school. 1 board member was not present. 5 proposed board members and the proposed Lead Administrator members introduced themselves to the CSAB and provided a brief professional history and explained their respective roles for Global Achievers School.
- Mr. Walker led the interview and reviewed each section of the application. Mr. Maimone asked question on how the school would be unique. Ms. Reeves had specific questions around the goals outlined in the charter application. Ms. Parlér had specific questions about the school being financially sound. Mr. Helton pointed to the fail in the application related specifically to the exceptional children considerations outlined in the application.
- Ms. Gibbs inquired about the lack of gender diversity of the board followed by Ms. Reeves on who would oversee the financials of the school since the majority of the board had educational backgrounds. Ms. Parlér wanted specifics on the exact proposed location the school would situate itself.
- Ms. Parlér asked questions related to the transportation plan outlined. Ms. Reeves commented on the facility plan outlined in the application along with Mr. Maimone. The CSAB referenced the revised budget supplied prior to the interview.
- A board member responded to Mr. Maimone's questions on how the school would offer something different since global education was a new buzz word. The board member responding outlined the website the school had created and the community buzz surrounding the school. Also she detailed the events planned to market to its proposed targeted population. One proposed

member outlined how the school would be different as it would offer an ACPT model and project based learning where the parents will interact with the curriculum. A full time social worker would reach out to each parent to help with consistent two way communication.

- Ms. Swinson, proposed administrator for the school, elaborated on the student project based portfolios which would detail the goals and student progress. Also, Ms. Swinson outlined the school would be responsible for obtaining materials for the projects, but would request every day products/supplies from parents such as (toilet paper rolls, etc). The school would also offer an extended day program which would help it be different from the schools in its proposed LEA.
- The board chair outlined its revised goals and outlined that the school planned to be 80% proficient in grades K-2 as measured by the NC K – 2 assessments. Other goals were outlined for students in other grades the school was proposing to serve. Mr. Maimone commended the school for its rigorous goals and hopes that they would meet the proposed goals.
- Mr. Helton asked questions on the EC plan to determine the group’s capacity to meet the needs of the EC population it would serve.
- The board chair spoke to its gender diversity and a new board member added which was submitted to the online portal prior to the meeting. That individual would also help the board ensure its financial responsibilities. Ms. Reeves asked direct questions on who would help the board oversee financials on a day-to-day basis. Ms. Swinson provided some details to who would be responsible for overseeing the finances. She additionally replied to the transportation plan questions about the reasons the board outlined the mile radius for transporting students. Another board member explained the rural area to justify its proposed transportation plan.
- Mr. Maimone wanted to know if the budgeted facility amount was sufficient. A board member outlined the proposed facility plan and that it had potentially secured 2 locations for the proposed school. Ms. Swinson quoted the amounts from the landlord and outlined he would be responsible for the renovations. Mr. Maimone questioned Ms. Swinson on what he thought would be the greatest challenge for the charter school as the future leader and former employee in OCS. Ms. Swinson outlined she thought the challenges would be similar as all other charters and felt that communication would be key. Additionally, Ms. Swinson outlined the proposed school would be approximately 20 – 25 miles between Rocky Mount Prep and East Wake Academy.
- Mr. Hawkes wanted information on the exact role of the registrar for the proposed school as the school may want to rethink its proposed salary given the role a registrar serves for a school and it is a critical role. Ms. Swinson responded the board would consider revisiting the budget for the registrar.

- Mr. Helton outlined the application was clear and overall well written. **Mr. Helton made a motion that the school move forward for approval. Mr. Maimone seconded the motion.** Mr. Hawkes outlined he would vote for the school and was placing a lot of faith in the relationship with Ms. Swinson. **The motion passed unanimously.**

POLICY UPDATES

- The CSAB received and discussed policy recommendation revisions for CHTR – 014 and CHTR-013 (charter amendment and planning year policies). The Office of Charter Schools made recommendation about the policy for the CSAB to consider. Mr. Steven Walker led the discussion.
- In the past, the OCS could approve some amendments to charter applications without necessitating State Board approval. A change in the CHTR-014 policy will add that the board will be notified of amendments to changing charter applications in respect to transportation, National School Lunch Program or school nutrition plan of changing charter a Charter Amendments for existing charter school.
- **Mr. Walker made a motion to recommend that number eight on the policy change to “the charter application with respect to the food service plan.” Mr. Helton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Maimone suggested that number six on the policy be clarified to reflect what pieces of the school lunch plan will go before the SBE versus what can be determined by the OCS. The only item that would go before the SBE would be “in addition or removal from the federal national program” and that verbiage should be added to the policy. **Mr. Maimone made a recommendation to add this verbiage to number six on the CHTR-14 policy for approval. Ms. Sherry Reeves seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**
- After continued CSAB discussion, **Mr. Walker made a motion to amend policy A-2 to “relocation outside of a five-mile radius of the approved location or relocation outside the approved LEA” requires SBE approval of the approved location. Ms. Reeves seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Walker made a subsequent motion to amend subsection B, by adding number 10 to “relocation within a five-mile radius of the approved location and not outside the approved LEA.” Mr. Helton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Mr. Reeves made a motion to send the amended CHTR-14 policy to the SBE for approval. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

- The acceleration policy, CHTR-13, requires that the preliminary school be the only charter school in the LEA. Changes to this policy will replace that criteria and require that the preliminary charter school demonstrate an exceptional need for a charter school in the proposed location and demonstrate there is a facility identified by the applicant that is feasible for opening on the accelerated schedule. The school would have to agree to participate in the planning year for that current year with the understanding that their application still may not be recommended by the CSAB to the SBE for final approval. The changes will not impact the fast-track for preliminary charter schools.
- **Mr. Maimone made a motion to recommend the amended changes to CHTR-13 to the SBE for approval. Ms. Parlér seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
- **Ms. Gibbs made a motion to adjourn the April 11 meeting. Mr. Hawkes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.**