

**NC Charter School Advisory Committee Meeting  
State Board of Education  
Meeting Rm. 755  
NC Department of Public Instruction**

**October 16, 2012**

**Meeting Minutes**

Attendance/NCPCSAC	Aaron Means (present) Kwan Graham (present) John Betterton (present) Richard Hooker (absent) Alfred Dillon (present) Rebecca Shore (present) Tim Markley (absent) Aaron Means (present)	Jennie Adams (present) Paul Norcross (via phone) Baker Mitchell (via phone) Alan Hawkes (absent) Robert Landry (present) Joseph Maimone (present) Cheryl Turner (present) Kate Alice Dunaway (present)
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>State Board of Education, Legal Council</i> Katie Cornetto (present)  <i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Thomas Miller, Consultant Lisa Swinson, Consultant Patricia Gillott, Administrative Assistant Joel Medley, Director Cande Honeycutt, Consultant	<i>Attorney General's Office</i> Laura Crumpler  <i>State Board of Education, Executive Director</i> Martez Hill

Welcome and Overview	Mr. John Betterton called the meeting to order at 11:00 am. He welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda for meeting.
Approval of Minutes	Mr. Joe Maimone made a motion that the September 11, 2012 minutes be approved. Ms. Jennie Adams seconded. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.  Mr. Aaron Means noted a correction on page 5 of the September 12, 2012 minutes. Mr. Means made a motion that the September 12, 2012 minutes be approved with the aforementioned corrections. Mr. Robert Landry seconded. The motion was carried unanimously.
Cape Lookout Discussion	Dr. Joel Medley reviewed the historical context of the Cape Lookout non-renewal and current status. Packets of information were distributed to Council in advance.  Ms. Sandra Johnson, NCDPI Finance and Business Consultant, shared student attendance findings that verified 47 students were in attendance at some point during the present school year. She noted that the school's first month preliminary ADM was 64. Dr. Medley responded that because the Council was the last entity to review Cape Lookout's materials they would make a recommendation regarding the status of the school's renewal to the SBE.

Ms. Barbara Johnson, Board Chair for Cape Lookout Marine Science High School, shared information about her background information, including her military career and that she did not have a background in education. She explained that she now has a strong group of people to give the oversight they need to provide success for the school. She stated that Cape Lookout is one of the only schools that serves at-risk students and then gave examples of student hardships. She continued to state that the board brought talent to the school and is committed to making the changes to be compliant with the recommendations of the school. She explained that the teachers and staff were working for free for the 60 students with real need. She implored that the Council must keep the school open. She explained that they (the students) stay until the doors close up at 7:00 at night. She continued by stating that the students would fall off the cliff without the school. She stated that they haven't missed a deadline and, "We're willing to do anything. Come see us every week. Give us all your reports. Let us answer them. Help us. You have tremendous, talent, skill, and experience. We're an open book for you." She asked the Council to grant four more years to the charter to graduate the current freshmen.

Ms. Johnson then elaborated on a new plan, Success Friday, to increase student attendance and overall performance. Ms. Stephanie Watson, board member, explained that she began working with the school to do a scuba diving lesson. She continued her work with the school through volunteering and eventually joined the board.

Dr. Robert Landry asked if the school had a totally new board. Ms. Johnson replied that everyone on the Board was new except the administrator and parent representative. She added that the previous board was dysfunctional but these new board members have made the school a priority.

Mr. Alfred Dillon asked about the commitment of the students. Ms. Johnson stated that the school is the student's last chance, that they are desperately committed because they see the board members taking them out for Success Fridays and they see the community making donations. The school has posted banners around the school for 60% academic achievement. The students are beginning to believe it. She added that there still is not a 100% commitment from the students.

Ms. Rosa Langston, Cape Lookout Board member stated that the school inherited some problems. She stated that she has been with the school for three years and that the school has the highest drop-out in the state. She continued by stating that 80% graduated last year. Ms. Turner asked if the school is offering all required EOCs. Ms. Langston answered that they didn't have the students they needed to offer the courses and what is offered is driven by student needs. Ms. Langston continued that there is no funding and that the teachers are working without pay.

Mr. Aaron Means asked about the number of students and inquired how the

school plans to address the budget shortfall. Ms. Langston continued by stating that the reporting software was not working to take attendance. Ms. Lisa Swinson, from the Office of Charter Schools, stated that there were approximately 25 students in the building during her visit on September 25, around noon. Ms. Langston explained that the children are on work release or off campus during that time. Ms. Johnson explained that the budget was done on 70 students and donations of \$30,000. Mr. John Betterton asked if the school has letters of commitment. Ms. Johnson answered no. Mr. Joe Maimone stated that the school cannot have a deficit, needs to maintain an enrollment of 65 students, and have test scores 60% higher in 2 of 3 years.

Ms. Pat McElraft, former Carteret County Commissioner and current Representative for the North Carolina General Assembly, addressed the Council. She stated that there was an effort to make this school succeed in the past three or four years. She stated Carteret County Schools used this school as an alternative school. She stated that the Carteret County Commissioners are behind the school and that Carteret County has their own alternative school. She asked the Council to grant the school four more years and that she has guaranteed the school \$1000 of her own money. She stated there was no pressure to close the school since the cap has been removed.

Mr. Means inquired about the health and safety issues of the building. Ms. Johnson stated that the school doesn't prepare meals in the school, that they have functioning toilets and passed fire inspection. The building was built for educational purposes. Ms. Watson stated that the mayor was behind them. Ms. Johnson continued that water coming in the ceiling interferes with internet connectivity. Ms. Watson stated that she has a landscape design business and that she and her husband would like to beautify the school property. She continued to state that she wanted to foster a happy, successful way of learning and rebrand the school.

Mr. Betterton inquired about the educational plan for the school. Ms. Teresa Parker stated that her plan is to do whatever it takes to graduate all students. She continued stating that she picks up students that are thirty miles away. She shared about her personal background from a disadvantaged household.

Ms. Kwan Graham asked about course offerings like English I that was not offered the previous school year. Ms. Johnson stated that every student that enrolls is evaluated. Ms. Langston informed the Council that in the application for admissions the family writes an essay and a barriers list. The school reviews the barriers and the student's transcript. The school requires ten hours of volunteer service by parents each year. She stated that each student has an individualized education plan in her files that has a barriers list. Ms. Johnson stated that the school takes the student where they are and moves them so they

qualify for a diploma.

Mr. Betterton entertained a motion. Ms. Turner expressed her concern with committing four years. Dr. Landry agreed. Mr. Betterton stated that the school was started in 1996, that the opportunity was there and has not materialized as promised. Ms. Watson interrupted and stated that this was because it was an alternative school. Dr. Landry stated that he was for quality. Ms. Kate Alice Dunaway stated that Sugar Creek was ready to be closed, but they were turned around. She asked what would have happened to the now 700 students that Sugar Creek currently serves. Mr. Dillon stated that the school is at a point of no return and has been given many chances. He stated that he was a dropout, understands the need, but the lack of performance is the concern.

Mr. Baker Mitchell stated that the audit shows \$109,000 budget shortfall for the last year. Ms. Johnson stated that the school has no frills. She continued stating that they currently have a controller on the school's board. She stated that the board is committed to the school and they know the governance and fiscal issues. She stated that they have 60 students that will be thrown down the drain if the doors are not kept open. Ms. Turner stated that Sugar Creek only got one year and recommended two years.

Mr. Betterton expressed his concern about the financial issues and requested to speak with the business person. Mr. John Aldridge stated that the base budget was based on 70 ADM and are showing a surplus at 70 students and an increase of 20% each year. Mr. Betterton asked how the school will get out of arrears. Mr. Aldridge continued that the school has no arrears, that there is a viable budget plan. Mr. Means stated that the audit said \$109,000 deficit.

Ms. Dunaway asked who provided board training. Ms. Johnson stated that the appointed board members reviewed state and local laws and bylaws and training with board specialist for board training vision. She stated that Dr. Miller will be scheduled to do board training.

Mr. Means inquired about the teacher back pay. Mr. Johnson stated that the board will allocate funds to address back pay. She continued that the teachers have agreed to work for less. Mr. Maimone asked how many teachers signed the agreement to be paid at \$30,000. Ms. Johnson answered twelve. Ms. Johnson stated that the teachers would not receive \$30,000 that they budgeted between \$22,000 to \$24,000. She stated that the teachers do not have a contract. Mr. Betterton asked if there are any legal issues with not paying teachers. Ms. Laura Crumpler asked about the teachers receiving unemployment while working. Ms. Johnson stated that they brought in the Employment Security Commission.

Mr. Maimone stated that the school did not make 60% growth and next year the

	<p>school will have to make it with composite because there will be no growth and the scores will be late in September or October. Mr. Mitchell inquired about the financial portion. Ms. Adams stated that the school should have to hit the rigor of what we require of other schools. She reiterated the issues Mr. Dillon addressed. Mr. Means pointed out page 52 that shows a \$12,000 deficit. Ms. Graham stated that she is looking for the same quality that she would in considering a new school. Ms. Johnson stated that the school is not a new school, that they have 60% performance, and lowered the drop-out rate. She continued that they were shut out of NCWISE. Ms. Graham reiterated her concern that the existing snapshot along with history is a concern. Dr. Landry pointed out page 3 of the September 12 minutes.</p> <p>Mr. Dillon made a motion that the school close and reapply as a new school. He stated that there is a stigma attached to the school and recommend that we do not recommend an extension. Mr. Betterton stated that there was no second to Mr. Dillon's motion.</p> <p>Ms. Turner recommended that the Council extend the charter for two years. Ms. Adams seconded the motion. Mr. Betterton asked for any further discussion. Mr. Mitchell asked why the school did not have the draft of the audit since the final audit is due on October 31. He stated that he is uncomfortable with the motion without the financial information. Mr. Betterton asked about the status of the audit. Ms. Parker stated that the auditor needed items and the system was down.</p> <p>Mr. Maimone amended the motion that the school provide a clean audit for 2011-2012 for the recommendation to proceed. Mr. Betterton asked for discussion. Ms. Dunaway stated that a clean audit could be challenging. Mr. Maimone agreed. Dr. Landry seconded the amendment. Mr. Mitchell stated that there should be no material findings. Mr. Maimone agreed. Mr. Betterton took a vote on the amendment to the motion to say audit with no material findings. The vote of the amendment was 11-0 in favor of the amendment.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton took a vote on the amended motion. The motion passed 10-1 with Mr. Dillon dissenting.</p>
<p>Advisory Council Meeting Dates Discussion</p>	<p>Mr. Betterton asked about future Council meeting dates. Ms. Swinson stated that December 10 is the next scheduled meeting date and that Tiller and Kennedy would be on the agenda for renewal. She stated that they will come in for the interview as part of the renewal process. Ms. Turner asked for clarification of the process. Mr. Betterton asked when the information will be available. Ms. Swinson stated that the information for Tiller was already complete and that the visit for Kennedy would be that Friday. Dr. Medley stated that OCS has</p>

	<p>established a time frame of Nov. 1 for the reports. He stated that the report will have multiple interviews with staff, administration, parents and will include historical data.</p> <p>Ms. Swinson stated that the next meetings would be January 14-15, 2013. Mr. Betterton asked about the agenda. Ms. Swinson answered that there is no agenda created for those meetings. She continued that the next meeting is February 11-12. She stated that the letter of intent is due on Jan. 4 so that may be a good time to review those and make plans. The next dates are March 11-12 and April 8-9. Ms. Turner stated that they would be reviewing applications. Mr. Betterton asked if the dates could be sent out. Ms. Swinson stated that she sent the dates out on August 21, 2012. She stated that the next dates were on May 6-7. Mr. Betterton stated to move on since the dates had already been sent.</p>
Larger Virtual Context Presentation	<p>Dr. Medley explained that Dr. Tracey Weeks would begin talking about the North Carolina Virtual Schools Framework. Dr. Weeks explained that she was the Chief Academic Officer of NC Virtual Public Schools. She explained that NCVPS provides supplemental services to the state. She displayed a list of students who a full time virtual school may benefit. She presented considerations with organization, staffing, curriculum and support with opening a virtual public school. She stated that online PE was currently standing in the way of NCVPS being able to offer all graduation requirements for students. A list of questions and concerns were presented in consideration of NCVPS becoming a virtual charter or an LEA. She added that NCVPS could not currently grant credit or award a diploma. A list of questions and/or possibilities were offered that were posed to SBE during their October planning session. Dr. Weeks replied that it would not make sense for NCVPS to become a full charter by getting rid of a virtual public school. She would be concerned that becoming an LEA may cut off the access of all students across the state. Dr. Weeks noted that there was not a strong desire to move into changing NCVPS.</p> <p>Dr. Medley noted that several states that have adopted virtual public school are now taking a look back at their funding. He added that he appreciated the SBE for taking their time with making a decision about virtual public schools. Legal compliance, academic excellence and board performance are the three leading considerations for a virtual charter school. Foundational policies that have to be considered were presented and discussed. Questions were posed concerning stronger accountability. Dr. Medley noted that funding was the biggest question because funding varies nationally from \$3,700 to \$16,000. He presented recommendations that the SBE made related to funding, the application process, a shorter charter term, physical location within NC, plan for student access related to technology and transportation. He presented a list of questions that the SBE would like input from the Council.</p> <p>Ms. Turner stated that she liked the idea of having a three-five-ten charter agreement. Ms. Adams noted that she was in agreement with the shorter term</p>

that Ms. Turner mentioned because of the two year review process. Mr. Betterton stated that the virtual charter would be subjected to an annual review. Dr. Medley added that the virtual school would still need to comply with the 60% composite rule. Ms. Turner asked what happens when a virtual school does not test 95% of their students. Dr. Medley replied that there was a school that was placed on low performing status because they had a history of not testing enough students. Mr. Betterton stated that the virtual charter school would have to provide computers and connectivity to the students. Ms. Dunaway noted that connectivity could be at the local library and the school would have to present a plan. Dr. Medley asked if the Council wanted that to be a requirement that they provide accessibility or that they have a plan. Mr. Dillon replied that it should be a requirement. He further noted that kindergartners may not be a good fit for a virtual public school. Ms. Adams replied that the grade level limitation should be around whether the student could be assessed. Ms. Turner added that the bare minimal should not be below third grade. Mr. Betterton added that a virtual school should be connected to a brick and mortar school so that they are accountable.

Dr. Medley explained that there had been one applicant for a virtual public school in North Carolina. He explained that it went into litigation with a court siding with the SBE; however, an appeal may still be possible. Ms. Adams suggested that a virtual public school would have funding based upon a different model than current charters. Instead of being paid for ADM for the first 20 days, schools could get paid on the number of students that complete a class. Dr. Weeks commented that there was a funding model that NCVPS gets paid in which they receive a fraction of the school's ADM because the school provides some support for the student. She presented the different ways that schools support students through the current NCVPS model. Dr. Medley explained that the entity that holds the charter would have to be a non-profit.

Dr. Medley asked if the Council wanted to keep the 50 page limit for the narrative portion of the application. Mr. Maimone noted that applications should not be longer than 50 pages. Dr. Medley explained that the SBE chair noted that the Fast Track applications were just under 75 pages and would like to Council to think about the 50 page limit. Ms. Adams commented that the repetition of the past applications could be diminished if the page limit is shorter. Mr. Betterton added that the applicants needed to understand that they will not get to add any new information and they need to include all of their information as succinct as possible. Dr. Medley asked if the Council would like for classes be synchronous or asynchronous. Mr. Maimone noted that charter schools were supposed to be innovative and they do not have to follow the same class size. He noted a school in Arizona that has a successful hybrid model. Ms. Turner noted that there needed to be some guidelines on the number of students a teacher of record has. Ms. Adams asked how the virtual school would comply with the new mandate of 1,200 hours. Dr. Medley noted that that was a question that is being asked around the country. Ms. Turner replied that it did not matter how much time it takes to complete a course as long as he/she is proficient on the EOG.

Mr. Betterton suggested that this topic be further discussed tomorrow after

	everyone has had an opportunity to think about it.
Mission Statements Training	<p>Dr. Medley introduced Dr. Les Stein and explained that at the last Council meeting a request was made for some professional development to be presented on mission statements. Dr. Stein began his presentation by noting that there were no real inconsistencies in the mission statements in current North Carolina charters. He noted that mission statements were important because they define where the school is going. He displayed three overarching questions that needed to be asked when creating a mission statement. He then provided three purposes of a mission statement. He added that mission statements needed to be discussed so that the stakeholders understood the reason for its existence. Dr. Stein presented statements about what a mission statement should be and added that the information should not be flowery. He noted that it was very important for mission statements to be measurable and quantifiable. He presented six qualities of a good statement. Dr. Stein presented an example of a charter school's mission statement to show how a mission statement could be formulated. He concluded the presentation by stating a mission statement should clearly delineate why the school exists and what it would accomplish.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton noted that it was always good to hear the information that he presented because the Council gets off target every now and again.</p> <p>Mr. Maimone asked to review the agenda for tomorrow. He asked if the annual review needed further discussion. Dr. Medley replied that the SBE is currently reviewing it and will vote upon it at their November meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton encouraged the Council to give some thought to the virtual school idea. Mr. Maimone asked if the idea of charter application reviews being regional was still on the table. Mr. Betterton replied that it was still on the table.</p>
Adjournment	Ms. Turner made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Means seconded. There was an unanimous vote to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:20 pm.



**NC Charter School Advisory Committee Meeting  
State Board of Education  
Meeting Rm. 755  
NC Department of Public Instruction**

**October 17, 2012**

**Meeting Minutes**

Attendance/NCPSCAC	Aaron Means (present) Kwan Graham (present) John Betterton (present) Richard Hooker (present) Alfred Dillon (present) Rebecca Shore (present) Tim Markley (absent) Aaron Means (present)	Jennie Adams (present) Paul Norcross (absent) Baker Mitchell (absent) Alan Hawkes (absent) Robert Landry (via phone) Joseph Maimone (present) Cheryl Turner (present) Kate Alice Dunaway (present)
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>State Board of Education, Legal Council</i> Katie Cornetto (present)  <i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Thomas Miller, Consultant Lisa Swinson, Consultant Patricia Gillott, Administrative Assistant Joel Medley, Director Cande Honeycutt, Consultant	<i>Attorney General's Office</i> Laura Crumpler  <i>State Board of Education, Executive Director</i> Martez Hill

Welcome and Overview	Mr. John Betterton called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. He announced that the Council would not be meeting in November but will meet on December 10 at 10:00 am. Ms. Lisa Swinson shared upcoming Council meeting dates.  Ms. Jennie Adams asked if charter school expansions request would come to the Council. Dr. Medley replied that the SBE had not delegated that to the Council at this time but may do so in the future.
Rubric Discussions	Dr. Thomas Miller explained that every section in the table of contents had an evaluation piece. He added that it would be up to the Council to qualify each section and assign criteria. Mr. Betterton stated that the ultimate goal was fine tuning the document and making sure that it had clarity. Dr Miller stated that the Council needed to make sure that the rubric aligned with the revised application. The Council broke into small groups to discuss the rubric. Each group reviewed a specific section and would report back to the full group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business and Finance: Ms. Kwan Graham, Mr. Aaron Means and Mr. John Betterton; Operations: Ms. Jenny Adams, Mr. Alfred Dillon, and Dr. Rebecca Shore;</li> <li>• Mission and Education Plan: Ms. Cheryl Turner, Ms. Kate Alice Dunaway and Mr. Joe Maimone.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Turner shared changes that her committee proposed. Dr. Miller made the changes to the document as they were discussed. Dr. Miller clarified that all of</p>

the goals in that section were not educational goals. Ms. Turner explained that the subcommittee did not want the applicants to write new goals. Ms. Adams shared that her subcommittee wanted check marks instead of bullets. She asked the Council to create criteria for awarding an inadequate. Ms. Adams asked legal to advise the Council on whether “will” or “should” be used in the Marketing Plan. Ms. Crumpler stated that the Council was looking to see if what the applicants said was reasonable. She stated that it could be defended anyway and it was up to the Council. Part of that statement was a psychological way to see if applicants know that this is something that they must do. Dr. Joel Medley read from the statutes to explain why the statement uses “will”. Ms. Adams explained that her subcommittee changed the rating on Civil Liability and Insurance to meet or not met. Dr. Landry joined via phone

In the Governance portion, Ms. Dunaway asked how whether an applicant had applied for a nonprofit corporate would be assessed. Ms. Turner suggested “yes” or “no”. Mr. Betterton stated that the rating would not be an issue. Ms. Adams suggested that it be assessed with met or not met because it has no significance on whether the application would go through or not.

Mr. Means shared proposed amendments to the Financial Plan section. In the “Total Budget Revenue” section he suggested that examples be added so the applicants would know what the Council was looking for. In the Budget narrative section, he suggested that page numbers be added to each bullet so that each Council member would be looking at the same section in order to gather information to assess that information. On also requested clarification on which signature page the section was referring to.

Ms. Dunaway asked if applicants had to identify the name of the firm. Dr. Medley asked if during the OCS review if an application does not have the name of the firm if the Council would like the application pulled. Ms. Tuner stated that we are not in the business of educating people and the application should be pulled. Ms. Dunaway stated that certain sections are deal breakers like Open Meetings Laws and the name of the firm. Dr. Medley stated that the Council needed to inform OCS of what the deal breakers were so that proper screening could occur. Ms. Crumpler stated that the Council needed to be consistent in their reviews. Mr. Dillon replied that if it was in the application it should be expected to be addressed. Mr. Betterton asked if OCS could make a list of deal breakers and let the Council discuss it before the conclusion of the today’s meeting. Dr. Miller asked if there needed to be criteria for Met or Not Met. Ms. Dunaway replied that there needed to be a definition. Mr. Dillon replied that if they are going to be running a school they should understand that.

Ms. Turner stated that the conversation needed to start with what sections are deal breakers. Mr. Betterton suggested that the Council go through the application and determine the deal breakers. Ms. Dunaway reminded the Council that the Education Plan, Finance and Governance are those sections.

The Council went through each section and identified which sections would be “Deal Breakers”. The identified Education Plan, Operation and Capacity and

	<p>Finance as the “Deal Breaker” sections. Dr. Medley explained that the rubric and application mirror perfectly because that was one thing that the Council stated that they wanted. Dr. Medley stated that OCS may have to delay the application submission to the Council by seven days because the LEA Impact Statement has to arrive to the LEA. He explained that all the applications that were submitted to the Council had a signature and the application does not mandate that the Board chair sign the document. Ms. Tuner sated that she was concerned about this because the author may sign it without getting the input of the Board chair. Ms. Adams asks if the rubric needs to be changed to reflect this information. Mr. Betterton stated that it could not be changed in the application but Dr. Miller needed to make sure it was covered in the resource manual and in his training.</p> <p>Dr. Landry referred to the Education Plan section of the rubric and asked if it should refer to Pathways. Mr. Betterton replied that charter schools are not required to follow the Pathways. Dr. Landry stated that if he saw three inadequacies he was going to be against forwarding that application. Dr. Shore stated that taking a percentage of the ratings would be adequate. Dr. Landry shared that Superintendents were discussing the process that the Council took and have questioned how some schools got through. Dr. Shore replied that if applicants omit something they should not go forward. Mr. Maimone suggested that there be a deal breaker bullet that affects the deal breaker sections. Ms. Turner stated that it is not necessary to identify the deal breakers. Dr. Medley replied that the Council has to be transparent. Mr. Means stated that there are certain bullets in the sections that are deal breakers. Ms. Dunaway suggested that the Council look into each section to determine which bullets are deal breakers. Dr. Shore suggested that if there are any inadequacies the applications it would not be forwarded by the Council.</p>
	<p>The Council went into closed session for an attorney client session.</p>
	<p>During lunch their working lunch, subcommittees discussed which bullets in each section where deal breakers. In section three, Ms. Turner shared anything other than special programs and at risk students was a deal breaker. Mr. Maimone asked if any of those were inadequate the entire section would be marked inadequate. Mr. Martez Hill asked Ms. Turner about whether or not the at risk section was a deal breaker. Ms. Tuner explained that that section is readily fixable because it was not a reflection of the whole school.</p> <p>In section four, Ms. Adams stated that anything that was related to the law was a deal breaker. Dr. Sore discussed adding the word “concerned” so that the section would not be stopped but flagged. Dr. Shore suggested that the section be divided into two sections deal breaker and not deal breaker. Mr. Dillon stated that if it is in the application then it should be addressed. Ms. Dunaway agreed but stated that “clear” would be what would open up discussion among the subcommittee members. Mr. Betterton posed that an applicant may not have a clear plan for a facility. Ms. Turner stated that they should at least have a plan. Mr. Maimone suggested that governance not be its only subcategory but be added to Organizational Structure. Mr. Betterton stated that schools who had an EMO, who were replicating or converting then those sections, would be</p>

	<p>deal breakers for those applicants. Dr. Shore stated that governance, projected staff, admissions, projected student enrollment, and were deal breakers. Dr. Miller asked if the application had to be changed to reflect the changes. Ms. Adams stated that the rubric still aligns. Mr. Maimone suggested that Governance be added to the title of Operation and Capacity so that it would read Governance, Operation and Capacity. Mr. Means stated that everything in the Financial Plan was a deal breaker with the exception of the budget narrative.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton suggested that comments should be required in the summary section of the rubric regardless of whether the application was approved or not. He further suggested that there be a tally vote overall and at the end of each section. Ms. Dunaway suggested that the section headings be updated on the back page. Mr. Means read an email from Dr. Landry in which he asked if a flow chart could be included so that the document reflected the deal breakers. Dr. Miller stated that he would mark them with asterisk. Dr. Shore suggested that they be marked high priority. Mr. Means stated that they have to be explained and noted that inadequacies would result in the application not being forwarded. Ms. Adams asked if there were sections that were marked inadequate if they will not go forward. Mr. Betterton stated that subsections could cause the section to be inadequate.</p> <p>Dr. Miller informed the Council that he emailed everyone a copy of the OCS initial screening sheet that would be used for screening and not an evaluation tool. Mr. Maimone stated if one thing is marked no, the council should not receive it for review. Dr. Miller stated that he took every section from the rubric and added yes/no. If it was not addressed, OCS would not forward it. Ms. Crumpler asked how putting the page numbers sequentially would be assessed. Would the application be thrown out if it is not sequential? Ms. Dunaway stated that having the pagination so specific would be difficult. Ms. Adams stated that it was difficult figuring out what page number everyone should have been looking Dr. Medley stated that Ms. Cande Honeycutt had added text boxes to each section so that the document flowed. Dr. Miller stated that when OCS did the screening the page numbers were not a deterrent from it being forwarded.</p>
LEA Impact	<p>Mr. Betterton stated that the LEA Impact Statement allowed schools give input. He encouraged the Council to offer their thoughts and ideas. Mr. Martez Hill mentioned that he sent the Council a copy of the vision statement that the SBE had adopted. He posed the following questions: What can be done to ensure that a child receives a quality education regardless of where he/she is being educated? What type of data might be shared? Mr. Maimone replied that the free markets should be allowed to work where it is business or education because one size fits all doesn't work. He added that there will always be a conflict with oversight and there will be more accountability when there are more choices. The parents and students interest would be the accountability. If the system is working they will stay if it is not they will go elsewhere. Ms. Adams stated that accountability was already in place but more dialogue and collaborative work was not there. Mr. Hill stated that there was accountability for charters and public schools but there was nothing for students who attend at private places.</p>

	<p>Mr. Hooker asked Mr. Hill to summarize the SBE mission. Mr. Hill explained that there are three diagrams. The first diagram shows a traditional K-12 school (95%) and private (5%). The second diagram shows various models of schools but they are disconnected. The third diagram would show these various models but they are collaborating and sharing with each other. He asked how the collaboration could be incentivized. Ms. Graham replied that there would always be competition but it came down to dollars and cents. The market is being driven by the parents and what is needed for their child. Mr. Hill asked if there was any role for SBE or Council to bring the people together or if the market would force collaboration? Ms. Graham replied that they would be forced because it would force a healthy conversation that highlights how each area is specific to each child. Mr. Maimone stated that the local funding model between LEAs and charters has caused a divide and if that was not present the collaboration would have already happened. Ms. Turner added that charters have to bill the LEA and it opens up bitter back and forth about what is local dollars and what is not.</p> <p>Mr. Hooker stated that he saw some opportunities to have courageous conversations from all the parties. He added that education had to be rethinking so that leadership would have open courageous conversations. Mr. Betterton stated that having educational think tanks where leaders of the private, charter and traditional schools get together in regions and put issues on the table and discuss them and come back with solutions. Dr. Shore stated that student work and student excellence should be in the middle of the discussion. Mr. Hooker added that policy makers and business leaders should also be a part of the discussion. Ms. Adams asked how do LEAs get on board with the charter movement and delete negativity. NCAE and NCSBA are entities that are still fighting against charter schools. Ms. Turner stated that the think tank should include them.</p> <p>Mr. Hill shared that DPI constantly provides training to traditional schools and several charter schools with RTTT monies but other charter schools have not been included in the training. Ms. Turner stated that RTTT is the first time that charters have been invited to DPI trainings in large groups. Mr. Dillon stated that what drove education after World War II because they started looking at the military where the soldiers could not read and write. He added that the individual kids were being failed because society has changed. Mr. Hill stated that the SBE is trying to have a balance to ensure that there is access and quality of opportunity for students</p>
New Business	<p>Dr. Medley advised the Council to visit the OCS website. He noted that there was a tab for best practices and a section called charter conversations. He asked the Council to share these best practices with OCS so that they could be highlighted and be shared with the public.</p> <p>Mr. Hooker stated that Howard Lee Institute recently held a conference in which the topic was Closing the Gap. It represented the courageous steps to break the old mold and paradigm and he applauded his efforts.</p> <p>Mr. Maimone asked about establishing regions for charter application reviews. Mr. Betterton asked Council members who are in the western region if they</p>

	<p>would be willing to commute to the East. Mr. Hooker noted that he would.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton stated that school systems were going to start rising a point that the large number of charter schools may cause an LEA to not be able to offer what the students need. The Council needed to figure out how to make a decision about the impact statement to ensure that students have quality options. Ms. Turner stated that the Council may need to consider the number of charters that are already operating. Mr. Betterton stated that it is more than just numbers but we also have to look at what the charter and the LEA offers. Mr. Hooker said that there should be some geographical integrity. There needed to be a sound basic education for all children.</p>
Adjournment	<p>Mr. Maimone made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Graham seconded. It was unanimous to adjourn. The meeting ended at 3:20 pm.</p>