

NC Charter School Advisory Committee Meeting
State Board of Education Meeting Room
NC Department of Public Instruction

June 20, 2012

Meeting Minutes

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

Welcome and Overview	<p>At 9:00 am, the meeting was called to order by John Betterton. He stated that the goal was to spend ten to twelve minutes on each application. Baker Mitchell asked to address the Council. He shared that he did not feel comfortable overriding a subcommittee's recommendation and that he will have to abstain from voting. He added that he trusted the subcommittee, who spent 160 hours reviewing the applications, and he asked that the Council accept the recommendations as they are. In view of the legal challenges they would be hard pressed to challenge any view that the subcommittee presented. It would be similar to someone prescribing medicine and they are not a doctor.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton stated that although he understood Mr. Mitchell's points, as a member of the Council, he wanted to hear from each subcommittee. Also, from a legal standpoint, it had to be action taken by the full Council. Laura Crumpler added that there was no time limitation and that the Council should do whatever it takes to thoroughly review each application. She reminded the Council that last time the Council had a different view than the subcommittee on some applications and that the subcommittee is the first stage of the review. Mr. Betterton stated that the Council would continue as planned and that they would</p>
----------------------	--

	take the thoughts that Baker had into consideration for the future.
Review of Subcommittee A's Applications	<p>Kwan Graham represented Subcommittee A and began the discussions.</p> <p><u>Addie C. Morris Children's School</u>: Ms. Graham stated that her committee recommended that the applicant come back for an interview and that most areas were rated excellent or average. She noted that there was one area in health and safety in which they would like the applicants to revisit their application to ensure that food and nutrition guidelines were met. Mr. Betterton asked if there was an impact statement included and if it was a conversion school and Jennie Adams replied no to both questions. Ms. Graham added that the subcommittee had concerns that were noted on the rubric related to governance and transportation but the thought those questions could be clarified in an interview. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.</p> <p>Robert Landry entered at 9:10 am.</p> <p><u>Aristotle Preparatory</u>: Ms. Graham noted that there were some concerns about governance and other areas but the application was strong enough to come back for an interview. Ms. Adams added that one of their strengths was the relationship with Johnson C. Smith University. Timothy Markley asked if there was anything in the application about the relationship with Johnson .C Smith, and Ms. Adams replied that there was no letter included in the application. He also pointed out that eight of the ten applications that were submitted for Charlotte-Mecklenburg were being reviewed by the Council and that the Council should take a look at that as a whole for the LEA. Ms. Graham added that the applicants support the need for the school and that the school spent a lot of time focusing on data. Mr. Mitchell asked if there was a Team CFA agreement included in the application. Mr. Betterton noted that that was one of the concerns listed on page 3 of the rubric. Alan Hawkes stated that the impact statement is immaterial since there is no cap on any LEA. Ms. Graham noted that her subcommittee found that the impact statement do play a part in this process. Al Dillon added that for the sixty applicants that the Council has, the mission is to improve the education status of North Carolina. Mr. Betterton stated that the SBE has asked the Council's input on the application process. Ms. Graham added that the subcommittee would like to see some clarification in grievance and the roles of the staff. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.</p> <p>Ms. Crumpler asked why some Council members were abstaining from voting on these applications. Dr. Landry asked if Mr. Mitchell had shared his reasoning earlier. When he was informed that discussion had occurred, Dr.</p>

Landry said his rationale was the same as Mr. Mitchell.

Cabarrus Charter Academy: Ms. Graham stated that governance was marked as inadequate. Ms. Adams added that there was also an inadequate marked in transportation. Mr. Betterton asked if there were any additional question or comments. He stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.

Cameron Creek: Ms. Graham began the discussion of Cameron Creek by noting that there were no inadequacies in any areas. Mr. Betterton asked if there were any questions and opened the floor for discussion. He stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.

Charlotte Choice Charter: Ms. Graham stated that although the subcommittee noted some concerns on the rubric in governance and projected staff , there were no inadequacies in any areas. Dr. Markley asked it a letter was delivered to the LEAs and Joel Medley responded that it was delivered to both LEAs. Kate Alice Dunaway pointed out on page four of the rubric that there was a comment that the applicants would need to apply for the one hundred eighty day waiver. Ms. Adams added that the committee was not sure if they had to apply for a waiver. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.

Charlotte Day Academy: Ms. Graham stated the subcommittee recommended that the applicant not be recommended for an interview because of concerns with their governance and budget being inconsistent. She added that the application had numerous inadequacies and the committee was not sure if the school was a conversation school or not. Mr. Hawkes asked if there was any clarification from OCS staff as whether this was a conversion school. Ms. Graham answered that the application stated that it was not, however, it read as a conversion school. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.

Douglass Academy: Ms. Graham stated that the subcommittee recommended them to come back for an interview even though the special education and transportation sections of the rubric were marked inadequate. Ms. Crumpler asked who RBA was in the application. Ms. Adams answered that RBA is Roger Bacon Academy an EMO operating in North Carolina. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in

for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell, Dr. Markley and Dr. Landry abstaining. Dr. Markley stated that he abstained because the school located in his LEA.

Eliada Academy: Ms. Graham stated that her subcommittee recommended that they come back for an interview. She added that this is a small school with enrollment projected at 67 and a focus on mental health and behavior issues. Mr. Hawkes asked if there was a compelling reason as to why the school is so small. Ms. Graham answered that it is specialized program that focuses on behavior and mental health issues. Ms. Adams noted that since there is resident and off campus portion that the subcommittee was not sure how governance and accountability would be handled. Mr. Dillon asked what type of special needs and how was the lottery going to be handled. Ms. Graham noted that these concerns were noted on the rubric. Ms. Crumpler reminded the Council that Grandfather Homes has a similar model. Mr. Dillon asked if the students would be referred to the school or if the parents would bring the students. He also questioned whether the students would be able to meet NC accountability measures. Ms. Graham shared that the applicants addressed having a lottery, as well as a plan for gifted and ELL students. She added that if the Council was going to ask them to explain how their students were going to meet the accountability measures that all applicants would also have to address that question. Mr. Betterton noted that the application was not cookie cutter and the definition of success for this school would be a little different. Ms. Dunaway noted that the school needed to address funding based on the movement of their population. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 1 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining and Mr. Dillon dissenting.

Heritage Collegiate Leadership: Ms. Graham began the discussion by stating that the subcommittee did not recommend the applicants for an interview. She noted that there were inadequacies in special education, student conduct, projected staff business plan and health and safety. She added that the budgets did not match, one of the goals in the education plan was unrealistic and the application overall lacked specificity and clarity. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.

Howard and Lillian Lee Scholars: Ms. Graham reminded the Council that this applicant was accepted through the Fast Track round but due to no facility, the decided not to pen up in August but retry during this round. She added that there was one inadequacy noted in the rubric in the area of transportation. Dr. Landry stated that he would recuse himself from the vote. Mr. Hawkes added that he was upset with the applicants for withdrawing their application but after talking with some people he understood that the applicants did not realize the

number of hoops they would have to jump through in Chapel Hill. He also recused himself. Dr. Landry further clarified that he was called in for a meeting in which the school was discussed. Mr. Betterton noted that the Council has to exercise their own judgment because the charter school community size ensures that they will all come in contact with a variety of individuals and he was appreciative of the Council members who made it aware that they had some contact related to the application. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 3 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining and Dr. Landry and Mr. Hawkes recusing.

Mr. Mitchell asked Crumpler if there was a difference between recusing and abstaining. Ms. Crumpler replied that there wasn't a big difference because you can abstain or recuse because of conflict.

Langtree Charter Academy: Ms. Graham stated that the subcommittee recommended them to come back for an interview even though there were concerns about governance. She also added that the application was marked inadequate in projected staff, transportation and business plan. Dr. Markley questioned why the subcommittee chose to forward the application if it received three inadequacies. He further added that applicants should reflect their best in the application because they get one chance to showcase their application. Mr. Betterton noted that even though there were some inadequacies, it wasn't enough to kill the application. Ms. Adams and Ms. Graham stated that they wanted clarification because there was nothing missing from the application. Mr. Dillon wanted to know the name of the EMO. Ms. Adams stated that the EMO was Charter School USA. Ms. Dunaway recused herself due to conflict. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 5 to 2 with Mr. Mitchell and Dr. Landry abstaining.

The Council took a break at 10am and reconvened at 10:12am.

New Bern International Academy: Ms. Graham stated that the application received inadequacies in mission and governance. She clarified that the need was not as educationally supported as and it would need some clarification. Mr. Betterton stated that their narrative went off on a tangent. Ms. Dunaway asked if the applicants would be adding grades 6-8. Ms. Adams answered that the chart did not address that they wanted to go the twelfth grade. Ms. Dunaway then asked if the education plan addressed grades K-12. Ms. Adams replied yes. Mr. Hawkes asked about the final enrollment of the school and the targeted population. Ms. Graham noted that that was something that the subcommittee wanted clarified. Mr. Betterton stated that it was hard to figure out the mechanics of the applications versus what the applicants were proposing. Ms. Adams added that the applicants were clear in enrollment but they were just inconsistent. Ms. Graham requested that the Council look at the

comments listed on the rubric in governance and mission to determine whether what the subcommittee listed was a request for new information or clarity. Mr. Betterton added that the by-laws seemed to be cut and pasted. This seemed to be a big concern with a number of applicants. Dr. Markley added that there are no legal requirements for transportation. Dr. Landry commented that the Blue Ribbon Commission states that governance and mission are the most important things that we have to look at and if it is not right there is nothing to look at. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion failed 3 to 7 with Dr. Markley, Aaron Means, Mr. Hawkes, Ms. Dunaway, Mr. Dillon, Dr. Landry, and Mr. Betterton dissenting

Springs Academy Charter: Ms. Graham began by informing the Council that this application had projected enrollment of thirty-eight. They deemed this application as incomplete because a big issue was the budget. There was not enough information about where the money was going to come from. Ms. Graham added that the applicants mentioned getting a line of credit but there was no plan as to how they would address the deficit referenced on pages thirty through thirty-two of the application. Mr. Hawkes stated that the difference between this application and the Corolla application was the amount of community support Corolla had. Dr. Landry added that he recently visited Corolla and the people were excited that their children would be able to attend the school. Mr. Betterton added that the subcommittee did not feel like the application was as compelling Corolla's. Ms. Dunaway recused herself from the vote because she had some tires with Barium Springs in the past. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Ms. Dunaway recusing.

STEM Education for Global Society Academy: Ms. Graham noted that the education plan was excellent and that they would recommend that this applicant be invited back for an interview. Dr. Markley inquired about whether was an agreement with UNC-W. Ms. Dunaway noted that there were five counties listed and wondered why that would be the case since charter schools serve any student in the state. Mr. Means stated that there a letter for support from UNC-W and Dr. Markley clarified that a letter of support is different from a letter stating a partnership. A partnership takes some time to establish. Ms. Adams reads the letter that is included in the application. Dr. Landry asked if the fact that one of the board members is a teacher in the school system going to be an issues. Mr. Betterton replied that that would not be an issue. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0.

Student First Academy: Ms. Graham noted that the application was marked inadequate in governance and special education. She also noted a concern under governance and would like clarification on the bylaws. Ms. Adams noted

that some of the applicants borrow and download bylaws from the internet. Ms. Graham notes that the school is a conversion school. Ms. Dunaway notes that there is a deficit in the budget and wanted to know what the usual line of action would be from the reviewers. Mr. Betterton noted that there were a number of concerns in the business plan but the deficit was in only one year. After Ms. Dunaway asked if finances would be done in house. Ms. Graham stated that finances would be handled in house. Ms. Adams notes that this is the application where the rent is two hundred dollars per year because of the applicant's relationship with CMS. Dr. Markley states that in Charlotte's impact statement on pages eighteen and nineteen that they mention students interviewing to get into high school and asked if the subcommittee discussed that. Mr. Betterton replied that they did not but would note to ask them during the interview. Mr. Means adds that he has worked with the LEA in the past but there is no conflict. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 2 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Successful Start Academy: Ms. Graham stated that the subcommittee did not recommend the application for an interview. She went on to say that there were issues with the bylaws and they were not signed or approved by the Board. The EMO financial relationship was not reflected in the budget. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

The Institute for the Development of Young Learners: Ms. Graham stated that the subcommittee had concerns with the governance and educational plan of the application. She added that although the business plan was rated inadequate the subcommittee felt that the concerns could be clarified during the interview. She went on to say that the education plan was rated excellent. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 1 with Dr. Markley dissenting and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

ZECA Schools of Arts and Technology: Ms. Graham stated that the only inadequacy that the subcommittee noted was special education, although they did have a concern with health and safety. Ms. Adams noted that this applicant has a parent school and the subcommittee wanted to know what the relationship was from the original school. Mr. Dillon asked how the school was going to going bout handling a lottery since it is an at risk school. Ms. Graham answered that the educational plan addresses the needs of all students. Mr. Dillon stated that in applications similar to this one there needs to specificity on how the needs of special populations are going to be address so that they are successful. Ms. Graham added that the school has plans for Saturday school and an extended day program with an emphasis on arts and technology which are the strengths of the application. Ms. Dunaway requested clarification on

	<p>why the school has six administrators and the teach teacher pay is \$30,000. Mr. Betterton responded that the application had a number of things that were different and that an interview would address those issues. Ms. Graham added that the application was strong enough to warrant an interview to address those issues. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.</p> <p>The Council took a break at 11am and reconvened at 11:11am.</p>
Subcommittee B's Application Review	<p>Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittees spent a lot of time reviewing the applications. He thanked the Council for their volunteer hours. Dr. Landry read from the Blue Ribbon Commission report. After reading, he commented that the document kept bringing up "innovative". He went out to say the Council should push the bar higher and not lowering the bar. He asked the Council to remember that their charge is not to be a replication of the tradition.</p> <p><u>Destination Leadership</u>: Dr. Markley represented Subcommittee C and began by reading the ratings from each section of the rubric and then reading the summary comments on page 9. Mr. Hawkes noted that Tom Miller should be commended for the detail that he used when recording the number of votes on the overall assessment of each rubric. Mr. Betterton asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.</p> <p><u>Entrepreneur High School</u>: Dr. Markley read the ratings from each section of the rubric and the summary notes on page 9. He added that a lot of work needed to be done to the application and cited that the student handbook was from another LEA with the name scratched out. Mr. Hawkes commented that the applicants did not have a concept of how many special education students they would need. He was hoping that they would resubmit because they had a good mission and target group. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.</p> <p><u>Flemington Academy</u>: Dr. Markley read the ratings from each section of the rubric and the summary notes on page nine. He added that the school is a conversion school and that the subcommittee had some concerns. Ms. Adams added that the school is in Bladen County and it would be a residential school. Dr. Markley noted that the charter school would be the nonresident component and the Boys and Girls Homes would manage it. Mr. Dillon commented that it would be difficult to keep the finances of the Boys and Girls Homes from comingling with the charter school. Mr. Mitchell added that the Boys and Girls Homes has some great students but they have struggled a lot with Columbus County Schools. Dr. Markley stated that the business plan shows that they</p>

want to convert to a charter school so that they can service students outside of Columbus County. Mr. Dillon added that charter money cannot be used for twenty-four hour care of a child and that there would need to be two budgets. Ms. Crumpler added that they would have to keep the books separate and that similar charter schools already in existence. Dr. Markley stated that the program itself is a pretty good program. Ms. Graham asked if there were any surveys from the counties outside of Columbus County because one of the concerns may be getting numbers from surrounding areas. Dr. Markley noted that the applicants looked at the number of students that would meet the criteria. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Invest Collegiate: Dr. Markley read the ratings from each section of the rubric and the summary notes on page 9. Mr. Means notes that he does understand the comment on the rubric related to "6 member schools". Mr. Hawkes responded that his committee had concerns about that also. Richard Hooker asked if there was an EMO. Mr. Betterton noted that according to their application they are going to eventually be one. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Ms. Dunaway recusing and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Island Montessori: Dr. Markley reads the ratings from each section of the rubric and the summary notes on page 9. He added that the subcommittee would like clarification on the fact that they will be having a preschool. Ms. Graham asked if there was a transportation plan. Dr. Markley replied that they are planning to car pool. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Dr. Markley and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Jefferson Preparatory: Dr. Markley stated that his subcommittee had concerns with this application because there was another one that was written exactly like it. Even the target population was the same. Mr. Betterton noted that the subcommittee had the same concern when the applications were submitted for Fast Track. Ms. Graham commented that if the Council's charge is to have innovative and unique schools she would like to know how the applicants address the needs of their area. Ms. Dunaway asked what the mission of the school is and Dr. Markley read from the application. He added that the application talks about "the students" but not the students in their area. Mr. Betterton added that he had a real concern with that. Mr. Hawkes stated that schools can have a general population that they are trying to address. Ms. Graham stated that the applicants should have looked at the area to make sure that their purpose met the needs. Dr. Markley said that there were no EMOs listed on the application. He went on to say that the two applications have two

separate nonprofits and questioned how they can create two applications that are similar. Mr. Dillon asked if the purposes are the same on both applications and Markley states that they are the same. Mr. Hawkes replies that that is not a good reason to deny an interview because they may think that they can do better than a LEA. Dr. Markley replies that Board are supposed to guide the school and how active a Board is in creating the application shows the level of commitment that they have. When applications are identical that shows a lack of Board commitment. He then asked Ms. Crumpler if that point could be considered important. Ms. Crumpler replied that the Council would have to make the decision as the importance of looking at applications individually. Dr. Markley asked if copying and pasting an application word for word shows commitment. Ms. Dunaway asked the Council to explain the difference between the identical applications and those schools that have similar EMOs. Mr. Betterton stated that if you have a replication from one area to another and you have some buy in and investment he did not have a problem with that. Mr. Dillon asked if the application stood alone would there be a discussion. Dr. Markley replied that the application was well written but he would have like to see more about the community that is going to be served. He said that if the application were a standalone, it would be invited back for an interview. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 1 with Ms. Graham dissenting and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Longleaf School of the Arts: Dr. Markley read the rating from each section of the rubric and the summary comments on page 9. Mr. Betterton asked for any questions or comments. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 2 with Ms. Adams and Dr. Markley dissenting and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

New Hope: Dr. Markley read the rating from each section of the rubric and the summary comments on page 9. He added that the subcommittee did not feel like the applicants did their homework because it appeared that they cut and paste and they were inconsistent. Mr. Hawkes added that the application was sloppy citing the use of New Hanover Schools Handbook without deleting the name. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

The Council took a break for lunch at 12pm and reconvened at 12:55pm.

Oxford Prep: Dr. Markley read the rating from each section of the rubric and reads the summary comments on page 9. He adds that there are a lot of AP courses offered in the LEA in which the application is located. Mr. Hawkes adds that it was self-evident that this school would impact the LEA because they would draw high achieving student in their school. He asked if that would

impact the education of the average students in the county. Mr. Betterton added that sometimes a child will survive and thrive in a smaller environment. Mr. Hooker asked if they addressed their facility. Dr. Markley replied that a building had been identified. Ms. Graham inquired if the applicant addressed what the difference is between what the LEA offers versus what the charter would offer. Dr. Markley read from the application and replied that they stated that they would offer more courses. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Paul Brown Leadership Academy: Dr. Markley read the rating and summary comments from the rubric. He stated that the disciple plan matched their mission and there was a ROTC focus, but no ROTC agreement. He added that without the ROTC component the school would not work. Mr. Dillon stated that he thought that the ROTC program had to be established first. Dr. Markley asked if the application could be approved without knowing if the program had been approved. Mr. Dillon replied that if they do not have some kind of agreement then they cannot get past the interview. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Dr. Markley stated that Robert J. Brown was never reviewed by the subcommittee. Dr. Miller explained that the application was incomplete and never made it to the committee. It was simply listed here in error.

Southeastern Academy: Dr. Markley read the rating and summary comments from the rubric. Mr. Dillon added that the school was a conversion school. Mr. Betterton asked if they address in their admissions policy that students who are currently enrolled do not get priority for admission. Mr. Hawkes stated that there were some inconsistencies with the leadership because there are twelve members and seemed like a large board. He added that during the interview that would need to understand that the current students do not get priority. Ms. Dunaway added that they are located in one the poorest counties in the state and they would like to offer a program for a diverse group of students. Ms. Graham asked for more information about the facility. Dr. Markley noted that they would be using the same building that they are currently in. He also added that they already have a bus route in place. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

The Achievement School: Dr. Markley read the rating from each section of the rubric and the summary comments. Ms. Adams asked what county the school will be located. Dr. Markley replied that it has a Fuquay-Varina address but it

is located in Harnett County. Mr. Betterton asked for questions or discussions. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

The NC Leadership Academy: Dr. Markley read the rating from each section of the rubric and the summary comments. He noted that the subcommittee had a question about the specific LEA because it was not disclosed. Mr. Hawkes stated that the school would be closed to Piedmont Triad because the location would need to be at or near the airport. Dr. Markley expressed a concern that other applicants may find a loop-hole if this application is accepted without a LEA listed. Ms. Dunaway asked if there was an impact statement presented to the LEA. Dr. Miller replied that an impact statement was given to the two LEAs listed in the application: Guildford and Forsyth. Ms. Graham noted that the business plan needed to reflect in the budget that the school would be participating the CAP program. Dr. Markley added that CAP is a national program and is not clear how they would establish a relationship. Ms. Graham asked if the basis of the school was the CAP program. Dr. Markley answered that there were several references to CAP throughout the application and that there are costs of the program that were not reflected in the budget. Mr. Hawkes added that during the interview it would be important to know if they have established a relationship with CAP. Ms. Dunaway asked about the contents of the impact statement. Dr. Miller read the impact statement that had been submitted via email. Mr. Betterton stated that there was no a problem with the education plan and that their plan to car pool meets the law. Dr. Markley adds that he has a problem with the CAP relationship not being defined, as well as, no LEA selected. Mr. Hawkes replied that they had contacted two LEAS. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 1 with Dr. Markley dissenting and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Thunderbird Preparatory: Dr. Markley notes that the application is identical to an earlier application. He reads the ratings from each section and the summary comments. He notes that the application is adequate. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 1 with Ms. Graham dissenting and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Uwharrie Charter Academy: Dr. Markley read the rating from each section of the rubric and the summary comments. Ms. Adams asked if there were any letters of support. Dr. Markley replied that there were a number of letters. Ms. Adams noted that the proposed LEA is Randolph where there are no existing charter schools. Mr. Betterton asked Dr. Medley if the subcommittee could ask the applicants to bring written verification during the interview, and Dr. Medley answered yes it would be possible. Mr. Betterton stated that the

subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.

Waddell Elementary International: Dr. Markley noted that the application listed three different LEAs and after with legal the subcommittee did not feel like it met the criteria for a chart school. He added that the applicants listed Randolph, Scotland and Robeson as potential LEAs. Mr. Hooker asked how many the boards. Dr. Markley responded that there would be one board for three schools. Crumpler comments that the Board could have sent in three separate applications for three separate schools and it appears that the applicant was trying to set up three schools through one application. Mr. Hooker asked if it is legally admissible for a technical standpoint to have one Board submit an application with three sites. Ms. Crumpler responded that there was a board that was called the F.R.E.E. Board so you can have more than one Board for different schools. Mr. Betterton noted that the application did not fit the organization pattern or the history of charter schools in the state. Ms. Crumpler states that statutes outlines one school per application and read from *Public School Law of NC*. Ms. Adams noted that the budget reflected three headmasters and one superintendent. Ms. Graham asked if the Council would be basing their decision upon the legal information. Dr. Markley replied that the subcommittee did not recommend the school for an interview because it did not meet the definition of a charter school. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mitchell abstaining.

Winston-Salem Middle College: Dr. Markley reads the ratings from each section of the rubric and the summary comments. He noted that the application mentioned a partnership with a college but there was not a clear definition of their connection. Mr. Hawkes comments that students move though each grade level and a new cohort begins after the ninth graders graduate. Dr. Markley added that there was no money allocated in the budget for transportation. Mr. Betterton stated that there is an existing charter school that is located on a university. Dr. Medley commented that a preexisting school purchased some property from the university. Ms. Adams notes that \$150,000 was in the budget for the university program. Dr. Markley stated that he understood that the law says that you do not have to have a facility but, the applicants plan seems unreasonable. Mr. Hooker states that, although it is a weak argument, the school as the same mascot as Winston Salem State University (WSSU). Ms. Crumpler stated that the application was thought through and they have made it creditable and doable. Dr. Markley mentions that on page five of the application there is mention of a meeting with someone at WSSU and that is all that is mentioned. Ms. Graham ask if the university if an integral part of the application. Dr. Markley states that is because they have an early college. He goes on to say that he foresees a problem with them getting approved because

	<p>they will go to the university and state that they were approved and then ask for a partnership. Ms. Graham asks if there are any Board members that are affiliated with the university. After reading through the application, Dr. Markley responded that there is no one on the Board from the university. Mr. Hooker noted that he is concerned about that. Mr. Hawkes stated that there is no documentation that the cohort model has been tried before and was successful. It is like starting a new school every four years and there is no school culture. Ms. Graham noted on page two of the application, the projected enrollment stays the same each year. Ms. Dunaway states that the challenge is the budget because then they lose students it will be difficult to replace them. Dr. Markley added that staffing would have to change each year because what is needed for ninth grade is not the same for the other grade levels. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Mitchell abstaining.</p> <p><u>Wisdom Academy</u>: Dr. Markley read the ratings from the each section of the rubric and the summary comments. Mr. Betterton asked if they were planning to integrate the arts into all of the classrooms. Dr. Markley responds by rereading the summary comments. Mr. Hawkes mentions that the mission statement was the issue because it got lost in the application. Dr. Markley added that the curriculum had not been established. Mr. Hawkes noted that the Council may be viewing the arts too narrowly. Mr. Betterton commented that the art teacher may be used as a teacher consultant. Dr. Markley states that that is not stated in the application. Ms. Dunaway asked if the EMO was going to provide the curriculum. Dr. Markley noted that on page six of the application that they state that they are going to write a curriculum that assigns with the NC curriculum but there is nothing in the budget to verify it and it is not in the education plan. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 2 with Ms. Graham and Ms. Adams dissenting and Mr. Mitchell abstaining.</p>
Packing Up	<p>Dr. Medley reminded everyone to leave any documents that were written on during the review. He announced that the interviews would take place during the afternoon of July 16th and all day on the 17th and 18th.</p> <p>He also wanted to update the Council on a State Board item for July. He stated that, based upon the passing of Senate Bill 8, schools must have a 60% composite on state testing or have made growth and there were two schools that feel into that category. He informed them that the schools had been notified based on preliminary test results. Mr. Hawkes asked if the OCS was going to go to the SBE without going to the Council. Dr. Medley responded that the matter was going straight to the SBE because the SBE policy stipulated they "shall" revoke. This decision was not a renewal but a direct revocation.</p>

<p>Concluding Business</p>	<p>Mr. Betterton stated that the Council will meet on August 27th and 28th to meet in their committees. He looked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Mitchell suggested that the Council go ahead and review Subcommittee C's application. Mr. Betterton asked for the interest of the Council. Ms. Dunaway stated that the Council still would need to meet tomorrow. Dr. Landry stated that he was in favor of completing the reviews that day. Mr. Mitchell adds that the discussion is streaming and people can hear it. Ms. Dunaway stated that she understood us moving through the applications but to change to a different day would be inconsiderate of the applicants. Dr. Medley informed the Council that Subcommittee C had already been informed that their reviews would take place on the next morning. Mr. Betterton stated that in fairness to the applicants the Council would wait. Mr. Mitchell noted that the applicants can't speak and aren't allowed to say anything during the review. Ms. Graham added that being transparent and fair is best, so she supported delaying the review. Mr. Hooker agreed.</p> <p>Dr. Markley made a motion to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by Mr. Means. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 2:33pm</p>
----------------------------	---

Minutes submitted by staff of The Office of Charter Schools.

NC Charter School Advisory Committee Meeting
State Board of Education Meeting Room
NC Department of Public Instruction

June 21, 2011

Meeting Minutes

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

Welcome	At 9:00 am, the meeting was called to order by John Betterton.
Review of Subcommittee C's Applications	<p>Alfred Dillon represented Subcommittee C and began.</p> <p><u>Anderson Creek Charter:</u> Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. Jennie Adams noted that some of the questions that were noted on the rubric related to the retrofitting could be answered in the narrative of the application. Kwan Graham stated that \$22,000 was allocated to contract services and wanted to know if the applicants spelled out the type of services. Kate Alice Dunaway stated the contract services could be anything like OT, PT, and maintenance. Mr. Dillon noted that the classroom size was too small for what they mentioned they would be doing with Study Island. Mr. Betterton questioned how they could insure that students would have twenty-four hour access to the internet. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.</p> <p><u>Falls Lake:</u> Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. He asked Laura Crumpler if it was legal if the</p>

Board could be receiving pay for services. Ms. Crumpler replied that if they are one the Board it is probably illegal for them to do that. Ms. Dunaway stated that the subcommittee could never figure out what the \$25,000 represented in the budget. Time Markley asked if there was any discussion in the education plan for what they are planning to do with middle school versus high school because there needs to be a plan. Robert Landry noted that nothing stood out to him. Ms. Dunaway sated that the school has a project based curriculum and the only reference to high school are the exit requirements. Mr. Betterton noted that there are three people on the board the subcommittee recommended that they have five. Ms. Crumpler added that there is no written requirement of how many board members that they should have. The Department's position has always been for at least five board members. Dr. Markley noted that there was a deficit in years two and three and this made for a weak business plan. Mr. Hooker stated that one of the things that stood out was the number of letters of support that came from a combination of organizations and businesses because it shows community support. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 8 to 3 with Ms. Graham, Dr. Markley and Mr. Hooker dissenting

In moving to the next application, Mr. Dillion announced that the Ft. Bragg Regional High School application had been disqualified due to changes.

Greensboro Progressive: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. Mr. Hawkes asked what was so compelling about the school that made the subcommittee request an interview when there were so many deficiencies. Mr. Mitchell commented that the committee was split and he thought it was a recipe for disaster. Ms. Adams commented that if they are invited back she would like for them to explain their budget. Aaron Means asked if the mission statement is flowing and there is nothing concrete. He wondered how that could be fixed during the interview. Ms. Crumpler replied that that will be up to the Council. Ms. Graham stated that when you look at governance you need clarification on Mr. who serves on the board and what their role is. This application is confusing. Mitchell stated that interwoven in the application they were depending on parents to run the school on a day-to-day basis. Ms. Dunaway noted that there were quite a few committees which created a lot of relationships which leads to mismanagement. Dr. Landry stated that the application gave the impression that parents were much involved in running the school and the administration was not. Ms. Dunaway remarked that the subcommittee recommended it for an interview because it had an innovative model. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion failed 2 to 8 with Dr. Landry, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Hawkes, Dr. Markley, Ms. Graham, Mr. Means, Mr. Dillon and Mr. Hooker dissenting.

High Point Academy: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. Betterton asked for clarification on whether the school is a single-gendered school. Dillon stated that the classrooms were single-gendered. Graham noted that the budget shows a low amount for professional development for the second year. Means noted that facility was rated inadequate, but there were no comments. Dunaway noted that they were exploring option but they did not have any evidence of the options. Mitchell added that there was no specificity of the size or plan. Hawkes commented that they did not understand why it was marked inadequate. Betterton noted that these are not Fast Track applicants so they do not need specifics about their facility. Mitchell stated that they would not need 55,000 square feet for 215 students. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 9 to 2 with Adams and Graham dissenting.

The Council took a break at 9:57am and reconvened at 10:06.

Leadership Learning Academy: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. Mr. Betterton states that the applicants will use the PTA for student discipline. Mr. Betterton asked if the budget reflected the Saturday school. Dr. Landry noted that the applicant mentions Project Lift and that there were no letters of support. Ms. Graham asked if the applicants were to explain the organization chart with the PTA would that be counted as a change to the application. Ms. Crumpler replied that explaining the chart is one thing and changing the chart is another. Ms. Dunaway noted that the PTA is on the same level as the Council. Ms. Adams added that the school administration has a direct line. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

Lindley Learning: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. Ms. Graham asks if there were any notes about Gifted or ELL students in their Education Plan because they will be using Reading 360. Dr. Landry stated that the Education Plan says that "everyone will thrive with our rigorous program" (Reading 360). Ms. Dunaway add that that the application mentions that everyone will participate in an afterschool program but there is not plan for transportation. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

Our Neighborhood Charter: Mr. Dillon reads the rating, comments and summary comments from each section of the rubric. Ms. Adams adds that there will be no kindergarten or first grade students. Ms. Dunaway commented that the students will be working in a business that one of the applicants own. Dr. Landry adds that the middle school students will be working in the business

afterschool through an internship. Ms. Dunaway noted that that was the vocational component but it is not a vocational school. She further added that there is a statement in the application that says that all student would be provided a lunch. Dr. Landry commented that the elementary program is called From Food to Stomach. Mr. Hawkes commented the program appeared exploitative. Mr. Dillon explained that in projected staff were not enough middle school staff members listed. Mr. Mitchell added that facilities were too small for the number of students and it would be hard to meet IDEA. Ms. Dunaway adds that they have a building and provided pictures in the application. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

Parents and Their Children: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from the rubric. Mr. Mitchell added that the projected staff was inadequate because the teacher allocation was too low. Mr. Means noted that several sections of the rubric had not been rated. Cande Honeycutt commented that the committee did not rate those sections because it deemed the application as incomplete. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

Piedmont IT Academy: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from the rubric. Mr. Betterton asked if the applicants state that they reserve the right to contact with an EMO would it have to go back to the State Board. Ms. Crumpler answered that that would have to go back to the State Board. Ms. Dunaway noted that the committee marked the Education Plan as inadequate because there wasn't enough funded for high school when you think about the number of teachers that are needed for the variety of classes that are needed. Mr. Dillon added that the school is supposed to be a STEM school. Ms. Dunaway added that the applicants did not mention anything about the K-5 program and she recommended that they fix that and reapply. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Dr. Landry abstaining.

Pinnacle Classical: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from the rubric. Mr. Dillon adds that the letter in the application is from the County Commissioner stating that the applicants will be using a county building and the cost is included in the budget. Dr. Markley clarified that the school can't just note that they will be IB because there are costs associated with that program. He added that there was no mention of what their plans would be for elementary education. Mr. Hawkes noted that the education plan was voted excellent but the mission stated was inadequate. Ms. Dunaway explained that the committee had different viewpoints related to mission statements and it was hard to come up with a consensus. Mr. Hawkes noted

that there seemed to be some confusion about the mission and that the focus should shift to the education plan. Ms. Adams suggested that the Council read the mission and give their input and Ms. Dunaway reads it aloud. Mr. Betterton and Mr. Hawkes commented that they did not have a problem with the mission statement. Mr. Mitchell said that he could not help but to comment because a mission statement should incorporate a goal and objective that can be measured. He added that the mission statement had a lot of buzz words that are difficult to measure. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. Hooker recused because the school would be located in the county in which he resides. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Hooker recusing.

Reaching All Minds Academy: Mr. Dillon read the rating, comments and summary comments from the rubric. Ms. Adams noted that there is a lot of money allocated to food services. Ms. Graham added that one of the concerns is the relationship with the Board member that could potentially provide services. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

Summerfield Academy: Mr. Hawkes recused himself from the vote and discussion of this application. Mr. Dillon read the comments, rating and summary comments from the rubric. Mr. Betterton noted that the committee was concerned that NHA will employ the principal. Ms. Crumpler stated that the statutes allows that but the teachers must be employed through the LEA. Ms. Adams noted that food service is budgeted at \$100,000 and requested more information about how that would work. Mr. Dillon answered that lunches are usually catered. Dr. Landry commented that he was familiar with the area and there is a lot of growth. Mr. Dillon added that the charter schools in the area have a waiting list of 1200. Ms. Adams noted that a documentation letter showing additional funding if the applicant is brought back for an interview. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0 with Mr. Hawkes recusing.

The Capital Encore: Mr. Dillon reads the ratings, comments and summary comments from the rubric. Ms. Dunaway added that all of the pacing guides that were included were pacing guides from an existing school that wasn't aligned with the NC curriculum. Dr. Landry noted the committee liked the idea of the arts program. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

The Expedition School: Mr. Dillon read the ratings from each category and the summary comments. Mr. Betterton asked if there were any questions or

discussions. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 11 to 0.

Vance County Learning Center: Mr. Dillon noted that this application had serious concerns from the beginning. He read the ratings and the summary comments from the rubric. Mr. Dillon added that the reason he noted this application as a ship wreck is because the school will be getting drop outs from the county and it would be difficult for the school to succeed with the number of student who will display an ability of not having success in school. He added that the school is a conversion school that does not currently have good enrollment or retention. Ms. Dunaway that they established a need and the students would benefit from the program but the way the application was written is not a plan for success. She went on to say that there were issues with the education plan, budget and so forth. Ms. Graham added that even though the model may not have worked in other places the Council should look at where the holes are. Ms. Dunaway commented that the budget that is explained in the business plan will not support the program. Ms. Adams stated the plan will not serve the students adequately. Ms. Dunaway noted that their education plan says that if students do not meet the eighty percent mastery level, they will not move on. Landry commented that the intent of the application should be commended and he would like to see them clean up the application and come back. Mr. Betterton noted that the applicants sated that they are year-round school but they will follow Vance County Public School's calendar. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 1 with Mr. Hooker dissenting.

Willow Oak Montessori: Mr. Dillon read the ratings and summary comments from the rubric. He noted that the school will not have kindergarten. Ms. Adams added that there is marketing plan and they will use a lottery. Dr. Markley noted concern that the principal would be in charge of a private school, as well as, the school in which they are applying for. Ms. Crumpler added that there are existing charter schools that operate in this manger like Sterling Montessori. Ms. Graham asks if the applicants were invited for an interview could they go back and change the fact that the principal was getting paid for both positions with charter monies. Ms. Crumpler answered that they could change it. Mr. Betterton stated that the subcommittee's recommendation was to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 6 to 4 with Dr. Markley, Dr. Landry, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Hawkes dissenting.

Wilson Preparatory Academy: Mr. Dillon read the rating and summary comments from the rubric. Ms. Adams noted that there were a lot of letters of support from the community. Mr. Betterton added that there was a high expense for meals and travel in the budget. Mr. Betterton stated that the

	<p>subcommittee's recommendation was not to invite the applicants in for an interview and asked to Council to vote. The motion carried 10 to 0.</p>
Fast Track Updates	<p>Mr. Betterton stated that Tom Miller would be providing updates on the Fast Track applicants.</p> <p>Dr. Miller noted that all applicants have a deadline of August 15th to present their C O. or they will not be allowed to open. At the present time, only one school had done so. He went on to say that five were currently doing renovations and two were still in renegotiations. Dr. Miller presented information about each school via Power Point.</p>
Approval of minutes	<p>Mr. Betterton moves the approval of the minutes. Ms. Adams makes the motion, and Mr. Hooker seconds it. The minutes were approved.</p>
Closing remarks	<p>Mr. Betterton informed the Council that the interviews will take place on the afternoon of July 16th beginning at 1:00 and all day on the 17th and 18th. He informed the Council that Joel Medley had drafted a letter to the applicants asking them to very clearly address the issues that were listed on the rubric. Each application will take thirty minutes. He added that the agenda was aggressive and there will be a time keeper.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton added that the Council will meet on August 27th and 28th so that the subcommittees can meet and we can prepare materials for to present to the SBE. He added that the automation committee felt like they were finished. Mr. Mitchell added that they had a good first start and that they needed feedback to start revisions. Dr. Medley added that that process had already been started and shared some potential revisions to the electronic application. Mr. Betterton commented that the Council will allow OCS to be in charge of this process if it was okay with them. Mr. Mitchell noted that they needed to keep Ms. Adams informed of any changes.</p> <p>Dr. Medley informed the Council that the SBE is moving to eBoard in which they have revamped their website and are moving to paperless communication. He added that they are hoping that the Council would also move in that direction.</p> <p>Ms. Dunaway updated the group on Cheryl Turner's surgery. She will not be expected back to work until late July.</p> <p>Dr. Medley informed that Council that they will be receiving a schedule of the interviews. He also added that they will be allowed ten minutes to address the Council through handouts and or presentations. Mr. Means commented that the Council needed to be strict as they are laying the framework for future applicants. Ms. Dunaway suggested that they be given fifteen minutes to present. Mr. Betterton stated that they will have fifteen minutes for their</p>

	presentation, ten minutes for the Council to ask questions and five minutes for the vote. Without further discussion, those specifics would be included in letters to each application group.
	Mr. Hooker makes a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Means seconds the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 2:33pm.

Minutes submitted by staff of The Office of Charter Schools.