

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

September 11, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Attendance/NCPCSAC	Aaron Means (present) Kwan Graham (present) John Betterton (present) Richard Hooker (present) Alfred Dillon (present) Rebecca Shore (present) Tim Markley (present)	Jennie Adams (present) Paul Norcross (present) Baker Mitchell (present) Alan Hawkes (present) Robert Landry (present) Joseph Maimone (present) Cheryl Turner (absent) 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 (present)	<i>Attorney General's Office</i> Laura Crumpler <i>State Board of Education, Executive Director</i> Martez Hill

Welcome and Overview	<p>Mr. John Betterton called the meeting to order at 12:56 pm. He welcomed everyone. He stated that in August, the SBE voted to support the recommendations of the Advisory Council. He added that he was amazed at the amount of support that was given to the Council for the work it did with the applications. Mr. Betterton thanked Ms. Kwan Graham for representing the Council during the July SBE meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Alan Hawkes apologized to Mr. Betterton for sending an email to the Council in which he spoke negatively about him not being attendance for the SBE meeting in July.</p>
Approval of Minutes	<p>Dr. Timothy Markley made a motion that the July 16, 2012 minutes be approved. Ms. Jennie Adams seconded. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>Mr. Alan Hawkes noted a correction that needed to be made on page 7 of the July 17, 2012 minutes. Dr. Markley made a motion that the minutes be approved with those corrections. Dr. Robert Landry seconded. The motion was carried unanimously.</p> <p>Dr. Markley made a motion that the July 18, 2012 minutes be approved. Mr. Aaron Means seconded it. The motion was carried unanimously.</p>

Closed session	<p>Mr. Betterton called for a motion to go into closed session.</p> <p>Mr. Alan Hawkes moved that the charter council go into closed session to discuss Cape Lookout Marine Science High School versus NCSBE and other attorney-client confidential communications. Dr. Markley seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.</p> <p>The Council went into closed session at 1:05 pm.</p> <p>The Council returned from closed session at 1:23 pm.</p>
Subcommittee Discussions	<p>Mr. Betterton reconvened the meeting and stated that the Council would go into subcommittee discussions.</p> <p>Dr. Markley shared information from the Policy Committee and stated that the documents were a revamp on the LEA Impact Statement. He added that there was no requirement that the LEAs complete the document and applicants would only be providing information on one LEA. He noted that if LEAs had a problem with the applicant receiving a charter they need to focus on more than just finances. Dr. Markley stated that CMS provided a great LEA Statement and did not mention finances at all. Ms. Kate Alice Dunaway stated that some information that the LEAs listed in their Impact Statement was incorrect. She asked if the information would be included in the application so that the applicants could deliver it to the LEA. Dr. Thomas Miller stated that they would wait until the Council discussed the LEA Impact Statement before that was determined.</p> <p>Dr. Markley stated that if it was included in the application it implied that it is the applicant's responsibility to get it to the LEA. He noted that the LEA Statements were submitted at different times during the process. He asked if there needed to be a date where the LEA had to submit so that it could be considered. Mr. Paul Norcross suggested that there be a deadline. Ms. Laura Crumpler read the statutes in which it stated that LEA Impact Statements must be submitted by July. Ms. Kwan Graham suggested that the statements should be due a week prior to subcommittee meetings. Mr. Betterton asked if it could be stated that they are due five days prior to the review. Dr. Markley asked if the LEA Impact statements were for the SBE or the Council. Dr. Joel Medley read from the statutes and explained that the Council should also consider the statements under their deliberation. Dr. Miller explained that the deadline was twenty days after the application due date and the Council started reading them prior to that date. Some of the statements came in within that date and others did not.</p> <p>Dr. Markley asked Council members to look at the LEA Impact Statement Template for Proposed Charter School Growth or Grade Expansion. Mr. Hawkes asked why the onus would be placed on the charter applicants. Dr. Markley answered that there needed to be a conversation, when possible, and the relationship needed to be bridged. Mr. Joe Maimone stated that both documents should be optional or they should not be presented at all. Ms. Dunaway stated that she was not completely in favor of the document and she had an issue with number two. Mr. Norcross read each of the statements from the document and stated that the information that was asked was redundant with the questions asked in the application. Dr. Markley agreed with Mr. Norcross</p>

that the document simply puts all the information in one place.

Ms. Graham stated that the Council needed to determine what impact the document would have. Ms. Dunaway asked what the real purpose of the Impact Statements were if they are optional. Dr. Markley replied that he did not see it as optional. Ms. Jennie Adams stated that number six was a judgmental statement and it would be interesting to see how the applicant feels they would impact the LEA. She asked what would be done with the information. Dr. Markley stated that that information has an impact on the district and the public. Mr. Maimone made a motion that a decision be tabled until the other subcommittees reported. Dr. Markley suggested that the documents be rolled into the application.

Dr. Medley stated that on the Charter School website there was a document that has charter school membership by LEA that would help answer questions about the impact of charter schools on specific LEAs. Mr. Baker Mitchell noted that the EOG/EOC scores were omitted from the impact statements and that it should be added.

Mr. Maimone shared information from the Policy Committee and stated that the subcommittee discussed the timeline. Although the committee wanted this year to move at a quicker pace, Dr. Medley reminded them that the SBE had to approve the timeline before it could be implemented. Mr. Maimone read the timeline for 2014. Ms. Dunaway asked if the date on the document should read 2013. Mr. Maimone concurred. Mr. Betterton asked for clarification on the process. Mr. Maimone explained that the applications would be reviewed as they come in.

Mr. Richard Hooker and Mr. Martez Hill entered the meeting at 2:00 pm.

Mr. Maimone explained that the SBE would approve the timeline no later than November and the applicants could get their letter of intent in by January. Mr. Baker asked for clarification on the timeline because the planning year and DPI Board Training overlapped. Ms. Dunaway explained that the planning year is the year before you open and the Board Training occurs during that time. Ms. Adams asked if there was time allotted for OCS to read through the application and weed through the incomplete applications. Mr. Maimone stated that that had been considered in the timeline. Mr. Mitchell asked if the Board training could be done in four months. Dr. Medley answered that the Board training would also include DPI departmental trainings. He added that once the SBE approved the timeline OCS would not wait until January to do training.

Ms. Dunaway stated that the Letter of Intent and LEA Expected Impact document could be a cover letter. Mr. Mamoine stated that the letter of intent does not need to be an application and should be short and simple in one page. Mr. Norcross asked about the purpose of the Letter of Intent. Mr. Maimone answered that it would give the Council an idea of the number of applicants, the region of the proposed charter school and would allow the Council a time to plan.

In reflection of the process that the SBE uses to make decision, Mr. Betterton suggested that the Council discuss the different information from the subcommittees today and the Council would vote after they have had a time to think about it overnight.

Mr. Mitchell asked for clarification of the dates on the timeline. Dr. Medley explained that there would be two processes occurring at the same year. He added that the dates would be added so that the timeline would be clear.

Mr. Maimone asked the Council to look at the Compliance Checklist. He explained that the document would be used by OCS. He explained the color coding on the document. He went through the document and discussed areas that were in red. He noted that a signature page was added to the last page. The goal of this would be for OCS and the school's Board to have an annual review of the school. Mr. Norcross asked how much of the information was covered in the annual audit. Ms. Crumpler replied that there was no reason why OCS cannot go behind the auditors.

Mr. Betterton asked if OCS could handle completing this document. Dr. Medley explained that OCS would be completing it during site visits. He further added that sometimes Boards inform OCS that they had no idea about the school's finances or accountability. He stated that the intent was to have it completed by the Fall. Mr. Norcross asked about the number of man hours it would take for OCS to complete the document. Dr. Medley replied that he did not know how many man hours it would take. Ms. Graham stated that if there are more schools there would need to be more consultants. Dr. Medley answered that although we are behind some states with the ratio of consultants and schools, our values are based on integrity and the work would get done.

Mr. Norcross stated that the annual review needed to be added to the application so that applicants would know what they there school would be assessed on. Dr. Medley stated that there was already a document that OCS uses to determine which schools get visited and how many times. He further explained that OCS uses a similar document during site visits.

Mr. Maimone stated that a lot of the fields could be populated automatically. Mr. Hawkes stated that the document would be helpful to OCS, the Council, SBE and the school. Mr. Hawkes remarked that the level of compliance would give everyone a heads up on who is doing well. Dr. Markley stated that the paper and reality don't always match. Mr. Norcross asked if the document would already be filled out prior to the site visits. Mr. Mitchell replied that page 2 would be by an outside source and page 3 is an annual audit. There are some audits that the schools are required to have that are not included in the document and some that are repeats. The information could come from the audits.

Ms. Adams stated that the subcommittee met the morning of September 11th. She thanked Dr. Miller for assisting the subcommittee. She explained that the discussion had been going on since the Fall and the subcommittee wanted the application to be lean and clean. Mr. Betterton stated that there were a number

of questions that kept coming up during the application reviews and the revisions would make the process clearer.

Ms. Adams stated that the goal was to have the application online and to have the applicants provide one hard copy. She noted that all of the appendices were at the end. Dr. Markley asked if it were possible to have a total online submission and a one page signature page. Dr. Miller explained that the hard copy would have to be signed by the Board chair. There were 13 online submissions and some were completely unreadable. He also posed that if documents were completely done online it may be difficult for them to make amendments.

Ms. Dunaway stated that the pages should be set and they should not be allowed to create a table of contents. Dr. Miller replied that it is not mandated that there be a table of contents. Mr. Norcross asked if the application would be done online and if so then there would be no need for a table of contents. Dr. Miller explained that those decisions would be made by the Council. Ms. Adams stated that she used the table of contents and liked having it.

Ms. Adams went through the application and noted the changes that Dr. Miller and subcommittee made. She stated that on the signature page additional years after the fifth year were added. The mission and purposes page gives a definition for the school's mission and vision and in the appendices evidence of the need would be presented. Mr. Mitchell asked if the application was asking for information that will never be used or looked at. Ms. Adams replied that the information was used. Ms. Dunaway noted that it would be a challenge to include all of the community surveys. Mr. Mitchell stated that some applications had several pages of data. Ms. Adams replied that the Council is not asking for that detail.

Dr. Landry asked what defines what the range of a good mission and vision statement. Ms. Adams noted that the definition has been added to the application to give guidance. Mr. Hawkes stated that brevity should be used on the mission and vision. Ms. Dunaway stated that it was challenging for her subcommittee and there needed to be consensus and feels very strongly that there needs to be some education on what is acceptable. She questioned why the application was now asking for a vision statement. Dr. Miller answered that there were several schools that turned in their five year review and their mission statement had changed. He further noted that mission statements should not change, but vision statements could. Ms. Crumpler stated that any changes had to be approved by the SBE.

Dr. Markley remarked that if the application is shrunk it takes away the individuality. Mr. Mitchell replied that taking out all of the extra things gives you more freedom. Dr. Markely added that he was afraid that the Council would see the same application that is simply cut and pasted.

Ms. Adams shared that Dr. Miller split out information that K-8 schools would share versus high school. She informed the Council that there is not a requirement for charter schools to follow the graduation requirements. She further noted that the applicant does not have to provide information about AIG

	<p>unless they have an approved plan. Ms. Dunaway asked if an EMO is replicating a school how it would be addressed. Ms. Adams stated that that would be a decision made by the Council.</p> <p>Dr. Landry asked if homeless children had to be addressed. Ms. Crumpler stated that it was not required through the statutes. Dr. Miller stated that if there are openings in the school the homeless children would have to accepted. Ms. Crumpler explained that they do not get preference they get equal acceptance. Ms. Adams shared that one of the other major things added was that the Board had to have proof that they had input in the writing of the application.</p> <p>Ms. Adams asked the Council to determine whether EMOs needed to explain how their current schools were performing. Mr. Betterton noted that this question is currently asked of private schools. Ms. Adams stated that the limit for the appendices was suggested to be one hundred pages and the application itself would be under thirty pages. Mr. Mitchell stated that there shouldn't be a page limit because of the amount of information that the application is asking for.</p> <p>Mr. Betterton thanked the subcommittees for the work they had done. He stated that the applications should be as brief as possible. Mr. Mitchell noted that on the agenda for September 12th the last thing to be discussed was Standard of Review and he asked that it be moved to the first thing. Ms. Adams asked who would create the rubric after the application had been decided. Dr. Medley replied that OCS would create the rubric. Mr. Betterton stated that the Council had a lot of homework.</p>
Adjournment	<p>Ms. Adams made a motion that the Council adjourn and Mr. Hooker seconded. The meeting adjourned at 3:49 pm.</p>

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

September 12, 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 (present)	Jennie Adams (present) Paul Norcross (present) Baker Mitchell (present) Alan Hawkes (present) Robert Landry (present) Joseph Maimone (present) Cheryl Turner (absent) Kate Alice Dunaway (present)
Attendance/SBE/DPI	<i>Office of Charter Schools</i> Thomas Miller, Consultant Lisa Swinson, Consultant Patricia Gillott, Administrative Assistant	<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 stated that future meeting agendas would be placed on E-board. In light of that, Council members would need to provide information three weeks in advance of the meeting. He shared the he asked OCS to help provide the Council with someone who could provide training about missions and visions. He also asked Council members to share any other resources that they had.
Subcommittee Discussions and Voting	Mr. Betterton began by informing the Council that the Office of Charter Schools would be taking the information provided by the Council and amending the rubric. Ms. Kate Alice Dunaway stated if we wait for approval in October, the timeline process would be affected. Dr. Miller stated that OCS would complete two drafts based upon the SBE recommendations. Mr. Maimone asked Council members to refer to the revised application timeline that he emailed to them. He reminded Council members that the purpose of the Letter of Intent was to inform the Council about the number of applications that may come in. Ms. Dunaway stated that applications would not be placed online until the final due date. Dr. Miller stated that they would be available for public records request. Mr. Hawkes asked if there was any way that the applications could be kept from being duplicated. Ms. Crumpler

replied that there was no way to prevent the applications from being a public record and the applications would not have to be put online. Mr. Maimone asked why an application could not be protected if it is under review. Ms. Crumpler replied that NC has one of the most lenient public records laws in the country.

Mr. Maimone stated that he was comfortable with the timeline the way that it was. Mr. Mitchell asked if the Council had the right to reject applications that had been plagiarized. Ms. Crumpler replied that the Council had the authority to look at the integrity of the submitter. Ms. Adams asked if the subcommittee addressed what would be included in the Letter of Intent. Mr. Maimone replied that his focus was on the timeline and not the contents of the impact statement. Ms. Adams noted that LEAs and charters need to be able to give an impact statement. Mr. Betterton stated that Appendix F needed to state "Public Schools" impacting instead of LEA to include all schools. Ms. Dunaway replied that OCS needs to include that information in their training.

Ms. Dunaway asked if the Council would be having the letters of intent as a part of the application review. Ms. Crumpler stated that the Letter of Intent is required before filing an application. She then questioned the implications of an incomplete Letter of Intent. Mr. Hawkes asked why letters B-F were a part of the Letter of Intent because it appeared to be like a mini application. Mr. Dillon stated that the Letter of Intent should simply say I intend to complete an application and should have their contact information. Ms. Dunaway suggested that the information be presented in a one page format. Mr. Betterton asked if OCS could create the document. Ms. Adams suggested taking away B-F. Ms. Crumpler suggested that B-F be optional.

Dr Markley stated that the purpose of the Letter of Intent was to inform the Council that they would be submitting a letter. Dr. Rebecca Shore asked if any Letter of Intent would be rejected. Dr Markley stated that the Letter of Intent was to find out who was coming and they cannot be rejected. Mr. Dillon said that the purpose of the Letter of Intent was for planning and all that is needed is the contact information. Mr. Mitchell added that the information would help to plan regional subcommittees. Mr. Hooker asked if the Letter of Intent would be revised by the Council. Mr. Betterton answered it would be the responsibility of OCS. Ms. Dunaway made a motion that OCS create a template for the Letter of Intent that included contact information, phone number, email, possible location of school by county and potential grade span. Ms. Shore seconded. Mr. Mitchell asked if the form would be online. Dr. Markley stated that there should also be an option of mailing it. Mr. Hawkes asked for amendment to not include the grade span. Mr. Mitchell stated that it may be an issue if an applicant who does not know their grade span 60 days prior to the application. Mr. Hooker asked if the motion needed to include an amendment that the application would be online. Ms. Adams seconded the motion. The motion was carried 9 to 5 with Dr. Landry, Mr. Mitchell, Dr. Shore, Mr.

Maimone and Mr. Means dissenting.

Dr. Miller asked if the Letter of Intent would entail a mandatory training with OCS for how to complete the application. Mr. Betterton stated that was a separate discussion. Mr. Mitchell made a motion to amend the original motion to include optional information as grade level information. Mr. Maimone clarified that letters B-F would be optional with no consequence if it is not completely filled out. Ms. Dunaway reminded the Council that the information is public record.

The motion was carried 13-1 with Ms. Dunaway dissenting.

Mr. Betterton asked Council members to refer to the current application's rubric. Mr. Hawkes stated the subcommittee B passed some applications on if they met the standards and other subcommittees did it differently. Dr. Markley stated that some sections were cut and dry. They either had it or they didn't. Ms. Dunaway stated that the subcommittees needed to come to a common ground on what was inadequate, average or excellent and decide the number of inadequacies an applicant could you get. Dr. Landry stated that there was a subcommittee that sent an application through with 3 inadequacies but he did not feel he could say anything because he did not spend as much time on it as the subcommittee did. Mr. Hooker reminded the Council that it was stated in an earlier discussion that if there were inadequacies in educational plan, governance or budget the application would not be moved on.

Ms. Graham explained that some subcommittee's inadequacy meant that they wanted to bring the applicants back to get clarification. Dr. Landry asked if the subcommittee should handle that before the at large Council. Dr. Markley suggested that there be 100% from subcommittee members before it is forwarded. Mr. Mitchell agreed that applications should be adequate in the big three and it receives unanimous votes from the subcommittee. Ms. Dunaway noted that if a group is required to come to a training and the information that they were presented is not reflected in the application it should be inadequate. Ms. Graham stated that the Council needs to create standards. Dr. Landry stated that the Council should not mandate that applicants go to training. Ms. Dunaway stated that once they are a charter school that have to sign in and show that they are attending meetings.

Mr. Means stated that in The Big Three there are several things that could make an application inadequate. It would not be based on one point. Dr. Markley stated that he spent more time on "Education Plan" than "Transportation". Mr. Betterton stated that some subcommittees spent more time on some sections than others. Ms. Dunaway stated that if a checklist was used it would be irrelevant because the quality needs to be defined. Mr. Betterton agreed that a numbered check system did not measure quality. Dr. Landry asked if the Council wanted quality charter schools or more quantity. Several Council

members answered quality. Ms. Dunaway shared a personal story about her daughter's view point of the Councils review. Ms. Crumpler stated that it is impossible to have a totally objective grading system. What the Council is doing is solid and it is not capricious.

Mr. Betterton stated that he had some issues with the way the different subcommittees handled the application reviews. Mr. Betterton stated that he would like some people to reflect upon it and give feedback. Mr. Dillon stated that there was no way that the applications would be reviewed similarly. There are different degrees of expertises. Mr. Mitchell suggested that those who have a business background look at the business section and educators look at the special ed and education plan. Ms. Shore stated that if that was done that would make the process objective. Mr. Norcross stated that he referred to others during the review because those were not his areas of expertise. He suggested that the business sections be standardized but the education plan be unique to the applicants. Ms. Crumpler replied that she had no problem looking at expertise. Mr. Norcross stated that the Council had to read and understand the entire application. Ms. Dunaway stated that her subcommittee had a range of expertise and she felt confident in her subcommittee and because they were strong in various areas.

Ms. Cande Honeycutt stated that if a group reads only certain sections, the Council would not know if the sections align. Mr. Betterton stated that when subcommittees are assigned the experts exchange ideas and thoughts. Mr. Maimone suggested during the October meeting subcommittees, based on each section, are formed to discuss what would determine the rating of each section so there would be consistency. Each subcommittee needs to be consistent and know that there will always be subjectivity. Dr. Miller stated that the rubric would be aligned and streamlined with met or not met. Mr. Norcross stated that the applicants should be told what the Council is looking for beforehand. Mr. Betterton stated that OCS would take the new content and create a parallel rubric. Mr. Norcross stated that once the rubric was put online it would be like completing an online grant. Ms. Shore stated that her subcommittee came prepared to the review. They had read the applications prior and finished within two days. Mr. Hawkes asked that OCS show the Council the rubric before to it is approved.

Mr. Martez Hill stated that he was in the process of setting up a meeting with the appropriate persons in IT and OCS to create a plan to get the applications on line. Mr. Norcross stated that there was an automation committee that was overseeing it. Mr. Betterton stated that Norcross said informed him that the subcommittee was finished and that they no longer needed to exist. Mr. Norcross replied that since the application is new the committee needs to be reconvened. Mr. Betterton replied that OCS is fine tuning it. Dr. Miller stated

that there was a recent reorganization in DPI and the conversations that were had with the past template can no longer be done and the main focus is making a document that is readable. Mr. Betterton asked if the OCS needed input and support from the Council. Dr. Miller stated that he would need to find out from Dr. Medley. He stated that there needed to be some testing before it went out to the public. Mr. Betterton asked members of the automation committee to be on standby if they were needed.

Ms. Adams asked the Council to reflect on the content of the application and if there needed to be page limits. Ms. Dunaway asked what “a complete application” meant. Dr. Miller answered that at the present time the statement meant that no new information could be submitted. Ms. Dunaway asked if the applicants would be submitting a copy of the application or notification. Ms. Crumpler read from the general statutes that a copy of the application had to be submitted to the LEA within seven days. It does not have to be a hard copy. Ms. Adams noted that since the meeting yesterday, it was noted that 504 students were not addressed in the application and it has been since added. She referred to a document that Mr. Betterton created with page length suggestions. Ms. Adams asked the Council to give input on the content. A timeline is going to be added to the top sheet. Mr. Maimone asked if training would be optional. Mr. Betterton stated that that would be discussed at a later time.

Mr. Mitchell suggested that appendices be submitted in PDFs and that needed to be added to the application specifications. Dr. Miller stated that if the application is not completed by January it would need to be online and hard copies. Dr. Miller stated that it is been asked that there be a PDF export so that when the application is submitted it would be PDF in its entirety. Ms. Adams asked where the specification would be added. Mr. Norcross answered that it should be left to IT or OCS. The content is important and the formatting is. Ms. Shore asked if a date has been established to get the application online. Mr. Hawkes asked why it is not a priority. Mr. Hill replied that a meeting has been established and he was not able to state when that would happen. Mr. Betterton stated that Mr. Hill had already committed to working on getting the application online.

Mr. Maimone asked if the application needed to be specific in asking if the grades served need to be when they first open or as they progress. He suggested that “Proposed” be added to grades served and total student enrollment. Dr. Miller stated that the previous applicants answered it in different ways and SBE asked for the information. The last five years were added because projected enrollment could only be seen for five years and they may have had plans to continue to add grade levels. The intent was to find out what would be the total grade levels serve. Mr. Maimone suggested that the first line of the worksheet be deleted and the applicant only complete the chart.

Ms. Dunaway stated that a vision statement did not need to be added. Ms.

Adams asked the Council to vote on whether they agreed. The vision statement was deleted. There will be a limit of 100 characters/words for the mission statement. Mr. Mitchell read number two under educational need. He asked if the parents needed to be a part of the mission statement. Mr. Norcross suggested that the term be changed to stake holders. Mr. Mitchell stated that the Board of Directors is responsible for the fulfilling the mission and questioned why the parents and community would have input.

Mr. Maimone stated that the new application is asking for more specificity. Mr. Norcross stated that there was no need to have five pages to answer a question and that was a problem that was discussed last time. Mr. Betterton added that the application would be less than 50 pages if the Council decided to follow his recommendations. Mr. Baker asked that every major section begin on a new page. Dr. Landry noted that he did not appreciate all of the surveys that were included in the application. Ms. Dunaway suggested that there be a one page sample survey with summary data. She suggested that the six purposes be moved before the goals. Mr. Norcross stated that the automated application would allow applicants to fill it out in any order they like.

Mr. Hawkes stated that it was important that metrics stay in the application to gauge success. Dr Miller notified the Council that he removed the title Program Overview because it was repetitive. Dr. Landry asked that instead of a synopsis a graphic be used. Ms. Dunaway suggested asking for a scope and sequence chart to show the planned curriculum. Mr. Maimone suggested that they be given an option: a detailed description or preferably a graphic format. Mr. Means asked Mr. Norcross if it were online would it make a difference it was graphic or text. Mr. Norcross answered that it could be done anyway the Council liked. Dr Markley suggested that there be a text description of the graphic. Dr. Miller replied that there is already a scope and sequence chart, Appendix B, and elementary could also use it. Ms. Crumpler added that applicants could not deny admission to any child eligible in the EC section.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he needed an explanation on number two of the student conduct and discipline. Ms. Adams stated that it was there to describe what should be included in the handbook. Mr. Norcross stated that it should be in the resource section. Dr Markley stated that this section was the most cut and pasted section. Ms. Dunaway suggested that the applicants write a philosophy of how discipline should be handled in their school. Dr. Markley added that the applicant should also provide a copy of their handbook that reflected their philosophy. Mr. Baker suggested that the section name be changed to student behavior and discipline. Ms. Adams suggested that "Education Plan" be renamed "Instructional Program".

Mr. Norcross asked why the application was asking the county of residence of the board members. Ms. Adams and Mr. Maimone stated that they would like to know where the Board members live. Ms. Adams suggested that they

include county and state of residency.

Dr. Miller suggested that there be two pages allowed for organizational chart and organizational structure. Ms. Dunaway clarified if Board members have a response page and one page resume. Ms. Crumpler informed the council that the groups were not subject to the Open Meetings Law until they get the charter. Mr. Betterton noted that it would have been advantageous to look at minutes for one of the applications because they were a sham. Ms. Crumpler stated that the minutes could be considered in the deliberation of whether to grant the charter. Mr. Mitchell asked if the "Parent and Community" section was a duplication of what was already in the "Education Plan". Ms. Adams noted that she would like to see how the parents are involved and it is important to keep that section. Mr. Maimone suggested that information in the "Parents and Community" section be moved to the "Marketing" section with the first statement being deleted. Ms. Dunaway suggested renaming the "Marketing" section to "Marketing and Community Outreach". Mr. Norcross suggested "Community Relations". Ms. Crumpler stated the "Community Relations" is what you do once you get going.

Ms. Adams referred the Council to the EMO section of the application. Ms. Shore asked if charter school applicants would know the significance of knowing the data of two existing schools that the EMO has worked with. Ms. Adams stated that that information would not be in the contract. Mr. Mitchell suggested that a fund balance be added to this section. Mr. Dillon stated that OCS may have that information if the EMO had an existing school. Dr Markley asked how the Council could determine if the EMO recruited the board or if the board recruited the EMO. Mr. Mitchell suggested that a chart with competitive bids be presented. Dr. Markley replied that what the Council wants to know is if the EMO is creating a community school or just expanding an EMO. Ms. Dunaway agreed that Dr Markley's question was direct. Ms. Crumpler asked if the Council felt that they would get a truthful answer. Dr Markley suggested that the question be asked in the Board section of the document.

Mr. Hooker asked if there was data available to inform the Council of the number of schools that were being run by EMOs. Dr. Miller answered that there are currently 7. Mr. Hawkes suggested that a question be asked to provide information about the number of years it will take for the EMO to make a profit. Mr. Mitchell answered that the EMOs are private corporations. Mr. Hawkes answered that the information being asked is intrusive. Ms. Crumpler

stated that it is relevant because you have a right to know where tax monies go and who is in control of the school. The concerns are legitimate in who is educating the school. It does not mean that it will be an automatic no. Ms. Adams asked the Council members if they were in favor of asking if a facility would be provided by EMO and lifting the fund balance and surpluses for each school managed by the EMO. Mr. Maimone suggested that the second statement be removed. Mr. Mitchell answered that it would be easy to provide that information.

Mr. Maimone noted that the questions in the “Projected Staff” area of the application were very specific. Dr. Landry asked Ms. Crumpler if charter schools had to address standards for teacher retention. Dr. Miller responded that only schools who get Race to the Top monies have to complete the administration evaluation. Mr. Mitchell asked if there should be a separate intent to enroll and lottery application. Ms. Crumpler explained that the documents should be separate because the intent/lottery should only ask for minimal information. Dr. Miller stated that the enrollment form was the form that has all information. All charter schools have to have a lottery. Ms. Adams clarified that the lottery applications do not ask about race, religion or EC. Ms. Dunaway stated that was OCS job to ensure that the forms were correct. Ms. Crumpler stated that the intent of putting this in the application was to ensure that schools do not ask for that information once they are up and running. Ms. Dunaway and Mr. Norcross suggested applicants be given examples during their training.

Dr. Markley stated that his issue with the “Health and Safety” section was that applicants should be told that there are certain things that they must comply with. Mr. Mitchell, Dr Markley and Ms. Adams agreed and suggested that the section should list the specific requirements that applicants should follow and have a place in which they sign off saying that they understand. Dr Markley suggested all charter schools must comply with state and federal health safety regulation.

Ms. Dunaway stated that very few schools have a facility and what was important to her was that they understood the steps that it takes to acquire a building. Dr Markley replied that the way the application was currently written is asking them to describe their dream building. It does not ask them to explain the process.

Ms. Adams directed the Council to look at the Appendices. Dr. Markley suggested adding a question about how the board member was recruited to the Board on Appendix E. Mr. Maimone added that that question was a great

addition to the application.

Dr Miller asked if the Statement of Impact on the LEA would be included in the application. Ms. Dunaway stated that the document was for those who may have just been pulled together but for those that have been working together for over a year it would be one more thing for them to do. Dr Markley commented that a charter school has an impact on the LEA and the LEA Impact Statement was optional. Ms. Graham commented that it should be optional for the Board to complete the Statement of Impact. Dr. Markley replied that the purpose of the document was to see if the applicants understood that their charter school would have an impact on the LEA. Ms. Graham added that schools were applying because there was an educational need in the area. Norcross stated that the applicant needed to know that they will not be operating in a vacuum. Markley commented that increasing the number of charter schools affects what is being offered in the LEAS. He added that there was a lower percentage of EC students in charters and transportation was an issue in charters.

Mr. Martez Hill requested that the Council discuss the idea of creating a hybrid of a public-private partnership in which they would be accountable to the public in some form or fashion. Ms. Graham stated that a bridge needed to build between LEAs and charters. She added that it was not fair that people had to justify why they want their child to attend a certain school because parents have a choice. Dr. Markley commented that as a community member he wanted to make sure that schools are strong but he had an issue if it is done at the detriment of others. Ms. Graham replied that if the LEA was strong the parent was going to keep their children there. Mr. Betterton stated that charter schools applicants needed to recognize that they have an impact and they needed to justify their existence when they take kids out of the traditional environment. He further added that the impact could be positive or negative.

Dr Markley replied that some charters are similar to the LEA. Ms. Graham noted that some students are leaving the LEA because of overcrowding or their needs are not being met. Dr Markley replied that some are starting because they are trying to get money. Mr. Hill thanked the Council for their comments.

Dr. Shore commented that the application asked applicants to list researched based strategies. She questioned whether this would have an effect on the charter's innovation. Mr. Hooker stated that there had been a lot of models in

charter schools that were exceptional. He added that Mr. Hill was signaling for opportunities for partnerships and collaborations. Markley commented that as a superintendent he would like for there to be some way for charter schools to see that they are a part of a larger system.

Ms. Adams asked the Council members to look at the remaining forms in the appendices and give any input. Mr. Maimone made a motion to accept the application. Mr. Norcross asked if the application was going to be put online. Dr Miller replied as of right now it could not be mandatory for it to be put online. Dr. Markley made a motion to approve the new application with the page limits and after this round all application would be done online. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maimone. The motion carried 12-2 with Mr. Hawkes and Mr. Norcross dissenting.

Mr. Norcross asked for an amendment not to accept applications until the applications can be one online.

Mr. Maimone informed the Council that the purpose of the Annual Compliance Review was not to replicate but to have one place to go to have an annual snapshot for the school and OCS. Mr. Norcross asked if the document would be available on the OCS Website. Dr. Miller stated that it could be housed there. Mr. Norcross noted that the document was fine but it had a lot of redundancy. Mr. Maimone noted that the state was looking at having one online hub for data collection. Mr. Mitchell commented that was an explicit requirement for an auditor to see if the school has board members available. He asked why OCS would have to go back and check to see if it was done.

Mr. Betterton asked for clarification of how the document would be used by OCS. Dr Miller replied that OCS currently had a similar document that was used during site visit and that the information was used to guide conversations during site visits.

Ms. Crumpler explained that legal used the information when schools were nonrenwed or revoked. Schools have often said that schools do not come and check on them but the document details the conversation that was had during the visit. She added that some schools refused to share their board minutes. The purpose of asking for the board minutes was to make sure that the board was running the school and not the principal. Ms. Dunaway stated that Dr. Medley informed the subcommittee that the document would be used for renewals and would be utilized by OCS and the Council. Mr. Norcross added that the information was public and but this document just gathered it in one place. He suggested that new charters be made aware of the document. He

also asked if the document needed to be approved by the SBE and if a flow chart needed to be created to say how the data would be collected.

Mr. Mitchell noted that when his school was audited by OCS it was a costly process and was done at an inappropriate time. He added that everything that was in the Annual Compliance Review could be found in the LGC Audit. Ms. Crumpler replied that everyone that was affiliated with a charter school that was sitting in the room was with a school that had integrity. She explained that not all schools operate with integrity and the LGC may not know what to look for to establish that. Mr. Norcross asked for clarification on how the data would be collection and how the document would be used. Ms. Cande Honeycutt replied that OCS currently collets data and the Compliance Review would be used in the upcoming school year. She added that OCS may see things that the auditors may not see.

Mr. Maimone made a motion to accept the Annual Compliance Review.

Mr. Means seconded it.

Mr. Baker stated that he did not have a problem with the data being pulled together but the duplication and the effort to perform a duplication audit. Mr. Norcross stated that a process needed to be established. Dr. Landry suggested that visits not occur during testing. Mr. Means reminded the Council that a motion was on the floor.

The vote carried 12-2 with Mr. Norcross and Mr. Mitchell dissenting.

The Council begun to discuss the Letter of Intent. Mrs. Dunaway asked what name would be written for “Applicant Name”. Mr. Miller replied that that would be the lead person. Ms. Dunaway suggested that the document also ask for the schools proposed name. Dr. Markley mad a motion to accept the Letter of Intent with the proposed changes. Ms. Adams seconded. The vote was carried unanimously.

Dr. Miller reminded the Council that they needed to vote on the LEA Impact Statement and LEA Enrollment Increase document. Dr. Markley stated that the LEA Impact statements could not be required and the only change that needed to make to the document is that the applicant would only give input on one LEA instead of three. Dr. Markley made a motion to accept both documents. Mr. Means seconded. Mr. Hawkes asked if both of the documents would go to the LEA. Dr. Markley explained that OCS would send the documents to the

LEA. Ms. Dunaway stated that both documents were optional.

The vote was carried unanimously.

Mr. Betterton stated that the next Council meeting would occur on October 16th. The meeting would convene at 11:00 am. Ms. Crumpler informed the Council that they may be interviewing Cape Lookout. Ms. Dunaway suggested that the Virtual Schools discussion occur during the meeting. Dr. Miller replied that the SBE will be discussing Virtual Schools during their October meeting.

Dr. Markley stated the he had questions about funding issues, whether teacher would be synchronis or asynchronis and accountability. Ms. Crumpler stated that her concern with a virtual charter is parents had to agree to drive their children to a testing location. Also, there would have to be a parent in the room for kindergartners through second graders. Ms. Dunaway suggested that NCVPS create a charter school instead of waiting for an out-of-state group. Ms. Adams asked how the funding would be established. She noted that charters get funding based on the first twenty days of attendance and asked if that would apply for a virtual school. Mr. Hill asked if virtual public schools should be able to issue a diploma. Dr. Markley stated that the virtual public school needs to become its own LEA. They should be able to issue diplomas.

Mr. Hill stated that the idea of creating a NC Virtual school that could offer a diploma is something that could be explored. He added that legislative funding would have to change because as of now it was based on brick and mortar. Mr. Dillon commented that he had a problem with giving the virtual school the same amount of money as brick and mortar schools.

Mr. Betterton asked for a motion to adjourn.

Adams made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Maimone seconded.

The meeting concluded at 2:30 pm.

--	--

Minutes submitted by staff of The Office of Charter Schools.