

**NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY**

**September 13, 2019**

Nevada Department of Education  
700 East 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Board Room  
Carson City, Nevada

Nevada Department of Education  
2080 East Flamingo  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Board Room  
Las Vegas, Nevada

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas:**

Tonia Holmes-Sutton  
Don Soifer  
Mallory Cyr  
Sheila Moulton  
Sami Randolph  
Melissa Mackedon

**In Carson City:**

None

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Randy Kirner

**AUTHORITY STAFF PRESENT:**

**In Las Vegas:**

Ryan Herrick, General Counsel  
Rebecca Feiden, Executive Director  
Mark Modrcin, Director of Authorizing

**In Carson City:**

Michael Dang, Management Analyst IV  
Danny Peltier, Management Analyst I  
Selcuk Ozdemir, Education Programs Supervisor  
Karen Gordon, Education Program Professional  
Michael Gawthrop-Hutchins, Management Analyst III  
Susan Hanshew, Legal Assistant

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**

**In Las Vegas:**

(See attached sign-in sheet.)

**In Carson City:**

(See attached sign-in sheet.)

**Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Roll Call, and Pledge of Allegiance**

Vice Chair Melissa Mackedon called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. with attendance as reflected above.

**Agenda Item 2 – Public Comment #1**

Phil Sorenson – Public School Teacher in Douglas County, Nevada and NEA BAT Caucus Chair. Mr. Sorenson shared a letter from Elizabeth Campbell, a Public School Teacher in Clark County, Nevada, and himself setting forth concerns about children's education in Nevada. The letter went on to say it is impressive that the charter Board is diverse and represents the different regions in Nevada; however, the Nevada State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) Board meetings are held during the workday, making it difficult for the public to attend and weigh in on matters. Decisions are made without the input of those that are affected the most, which are students, parents, and stakeholders. In the interests of transparency, they requested that the meetings be held during the evening hours.

Jeremy Christiansen – Mr. Christiansen is the Executive Director for the Freedom Classical Academy in North Las Vegas but was speaking for himself and not for the school at this meeting. Mr. Christiansen stated that over the last few years the Board has spoken about the increasing need for charter schools to serve underserved populations including minorities, special education, free and reduced lunch and English language learners. The Legislature concurred that the underserved populations need to be addressed. It is imperative that this Board consider how its existing policies support charter schools serving difficult demographics. Research has found that it takes three to five years to turn around the performance of underperforming students. Under the current intervention ladder this Board has adopted, schools are required to complete this process in one year. Mr. Christiansen believes this is unrealistic based on every first-year charter school getting a notice of concern last year. Mr. Christiansen is requesting the Board to modify the intervention ladder to consider the students the charter school is serving. Charters serving 1-Star populations can make a heroic effort and still receive a notice of concern or notice of breach from the Board. Mr. Christiansen is advocating for a sliding scale of accountability that considers the schools in the high need areas and demographics.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked the new Board members to introduce themselves.

Member Mallory Cyr is a Native Nevadan and a product of the Clark County School District and a parent of an elementary charter school student.

Member Don Soifer has an education researchers background and has been a Charter School Authorizer for the past ten years at the nation's capital where more than 50% of students attend charter schools.

Member Tonia Holmes-Sutton is a National Board Certified Teacher and an educator of 20 years in Clark County. She is serving as the Interim State Director for Teach Plus Nevada and also facilitates the support of teachers through national board certification through the Nevada National Board Professional Learning Institute.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Approval of the July 26, 2019 SPCSA Board Meeting Action Minutes**

Member Moulton noted that she attended the July 26, 2019 meeting telephonically and the minutes indicate she was in attendance. Also, the convenience break was not from 1:54 p.m. until 2:00 p.m. Member Moulton requested that these two items be corrected in the July 26, 2019 minutes.

*With those corrections, Member Moulton moved to approve the minutes of the July 26, 2019 Authority Board meeting. Member Randolph seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

### **Agenda Item 4 - Schools Under Receivership or Previously Under Receivership**

#### **a. Argent Preparatory Academy Update**

Mark Modrcin, Director of Authorizing for the SPCSA. Argent Preparatory Academy was previously under a receivership agreement between the SPCSA and the Receiver, Mr. Josh Kern. Due to performance concerns, the school was closed at the end of the 2017–2018 school year. Mr. Kern has been wrapping up a few items including the transfer of student records and the sale of a land parcel. Mr. Kern's report to this body in July noted that he accepted the sale price of \$2.25 million from Carson Montessori.

Joshua Kern – Receiver for Argent Preparatory Academy. Mr. Kern discussed the final wind down of the Argent Preparatory Academy. Argent's property at 788 Fairview Drive is under contract for \$2.25 million with Carson Montessori School as the purchaser. The closing was scheduled for Monday, September 9, 2019 but the escrow has been extended for 10 days to provide Carson Montessori with their requested additional time to secure financing and to address additional issues associated with their special use permit.

The current contract had a non-refundable \$50,000 deposit. When Carson Montessori did not close on September 9<sup>th</sup>, Argent agreed to the additional 10-day no cost extension in consideration of Carson Montessori releasing the \$50,000 to Argent which it now has in its possession. If, and when, Carson Montessori closes on the sale of the property, the deposit, in its entirety, will be applied toward the purchase price.

The 10-day no cost extension was made with the specific understanding that any further extension of escrow beyond the 10 days will require mutual written consent of the parties and significant consideration in the form of an earnest money deposit and other assurances of Carson Montessori's ability to close. Argent is not in a position to further extend escrow without such consideration.

Mr. Kern further discussed Carson Montessori's condition that the building be free of all Argent's furniture, fixtures and equipment. With the assistance of the SPCSA and the State's Purchasing Division, the school was free and clear of its possessions by the time of the scheduled closing.

Argent wants Carson Montessori to purchase this property and their actions over the last nine months have demonstrated their intent. Mr. Kern recommended that a staff or Board member from the SPCSA provide support to Carson Montessori to help bring this to a close.

The proceeds of the sale of the property will be used to pay Bank of America who holds the note, brokerage fees, severance to former employees, digitizing files, etc. If Argent sells the property to Carson Montessori for the anticipated \$2.25 million, the proceeds from the sale will be sufficient to pay all of Argent's obligations with some funds remaining to turn over to the State.

Member Moulton asked the total amount of Argent's outstanding obligations.

Mr. Kern stated that the majority of what is owed is the \$1.55 million payoff amount on the note as of September 9<sup>th</sup> which is growing daily with principal and interest until the sale is concluded. There is \$500,000 owed for other costs and fees. At the current purchase price, it appears that \$250,000 would go to the State if the sale is concluded within the 10-day extension and Carson Montessori is the purchaser.

Member Moulton asked where Argent's inventory is located.

Mr. Kern said the property that was designated as State property is now warehoused in Reno and the other property was given to schools, agencies or liquidated.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked Mr. Kern if he is confident that the sale could be concluded within ten days.

Mr. Kern is hopeful if the two issues are resolved the sale will go through. The first issue is financing and the second is the concern about the special use permit. Mr. Kern discussed the two issues.

Member Soifer asked about the situation with Carson Montessori's facilities.

Mr. Kern replied that they are in two facilities and one does not have the required special use permit. He reiterated his recommendation that an SPCSA person be designated to advise and support Carson Montessori.

Executive Director Feiden said that Ryan Herrick, General Counsel for SPCSA has been in frequent communication with Mr. Kern and others related to this issue. If appropriate, he would be the right person to be designated to assist Carson Montessori.

Executive Director Feiden asked about the current expected closing date.

Mr. Kern responded that it is 10 days from September 9<sup>th</sup>, which would be September 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Herrick wanted to assure the Board that the proceeds from the sale will close everything out regarding Argent and its remaining liabilities.

Mr. Kern agreed that upon closing on the property, a final financial audit would be done to reflect the wind-down process.

Member Soifer asked about the capital improvements that might potentially jeopardize the special use permit.

Vice Chair Mackedon responded that Carson Montessori would have to move their playground to the new location because it is an elementary school and there are drop off and pick up requirements that need to be met.

Member Soifer asked if Carson Montessori has to complete these improvements before the close of the property.

Mr. Herrick said he is hopeful that the property will close and the special use permit can be resolved after the sale.

Mr. Kern agreed that Argent needs to be done with the sale and understands the issues but they can be taken care of after the sale is completed.

Member Moulton wanted to know if there is a Plan B.

Mr. Kern said that he is in touch with an interested party through another realtor and he has been actively working on Plan B since the closing did not take place as scheduled.

#### **b. Quest Academy Update**

Director Modrcin provided background for the new Board members about Quest Academy. Quest has been a sponsored school since 2008 and has been under a receivership since 2015 due to a number of issues which included financial, academic and organizational compliance. Mr. Kern is the Receiver for Quest and has assisted them in resolving a large number of financial and organizational issues and is working on turning around the academic performance. Quest is up for renewal later this fall and staff expects to receive an application from Quest on or before October 15<sup>th</sup>.

Joshua Kern, Receiver, Quest Academy – Mr. Kern stated that Quest has resolved every legal, financial and operational matter that was the basis for the receivership with the exception of the Bridger litigation. The Bridger litigation is the final legacy issue. Without a workable settlement, Quest cannot continue past this year. Mr. Kern provided a brief summary of the Bridger litigation.

Mr. Kern has been in frequent communication with the representatives of ESP Bridger and on August 22<sup>nd</sup> a written proposal was received from them.

Mr. Kern believes that there are two essential ingredients to an acceptable settlement that will provide Quest with a reasonable opportunity to be financially viable going forward. Mr. Kern stated that Quest needs to be unencumbered from its past mistakes. Mr. Kern explained how this can be accomplished. Quest requires the proceeds from the sale of the Alexander Campus which is currently being marketed for sale. Quest will consider any proposal that satisfies these two conditions. Mr. Kern went on to explain that this litigation with CSP Bridger needs to be resolved.

Mr. Kern stated that Quest committed to a multi-year school improvement process. Utilizing this process, Quest moved from the bottom 5% of schools in Nevada to become a high 2-Star elementary school and a 3-Star middle school in one year. Quest serves one of the most racially diverse and economically disadvantaged student bodies among all SPCSA schools. Mr. Kern went on to set forth statistics substantiating this statement. Even though Quest is one of the most racially diverse and economically challenged schools, student attendance is on par with the State and State charter averages since the improvement efforts began.

Mr. Kern looks forward to working with the SPCSA in the final wind down of the receivership and the review of Quest's charter application for renewal.

Member Soifer asked the status of the time frame of the proposed renewal of Quest.

Director Modrcin responded that staff has received letters of intent for all seven schools that are up for renewal that were due by September 1<sup>st</sup> and applications are due by October 15<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked if SPCSA staff would be doing the renewal applications.

Director Modrcin said that staff is in the process of drafting the renewal applications.

**c. Discovery Charter School Update**

Executive Director Feiden invited Discovery Charter School to provide a written report at this meeting which is included for this agenda item. Since this is the first couple months of school, they were not able to attend this meeting. They will appear and present at future meetings.

Executive Director Feiden provided a brief background about Discovery Charter School. They are located in Las Vegas and serve approximately 380 students across 2 campuses. The receivership started in 2017 and in their first 2 years Discovery made significant academic gains. The Board voted to end the receivership at their August meeting. Discovery will appear regularly at Board meetings to discuss the transition and to ensure there is proper oversight as to the schools' progress.

Staff from SPCSA went to the school and provided training and background for Discovery's board. Mr. Herrick also provided training on the Open Meeting Law.

The written report from Discovery sets forth the reconstitution of the school board and information about the school's first board meeting. The report also states that the PERS payment has been consistently paid

for the months of August and September in the amount of \$10,085 each and the budget is being managed to allow for these payments to continue until fully paid.

### **Agenda Item 5 – Nevada Virtual Academy**

Mr. Herrick provided some background and an update about the Nevada Virtual Academy (NVA) litigation. In the spring of 2018, charter contract termination proceedings were initiated for NVA due to academic underperformance specifically relating to its elementary school. As a result of that litigation, an agreement was reached with NVA that in the event the academic benchmarks were not met in the fall of 2018 the school would close. The benchmarks were not met and the elementary school closed last year.

For the 2019–2020 school year, NVA consists of a sixth through twelfth grade virtual online school with an enrollment cap of 1,790 students. The school was up for renewal last summer. In that renewal, the Authority incorporated similar benchmarks in regard to the middle and high schools. The school did eventually sign the contract, under protest, the day before its prior contract expired and is operating under that contract. The school has sued claiming that the academic benchmarks could result in the closure of the middle or high school and the provisions are unlawful. The school filed suit in June seeking an injunction or a court order allowing the school to stay open past its charter expiration date. The SPCSA prevailed in that part of the litigation and a court order and/or injunction was not issued.

Discovery has begun and we are disclosing our witnesses and documents to NVA. The Nevada Attorney General's Office has been associated as co-counsel going forward. The trial is set for May 2020.

The Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) results will be released next week and the tentative results show that the NVA middle school and high school have met the benchmarks. If the ratings hold, both schools will have a 3-Star rating for the 2018–2019 school year.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked if NVA plans to continue with this lawsuit even though they have hit the benchmarks.

Mr. Herrick responded they would have to be a sub 3-Star school for 2 consecutive years for the school to not meet the benchmarks. Even with the contract provisions, nothing would happen with the current contract until the fall of 2021. It is unclear as to why the litigation is continuing.

Member Moulton asked if the costs of the lawsuit are open to the public as a public record.

Mr. Herrick answered that Nevada Virtual Academy is a public body subject to the Open Meeting Law and the Public Records Act. A Public Records Request could be lodged. Mr. Herrick believes that the descriptions are subject to privilege and would be redacted and the amount of time and amount spent would not be privileged.

Member Moulton expressed her concern about the costs associated with this litigation. She does not understand why NVA would continue with the litigation if they meet the requirements that come out next week. Member Moulton asked how many years the contract was renewed.

Mr. Herrick replied that it is a 6-year contract that runs through the summer of 2024. The 2-year triggers are in the contract.

Mr. Herrick advised the Authority that NVA's counsel was present at this meeting.

## **Agenda Item 6 – Charter Contract Amendment Applications**

### **a. Oasis Academy (Expansion)**

Vice Chair Mackedon recused herself and appointed Member Moulton to take over the meeting.

Director Modrcin explained this is an amendment request from Oasis Academy to amend its charter contract to allow for additional students in already-approved grade levels at its existing campus. A memorandum, as well as the Oasis Academy's Application, are included for this agenda item. Director Modrcin provided a summary of the request and background information which can be found in the memorandum.

Oasis Academy is a K-12 brick and mortar school in Fallon, Nevada serving approximately 600 students during the 2018-2019 school year. They are seeking an amendment to expand their charter by implementing a slow growth model of grades K-8 which would add a third class or section of 25 students per grade until there is a third section for all grades. It would add approximately 200 seats over the course of 9 years.

There are a couple key reasons for this amendment which are outlined on page 1 of the memorandum. The first is to accommodate the significant demand for the high-quality seats at Oasis. It is noteworthy that the school believes a slow growth approach to expansion is the best move for the school and the community.

For all of the reasons outlined in the memo, staff is recommending that the Authority approve the request of Oasis Academy, with conditions, permitting the school to add an extra section of each grade level for grades K-8. The conditions that staff is proposing to attach are in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 462 which was approved at the last legislative session and are outlined on page 3 of the memorandum.

Member Soifer asked if Melissa Mackedon was okay with the proposed conditions and the associated costs.

Melissa Mackedon, Chief Executive Officer, Oasis Academy apologized for the absence of the leadership team at the meeting due to a conflict that was scheduled approximately nine months ago. In answer to Member Soifer's question, Ms. Mackedon said that Oasis is completely on board with all of the conditions.

Member Moulton asked what the increase will be annually.

Ms. Mackedon answered that it would be less than 10% for the entire school.

Member Moulton asked about the provision for the military to be accepted.

Ms. Mackedon explained that the school will accept the applications; however, if the school is full, they cannot go over the seats. The lottery is open year-round for military connected families. When seats become available, they would be eligible for the lottery.

Member Moulton asked for a motion to go along with the staff report and recommendation to approve Oasis Academy's request to amend its charter contract to allow for additional students in existing grade levels at the existing campuses with the two conditions.

*Member Soifer made the motion proposed by Member Moulton. Member Randolph seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

Ms. Mackedon thanked Member Moulton for taking over the meeting during the Oasis Academy agenda item and returned as Vice Chair and introduced Agenda Item 6.b.

**b. Doral Academy of Northern Nevada (Expansion)**

Mike Dang, Manager of Financial and Organizational Performance of the Nevada State Public Charter School Authority. The responsibilities of the SPCSA include the contract amendment process including requests for amendments (RFA). Doral Academy of Northern Nevada (DANN) is seeking SPCSA Board approval to amend its current charter contract to allow the expansion of its enrollment in existing grade levels from 636 students (during the 2018-19 school year) to 834 students during the current 2019-2020 school year. Mr. Dang's Briefing Memorandum is included as part of the supporting materials for this agenda item.

This is DANN's first contract term which began July 1, 2017 and is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2023. DANN's current contract allows for enrollment of up to 660 students this school year ending in 2020. Instead, DANN has enrolled approximately 834 students. SPCSA staff discovered this potential problem in early August without notice from the school that it had exceeded its contractual enrollment cap. Once the SPCSA spoke to the school and the Board about this, the school then submitted an RFA to approve this enrollment level. This is an after-the-fact request asking the Board to amend its charter contract and approve the increased enrollment of over 30%. Mr. Dang summarized DANN's request which is included in the Briefing Memorandum for this agenda item.

Mr. Dang said that the Authority recommends, with reluctance, that the good cause exemption be granted and also approve an enrollment increase request for DANN in the current school year ending 2020 ONLY. Page 2 of the Briefing Memorandum shows the additional seats that DANN is proposing for future years. The Authority is recommending this one time increase in enrollment for the current school year since they do not want to disrupt the learning environment of approximately 100 students forcing them to find other schools less than a month into the school year. Another reason for the recommendation is that the school has demonstrated a strong academic performance as a 5-Star school. Therefore, the Authority recommends that the Board approve the RFA for the current school year subject to the conditions in the Briefing Memorandum contained on page 5.

Indra Winquest, Chair, Board of Directors, Doral Academy of Northern Nevada and Angela Orr, Principal, Doral Academy of Northern Nevada. Mr. Winquest read from a statement that said DANN appreciates staff's recommendation for approval of its increased enrollment numbers for this school year and any future increases would be addressed in a separate RFA. Mr. Winquest said the mistake was unintentional and will never happen again. The letter also states that there are 551 students on a wait list seeking entry into the school. They are prepared to continue offering a high quality and rigorous education opportunity.

Member Moulton expressed her concern as to how a mistake of 30% over-enrollment can happen and asked when DANN's lottery took place.

Colin Bringhurst, Academics Representative answered that the lottery ran in January.

Member Moulton said she read somewhere that the Doral in the north thought they were the Doral in the south and they had the numbers. She does not understand how staff; the Board and the overseer did not catch over 200 additional students. Member Moulton asked if there is any explanation as to how the lottery could have occurred in January and SPCSA staff found out about the over-enrollment in August.

Mr. Bringhurst responded that Doral Academy, Academics staff and the Board of Directors discovered the problem prior to SPCSA staff contacting them. They put it on a public meeting agenda and received approval from the Doral Academy of Northern Nevada Board of Directors to submit a letter of intent for an RFA.

Member Moulton asked when did DANN discover the over-enrollment.

Mr. Bringhurst answered that it occurred in July.

Member Moulton referred to a letter from August 13<sup>th</sup> from Indra Winquest, who was the Board Chair at that time which states "that prior to the lottery for the 19-20 school year, DANN inadvertently approved enrollment numbers that exceeded the maximum enrollment and the 10% yearly growth allowed." She went on to say that it appears that August was the first time that the Authority was advised. Also, the Board meeting on August 14<sup>th</sup> lasted about seven or eight minutes.

Member Moulton stated she is extremely disappointed because last year the Authority fought the Legislature to put off the moratorium on charter schools. One of the big reasons the Legislature wanted the moratorium was they thought we were growing too much. Something like this happening is of great concern. This is a management issue and the consequences will be statewide.

Member Moulton said that she and Executive Director Feiden met with the Clark County School Board of Trustees and they had a lot of questions and concerns. Legislators are going to ask how this happened.

Vice Chair Mackedon said she agreed with what Member Moulton had to say; however, the main issue is if this is not approved, the students will be punished due to management's mistake. She supports staff recommendations due to the impact it would have on students and Washoe County schools and lack of teachers if it was not approved.

Member Moulton does not want to kick kids out of school. She does not know how this happened when the lottery took place in January and DANN did not figure it out until July. She would like some kind of consequences. Whether it is a notice of intent for mismanagement or some other recommendation from another Board member.

Member Cyr asked if when this was found in July whether they considered contacting parents to see what they thought about the over-enrollment and see if they had any suggestions.

Mr. Winquest agreed that this is completely unacceptable. There was some turnover on the Board and a change of leadership at the school. It was unintentional and was missed. Some of the confusion on staff and the Board's part is they were under the assumption they were mimicking the sister school in Las Vegas where they had four classrooms per grade and that was the growth model they were going on.

Ms. Orr agrees that DANN should be transparent and follow their charter. Her first day as principal was April 22<sup>nd</sup>. She noticed the error within two weeks of that timeframe and began asking questions of the management company and Board members. It took awhile to reconcile what happened. It was then put on the next Board meeting agenda to go to the Authority with an amendment. Ms. Orr said that they take full responsibility for this situation. The change in leadership from January to the end of April allowed for this to last longer than expected. It did not come up until after she was hired in late April.

Member Moulton asked for a timeline based on the lottery being in January, Ms. Orr coming on in April and within two weeks, which would be sometime in May, this had occurred and it wasn't on the board agenda until August 14<sup>th</sup>. She asked Ms. Orr if that was correct.

Ms. Orr responded they did not have a Board meeting in June. There was a Board meeting in July. The short telephonic Board meeting in August was for a management issue. It was a quick additional meeting.

Member Moulton read from the August 14, 2019 Board Minutes. Item #4 is "Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Submission of a Charter Amendment for Doral Academy of Northern Nevada to Increase Enrollment Numbers."

Member Moulton stated that the timeline puts up red flags. She reiterated Vice Chair Mackedon's statement that DANN is asking for forgiveness rather than permission.

Ms. Orr said there was a meeting at the end of June where it was originally on the agenda. There was an approval in June to get this on the agenda. When the error was recognized, it went on the next Board meeting agenda.

Mr. Bringhurst said that it was either the end of June or July but doesn't recall the exact date of the board meeting. They did approve a letter of intent to submit an RFA regarding this issue.

Member Moulton said she was referring to the August 13<sup>th</sup> letter that was addressed to the Authority as backup.

Executive Director Feiden responded that the Authority did not find out about the over-enrollment until August. They found out while looking at Board agendas or other SPCSA documents. A conversation was had with the school just before the letter was submitted to the Authority. It appeared the school was aware of the situation.

Executive Director Feiden wanted to let everyone that has dealings with the SPCSA know that if they have an issue or a question, there is no need to wait to contact the Authority. Board meetings are only held monthly but there is staff available that can be contacted. If a phone call had been made in April, there would have been a lot of options available. The Authority is willing to work with the schools and requested immediate disclosure.

Member Moulton stated has been a supporter of charter schools and family choice for many years. She feels that there has to be a consequence; a notice of intent for mismanagement. She mentioned how close it came to a moratorium on charter schools that would have started in July. She is certain that the Authority would have worked with Doral to remedy this situation.

Member Soifer asked what the current enrollment is at the time of this meeting.

Mr. Winquist responded that the current enrollment is 814 students.

Member Soifer asked if this is in violation of any fire safety, student safety or licenses.

Mr. Winquest responded that they are fully compliant.

Member Soifer referred to staff recommendations and that the enrollment cap for the next school year would drop to 690. He believes that students and families should not pay the price for adult mistakes. He would not support kicking students out of the school. He asked how the numbers were considered for the staff recommendation.

Executive Director Feiden responded that the enrollment allows for an extra 10% which adds a little buffer over the 690 for next year. The school may not be able to shift in order to hit this number. Staff did not want to make the decision today before knowing where DANN is in December in advance of doing their lottery. They have requested to increase their enrollment and it was not an appropriate decision for the Board to make today. The recommendation would be to have the school, if that number cannot be achieved for next year, come back in advance of their lottery with a thoughtful, intentional advance plan for their long-term enrollment rather than making that decision under these circumstances.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked if what was said means that it is going back to 690 unless a new amendment request is submitted under the normal protocol, procedures and timelines.

Executive Director Feiden said that was correct.

Member Randolph asked if the proposed enrollment plan for the 2019-2020 school year is 834 students and if DANN was going to continue to enroll students for this school year.

Ms. Orr said that some students did not show up due to moving or other reasons. If they had known that enrollment was going to be less than 834, they would have enrolled more students up to the 834. She said that Ms. Feiden asked the school to not enroll any more students until after this Board meeting. If the amendment is approved, they would enroll students up to the 834 to fill the classrooms.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked for clarification as to the number that is being approved at this meeting; whether it is 814 or 834.

Executive Director Feiden responded that the staff recommendation was 760 and with the 10% allowable increase it would be 836.

Member Soifer referenced the table on the top of page 3 of the Briefing Memorandum. The current student population served by the school as of last school year shows significant under-representation compared to the school district and Galena High School for Hispanic/Latino, Individualized Education Program (IEP), English Language Learners (ELL) and Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) populations. He asked what the Board's expectation is for representation of these special populations and the changes being discussed.

Mr. Winqest responded that it is DANN's goal to have the most diverse school possible. They are somewhat limited by the lottery process. Two schools that are very close to DANN are Hunsberger Elementary School which has a 7% Hispanic student rate, and Lenz that has a 12% Hispanic student rate. The goal is to serve every demographic which makes a healthier environment and exposes students to the real world. They are taking that into consideration and it is an issue with the Board and staff.

Member Soifer asked if DANN has numbers for the IEP, ELL and FRL students.

Ms. Orr replied that those numbers can be obtained but were not available at the time of the meeting. The school is in the process of completing the paperwork for FRL students. They will also be reaching out to communities of need that are in a reasonable driving distance from DANN. They are working on the diversity ratios at the school site.

Member Soifer asked what the relationship would be with the 515 students on the wait list and the outreach.

Ms. Orr said that there are an increased number of diverse students on the wait list. They have contemplated the idea of moving into a weighted lottery system that might allow for increased diversity. They currently pull from 21 zip codes and many are in areas of need. They are also pulling from other counties.

Member Soifer asked about the notion of the weighted lottery.

Mr. Winqest said that based on current enrollment and the current student body, they understand there is a need for more diversity in the school. They will be working with Academica and their staff to start looking to evaluate a weighted lottery system assuming it complies with this Board. At that time, they will

do an evaluation and decide what is best for the school. They intend to file another RFA in the next filing period to potentially support the growth as shown in the current application.

Director Modrcin stated that this is the reason there is an organizational performance framework which holds schools accountable. Staff grappled with this recommendation but believe it is in the best interests of the students. When looking at the indicators and organizational framework, one of the things is following the contract and this could affect their results in this indicator next year. There will be consequences presented to this body at a later date.

Member Holmes-Sutton asked if there was an RFA submitted to mimic the sister school in southern Nevada.

Executive Director Feiden said that was the confusion that led to this mistake and an RFA was not submitted.

Member Holmes-Sutton in considering the recommendations, if attrition does not take place as anticipated, will students and families be dismissed to accommodate the numbers that have been recommended for next year?

Executive Director Feiden said the Board may consider an amendment request from this school with significantly more foresight with respect to the plan; however, staff thought it best not to make that decision at today's meeting.

Member Holmes-Sutton asked the school representatives, if they take full responsibility and acknowledge the mistake that has been made, why would they come to the Board with a recommendation to continue to increase the enrollment in the manner in which they have.

Ms. Orr replied that the increased enrollment would only allow DANN to keep the four classes per grade which was the mistake that was made. The charter application allowed for three classes per grade. Once they enrolled four classes per grade in K-4 it necessitates if they keep those students and allow for them to stay at the school, then grade five will then become four classes, grade six will become four classes, etc. It would only be to maintain the status of current enrollment and not grow beyond that.

Members Holmes-Sutton asked, based on the school taking full responsibility, what they think the consequences should look like.

Mr. Winquist is not aware of the Board's options as to consequences. They are holding themselves accountable and feel it is unacceptable and embarrassing. They will accept whatever consequences or outcomes are imposed. They assured the Board they will not make this mistake again and will be in full compliance and will over-communicate as to long term plans as to the sustainability of the school.

Vice Chair Mackedon assumes DANN is going to put forth a traditional amendment request and at that time the consequences would come in staff recommendations with some sort of condition with a final recommendation.

Executive Director Feiden said that if the Board receives an RFA, that any continued growth would come with conditions and that could be one of the outcomes. The Board could direct staff to add an additional step if the Board deems it necessary. The Authority could also discuss other options.

Member Holmes-Sutton asked if the Board was to approve staff's recommendations for this year and moving forward versus what DANN has proposed, how does that impact the students and families. She was concerned that DANN put forward its proposal for enrollment knowing that subsequent grades would need to increase as well. That is what she is considering.

Ms. Orr will come back with all reasoning and supporting documents for further expansion and the amendment that will come forward in a future board meeting. They want to continue to serve the current student community. Later grades and current staff will be affected. With the new Board in place and all members being aware of the problem, they will do whatever is necessary to serve their current student population.

Executive Director Feiden said that the next amendment cycle for applications for amendment are due by October 15<sup>th</sup>. This is a tight timeline. This Board will have the opportunity to weigh in again well in advance of the lottery.

Member Moulton said that she will not support this due to what happened at the Legislature last year. She is concerned that this will promote further legislation adverse to charter schools. She would like to see this school implement a weighted lottery. Assembly Bill 462 requests that written notice be provided to local school districts and departments of any notices of intent, new school applications or amendment requests and approvals.

She also noted that there are over 500 on a waiting list and if they are thinking about a new school and if that is the case, it should be placed in one of those diverse areas and zip codes. That would be one step that would help the Legislature see we learned from our mistakes. She respects a Board that does what they need to do and she said that she will vote against this proposition.

Member Cyr asked the question again about parent involvement when it was discovered in May. Parents are part of the solution. She wonders if this could have been avoided by working with parents in either May, June or July. She also asked for clarification if they would have to reduce enrollment for the 2020-2021 school year.

Executive Director Feiden responded they could amend in advance of next school year to create a thoughtful, methodical plan for the future. One of the conditions is they would have to provide us with a monthly enrollment report.

Member Cyr asked if parents were engaged regarding this situation.

Mr. Winquest replied there wasn't any engagement with the parents since it was an extremely sensitive situation and they wanted to explore all options and opportunities to make this right before going that

route. Speaking with parents would have triggered having those conversations very close to the first day of school. The entire situation was stressful and they made decisions as to what was best for morale for the school and the community.

Vice Chair Mackedon said she understands that this would have been difficult and there could have been outrage based on an experience that she had.

Member Soifer wanted to bring up the aspect of wanting schools in underserved areas and the schools need partners in other levels of government. He shares Member Moulton's sentiment and the willingness of DANN considering a weighted lottery is a significant development. He feels it is the intent of this Board to serve populations that are not being served at this time and he would like to be involved in this engagement.

Vice Chair Mackedon is proposing a potential motion based on the recommendations from the Briefing Memorandum which are:

SPCSA staff recommends the Board:

- 1) Approve the Good Cause exemption
- 2) Approve an enrollment cap of 760 (with the standard 10% flexibility) for the 19-20 SY and then a return to the Approved Enrollment levels absent a separate RFA to be approved by the SPCSA Board at a later date and subject to the conditions further below.

There are 3 additional conditions set forth on page 5 of the Briefing Memorandum.

*Member Soifer made a motion to approve the Good Cause Exemption. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded.*

Mr. Herrick asked for a roll call of the vote.

*Members Holmes-Sutton, Soifer and Mackedon were in favor of the motion. Members Randolph, Moulton and Cyr were opposed.*

Mr. Herrick said that since there was a 3/3 split no action was taken so the amendment was not approved. The motion did not pass.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked for clarification.

Mr. Herrick responded that the good cause exemption amendment did not pass so they would have to go back to the current cap. He requested that a second motion be made.

*Member Randolph moved to approve a good cause exemption approving an enrollment cap of the current enrollment of 814 with no 10% flexibility for the 2019-2020 school year. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion.*

Member Soifer asked for clarification about what is being proposed for the 2020-2021 school year.

Member Randolph replied that nothing would happen and they would have to come back.

*Members Holmes-Sutton, Soifer, Mackedon and Randolph approved the motion. Members Moulton and Cyr opposed the motion. The motion carried at 4/2.*

Member Moulton wished DANN luck in the future and commended the Board on they way the vote was handled.

Vice Chair Mackedon said staff will call the school on Monday to confirm the next steps in terms of these conditions and to make sure they are maintaining no more than the 814 cap for the remainder of the school year.

Member Holmes-Sutton asked if children were to move or leave the school, will children be taken from the waiting list and be enrolled.

Vice Chair Mackedon believes they would backfill the slots that opened up to the cap of 814.

Executive Director Feiden said that enrollment procedures allow for the backfill.

Mr. Herrick mentioned a sliding cap and it has been done both ways.

Vice Chair Mackedon replied that difficult situations can occur if you do not backfill.

Mr. Herrick stated that the interpretation of the motion is that they can backfill up to 814.

Member Holmes-Sutton said that was what she intended when making the motion.

### **Agenda Item 7 – State Public Charter School Authority Performance Framework**

Director Modrcin stated that this agenda item is a recommendation to update the performance framework guidance document that accompanies the three components (academic, financial and organizational). The Authority approved the revised academic and organizational framework in June and the revised financial framework was approved in February of this year. The SPCSA staff wants to tie all three of those documents together and provide a clear guidance to our schools and ensure we have the correct legal citations. Staff also wants to ensure that the guidance associated with all three of those frameworks are accurate and reflect the measures approved by this body. If approved, these recommendations would take effect for the 2019-2020 school year.

The Exhibit is a copy of the revised document which is included as part of this agenda item. It is broken down into five sections which Director Modrcin summarized.

Section 1 is an overview of what this document seeks to accomplish including its objectives and purpose. It includes an emphasis on oversight, clear communication and quality schools.

Section 2 is a breakdown of the three components which are academic, financial and organizational. More detailed information is contained on page 3.

Section 3 addresses the data sources, what annual oversight looks like and how and when results of these frameworks will be reported as shown on page 4.

Section 4 provides an overview of the interventions and incentives for schools and the possible circumstances and outcomes for schools under different types of notifications.

Section 5 is a brief summary and reiteration of how all three of these components and information will be incorporated into high-stake decisions.

*Member Moulton made a motion to approve the State Public Charter School Authority Performance Framework as presented. Member Holmes-Sutton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

Vice Chair Mackedon requested a 10-minute convenience break at 2:28 p.m. The convenience break ended at 2:38 p.m. and the meeting was reconvened.

### **Agenda Item 8 – Site Evaluations**

Director Modrcin stated that this agenda item is a recommendation to approve minor changes to the site evaluation process and protocol. A revised handbook is included as an attachment to this agenda item that notes the minor changes that are being recommended. The relevant changes are highlighted in yellow.

The purpose of site evaluations is a resource in our accountability toolkit but also validates strong practices for our schools to have third parties come in and say what they are doing really well. Site evaluations advance our monitoring capabilities, help us document strengths and progress towards goals and opportunities to improve. They also help us uncover deficiencies. Information captured during site evaluations is used to inform high-stakes recommendations such as renewals and amendments. A more complete overview of site evaluations is contained on page 3.

During site evaluations, we focus on adherence to the approved charter, their contract, adherence to mission and vision of the school as well as applicable laws and regulations.

Staff of the SPCSA has been working diligently to complete site evaluations for the portfolio. Eighteen were completed last semester and a report was provided at the July Board meeting. Five have already been completed this year and we are well on our way to evaluating all of our sites by the 2019-2020 school year.

There are three main areas that staff is recommending be altered to improve the process and these are highlighted in the handbook. There are a couple of other minor changes listed but he spoke to these three since they are the most relevant to the Authority's work.

First, Assembly Bill 462 from the 80<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session is a key piece of legislation related to charter schools in Nevada and includes language that impacted the site evaluation process. Specifically, it requires our site evaluations to evaluate achievement and school performance at each campus and identify any deficiencies related to achievement or performance. The sponsor shall develop a plan with the charter school to correct any such deficiencies. Future reports will now identify strengths and recommendations. If there are deficiencies, SPCSA staff will assist in correcting them. The handbook now contains AB 462 language and is highlighted in yellow on pages 3 through 9.

The second shift is the amount of time allocated to the on-site reviews at campuses. The SPCSA is aware that it is time-consuming for the schools to prepare for these evaluations. The SPCSA will be reviewing the documents in more detail and a third member will be added to future site evaluations if needed. A sample evaluation schedule is located on page 12.

Proposed changes for multi-site networks are located on page 8 of the handbook. The authorizing team will work to eliminate possible redundancies. It may be feasible to conduct one or more focus group interviews for a set of schools within the same network rather than several at each school site.

The Authority wants to be more transparent about our classroom observation and rubric. SPCSA staff will host live and web-based learning sessions for charter school leaders to gain a clear understanding of the SPCSA Classroom Observation Form and Rubric. More detailed information is contained on page 15.

Member Soifer recommended that once we have completed what we are legally obligated to do, he would like to revisit this collaboratively with our schools. He would like to be a part of this ongoing process.

Director Modrcin agreed that it is not appropriate to make changes mid-cycle and welcomes any feedback from this body and from schools. Staff is working on a list of possible modifications in the spring that may go into effect as early as 2021.

*Member Soifer made a motion to approve the Site Evaluation Handbook as proposed. Member Moulton seconded. The motion carried unanimously.*

### **Agenda Item 9 – Overview of the Nevada School Performance Framework**

Dr. Selcuk Ozdemir – Education Programs Supervisor for the SPCSA. Dr. Ozdemir gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). His presentation is included as an attachment to this agenda item.

Dr. Ozdemir started his presentation with background information. The Elementary and Secondary Act (ESA) was signed into law in 1965. In 2002, it was reauthorized with No Child Left Behind. It was signed by President Obama into law as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015. Slide 2 sets forth what the states are tasked with under this federal law.

The timeline and data availability dates are shown on slides 3 and 4 of the presentation. This year the final results will be published on September 16<sup>th</sup> since the 15<sup>th</sup> is a Sunday.

There are five performance indicators and there are several measures listed under each indicator. Schools earn star ratings by earning points associated with each of the measures. The points add up from 1-100 and then stars are reassigned to index points. Dr. Ozdemir provided an example of how the rating system works and a chart is located on slide 5 of the presentation.

The Elementary, Middle and High School Performance Frameworks are shown on slides 6 through 8. Dr. Ozdemir explained in detail each of these performance frameworks in his presentation.

Slide 9 is a sample of the NSPF Report. Dr. Ozdemir went into detail as to the report and scores. Indicators are shown on the left side and the pooled proficiency table is located on the right side of the slide. Dr. Ozdemir explained how this particular school rated based on the report.

Once the total index score is determined by using the method on slide 9, the school's star rating needs to be calculated. Slide 10 shows the index cuts for NSPF star ratings that will be applied in September 2019. The final NSPF results will be covered at the next board meeting.

Charters, campuses and NSPF star ratings are contained on slide 11. This year SPCSA will receive a total of 102 star ratings – one for each elementary, middle and high school. Examples are shown on this slide showing the differences between a charter, campus and rating.

Dr. Ozdemir spoke briefly about the recently approved SPCSA Academic Performance Framework which relies heavily on NSPF results that will be received next week. A chart is shown on slide 12.

The final ratings for all schools and potential recommendations will be presented to the Board on October 4, 2019. November 1<sup>st</sup>, enrollment and demographic information will be received and will be presented at the following meeting. On November 1 or December 13, 2019, the renewal recommendations will be made to this Board using the historical and most recent year data to make those decisions. In January 2020, the graduation rates will be received and those results will be provided to the Board.

Executive Director Feiden stated that our star ratings will come out on Monday along with all the star ratings across the State. There will be information available and the SPCSA will issue a press release with summary information as to the charter schools within our portfolio. At the October 4<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, we will go into detail as to the performance of our schools. There may be potential notices in alignment with our framework at that time based on the ratings. If schools are not meeting standards, notices are issued and will be brought forward at the October meeting.

### **Agenda Item 10 – Strategic Planning**

Executive Director Feiden explained that this agenda item is referred to as the future of the SPCSA. There are two big items today with regard to our Strategic Planning. The first is the Strategic Plan and the second is the Growth Management Plan. The presentation is meant to be an overview of our strategic planning approach and process and how it will work and includes the Growth Management Plan discussed later. Her presentation can be found as an attachment for this agenda item.

Slide 4 contains the components of the Strategic Plan. It provides a summary of the things that staff believes should be included in our Strategic Plan and brief definitions of those items. They include vision, mission, values, goals, strategies and measures.

Slide 5 shows the differences between a strategic plan versus an implementation plan. The Growth Management Plan is envisioned as an implementation plan. The slide explains the differences between the two plans as to primary audience, visual appearance, accessibility and specificity.

Slide 6 explains the connection between the strategic plan and the implementation plans. We are envisioning a 5-year strategic plan that is an overarching document to set our course. We are proposing to draft three implementation plans: 1) the Growth Management Plan; 2) the LEA Support Plan, and 3) the Organizational Effectiveness Plan. The Strategic Plan is the umbrella that defines the overall course and the implementation plans will provide a road map as to how we will get there.

Slide 7 articulates the thought process of how to build the Strategic Plan. It is focused on the big umbrella piece. The starting point is for staff to begin generating ideas, concepts and proposals to bring to the Board. The Board will then provide input and feedback which staff will gather and incorporate into a final draft. The Board will review the final draft and consider approval of the Strategic Plan. Throughout this process, staff will solicit input and feedback from key external stakeholders.

Member Moulton is excited about this plan since it models what schools and other entities should do with the support of a strategic plan. Member Moulton asked how input is obtained. She explained that Executive Director Feiden and she spoke with the Clark County School District and received quite a bit of feedback with pointed questions and concerns.

Executive Director Feiden began her presentation on the Growth Management Plan with a review of the requirements of Assembly Bill 462 which is shown on slide 10. The SPCSA is up-to-date with written notices. The Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment was approved at the last Board meeting and met early this week to plan for the update which will incorporate the new data that is coming out. It will be worked on in October and November and the plan is to bring it before the Board for approval before January 1, 2020 as well as the Growth Management Plan. There are 42 site evaluations scheduled for this year and the Authority intends to be on track and will provide statuses throughout the year.

Assembly Bill 462 is a requirement but it should be considered an opportunity as a way to move forward to accomplish some of our strategic priorities that have been identified by the Board as being performance of schools, demographics, etc. Slide 11 shows the AB 462 implementation timeline. Note the slide shows August highlighted and it should be September. Slide 12 shows how critical the Growth Management Plan aligns with the Strategic Plan.

The left side of slide 13 sets forth the requirements of AB 462. Moving forward, the Needs Assessment will be incorporated as part of the Growth Management Plan. The right side sets forth some of the key questions that we would like the Growth Management Plan to answer. How do we create the growth that we have articulated and how do we meet the demands of that growth? This is not a requirement under AB 462; however, we feel it is appropriate that we plan for the SPCSA as well.

Slide 14 is a summary of the process. We are using the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment as a starting point for the Growth Management Plan. We also need to review SPCSA schools and engage with key stakeholders. The implementation is where we will bring this plan into action. This is due to the Legislative Counsel Bureau by January 1, 2020.

Slide 15 shows a tiered approach to engagement. The three methods that will be used are broad outreach, targeted outreach and working groups. Executive Director Feiden went into detail about this approach.

Slide 16 is a summary of timelines regarding the Strategic Planning Process and the Growth Management Plan.

Vice Chair Mackedon stated she is interested in the targeted outreach for soliciting specific information as to the opportunity for sites for school facilities and the challenges in finding ones in the at risk areas and challenging neighborhoods.

Member Soifer sees the potential for this to be a two-stage process. The first is receiving the feedback but also to use it as an opportunity to share the feedback with the working group partners and stakeholders. He would like to attend some of these working group sessions and be able to facilitate two-way conversations.

Member Randolph asked if something similar to the meeting with Clark County has been considered with Washoe County and also the government entities within the larger communities and the rural communities as well.

Executive Director Feiden said that she met with Washoe County leadership and they have set a tentative date for a presentation but it hasn't been finalized. She has also been in touch with local municipalities and is working with rural development organizations. There have been meetings with a few elected officials up north and will continue to try to meet with more and will take recommendations.

Member Moulton suggested speaking to the Chambers and provide a 15 or 20 minute presentation. She believes they would enjoy a presentation as to charter schools. Also, she recommended increasing public relations and it may be a good idea to invite the press. She commended Executive Director Feiden as to how she dealt with the meeting with the Clark County School District.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked if the Board is going to be involved with the working groups.

Executive Director Feiden wants manageable sized groups of around 15 and will be open to whoever the Board wants to engage.

Mr. Herrick said there are open meeting law complications that can arise but there could possibly be one member of the Board present. Another idea is a former member of the Board has shown interest in being in the working group. He recommended that the Board needs to be cognizant of the open meeting law implications.

## Agenda Item 11 – SPCSA Executive Director’s Report

Executive Director Feiden presented the Executive Director’s Report.

- Appointments to Authority Board – Welcomed the three new Board members and extended her appreciation for their involvement. There are two more appointments to be made.
- Change to December Board Meeting Date – The meeting has been moved from December 6<sup>th</sup> to December 13<sup>th</sup>. The SPCSA is under a very tight timeline to complete the Needs Assessment and Growth Management Plan. The extra week will give the Authority more time to incorporate the new data, including the demographic data. The calendar for 2020 can be discussed at the October Board meeting.
- New School Application Update – The Authority received 9 applications on July 15<sup>th</sup>. They are being reviewed and are posted online and available to the public. There is an online form/survey for the public to complete. The SPCSA is also required to solicit input from the school districts. The letters are ready and will be mailed by Monday. The Authority will engage with the districts around the applications. The districts have access to information that the SPCSA doesn’t have. They have a different perspective. When the input forms are returned, they will be reviewed and provided to the Board when the recommendations are made regarding the new applications.

Member Moulton expressed her concern as to who is receiving the letters or emails. She sees it as a challenge as to getting this information to those interested in receiving it.

Executive Director Feiden said that Clark County School District confirmed they received theirs. They also heard from the City of Henderson and the intent is to contact other municipalities to provide input. They can provide insights into traffic patterns, zoning laws that impact where schools can locate and how they operate that this Board may not have access.

Of the nine applications, the SPCSA does not intend to bring more than four to the Board in November and any remaining applications in December with recommendations. Due to the number of applications, they are being divided up in terms of timeline.

- Renewal Process - There are seven schools whose contracts expire at the end of this year. All seven schools have submitted letters of intent. Their applications for renewal are due by October 15<sup>th</sup>. A subset of those will be brought to the November meeting to break up the volume. One change to the process is the opportunity to renew schools between three and ten years instead of always doing a six-year renewal. Staff will bring recommendations regarding that term length as well as all other recommendations as to the renewals.

Vice Chair Mackedon asked if expedited renewals are still being done.

Director Modrcin does not think that any schools would qualify for an expedited renewal. It is still available but has a pretty high threshold.

Member Soifer asked for clarification as to the process of reviewing applications and the timing as to hearing them on different meeting dates.

Executive Director Feiden asked if the question is that if there are nine applications and the Board only sees the first four that may influence the perception of the other 5. That the Board may not be prepared to vote on the first four.

Member Soifer said that there is a potential for that to occur.

Executive Director Feiden said they could work with the Board to come up with an alternative approach. There was mainly a concern with the volume.

Member Soifer asked about new applications and the requirements under AB 462 as it relates to the Needs Assessment.

Executive Director Feiden said they could be brought before the December 12<sup>th</sup> Board meeting even though it would make for a very long meeting. Alternatives can be brought to the October Board meeting as to different approaches.

Executive Director Feiden had not contemplated a quota. What may occur is that seeing all applications at one time may add insight. Alternatives can be brought to the October Board meeting as to different approaches such as having a separate meeting, etc.

Vice Chair Mackedon suggested renewals in November and applications in December.

Director Modrcin planned to bring a few new school applications and a few renewals in November and the remainder would be brought in December.

Executive Director Feiden said that there is a 30-day appeals process if a school is denied and there are statutory issues, etc. that the Authority needs to be cognizant. A proposal can be discussed at the October meeting.

Vice Chair Mackedon recommended that there should be two options available and the Board would come to a consensus.

### **Agenda Item 12 – Long-Range Board Calendar**

Executive Director Feiden provided the updated Long-Range Board Calendar. The Board will consider the schedule at the October meeting as well as how to approach applications and renewals for this cycle. Board elections have been tentatively scheduled for the October meeting and the focus will be on the outcomes of the 2018-2019 star ratings. Executive Director Feiden asked if there were any additional items to be added to the calendar for the coming year.

Member Moulton feels it is imperative to get some dates for 2020 so that all Board members can be available for the meetings.

Vice Chair Mackedon recommended that Danny Peltier could propose a few options to the Board so that the schedule can be finalized.

Executive Director Feiden said that a survey or questionnaire will be sent out prior to the October meeting as to what works best for the Board members.

**Agenda Item 13 – Public Comment #2**

Dr. John Hawk – Chief Operations Officer, Nevada State High School – Dr. Hawk wanted to applaud the SPCSA for wanting to work with Nevada State High School. The SPCSA did a week long site visit with all of the campuses. The visits were very professional. There were two new staff members on the leadership team who were not aware of the process and they were blown away by the feedback. The teachers and parents are all excited.

**Agenda Item 14 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.