

NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

August 24, 2012

Nevada Legislature
Room 2135
401 South Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada

And

Grant Sawyer Building
Room 4412
555 East Washington Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(Videoconferenced)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Kathleen Conaboy
Michael Van
Robert McCord
Nora Luna
Elissa Wahl
Marc Abelman

In Carson City

Melissa Mackedon

AUTHORITY STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Dr. Steve Canavero PhD

In Carson City:

Katherine Rohrer, Education Program Professional, State Public Charter School Authority
Angela Blair, Education Program Professional, State Public Charter School Authority
Allyson Kellogg, Management Analyst, State Public Charter School Authority
Danny Peltier, Administrative Assistant, State Public Charter School Authority

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

None

In Carson City:

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:**In Las Vegas:**

Richard Moreno
Ryan Reeves
Ruth Parker
Heidi Arbuckle
David Calvo
Jennifer Burbank
Valerie Blake

In Carson City:

Judy Osgood
Brian Flanner
Jennifer Dukek

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE; APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Conaboy called the meeting to order at 9:04a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

Agenda Item - Public Comment

None

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of June 29, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Member Luna made a motion for approval of the July 31, 2012 SPCSA meeting minutes. Vice President Wahl seconded the motion. There was no discussion. President Conaboy abstained due to her absence at the July 31, 2012 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 5 – Common Challenges and Promising Practices of Independent Statewide Chartering Boards – presentation of work funded through a grant from the National Governors Association

Director Canavero began by thanking Ms. Judy Osgood, Senior Policy Analyst in the Office of Governor Sandoval, for her work in assisting the State Public Charter School Authority in collaborating with Paul O’Neil. Ms. Osgood began by introducing a project she had been working on with Director Canavero. The project, Common Challenges and Promising Practices of Independent Statewide Chartering Boards, is a joint project between the National Governors’ Association Center for Best Practices and the Center for School Change at McAllister College at the University of Minnesota. The project provided technical assistance to Nevada to help the SPCSA improve as an independent chartering board.

Ms. Osgood introduced Paul O’Neill, consultant to the NGA and advisor to many organizations on the complexities of educational organizations. Mr. O’Neill outlined the different types of charter school authorizers throughout the country, including independent state charter boards. He said that Independent Charter Boards (ICB), which exist in 12 states, are different from other authorizing entities because they have a singular purpose, namely to approve and oversee charter schools and hold them accountable for quality. This singular focus may have considerable benefits but also brings with it unique challenges. The experiences of ICBs across the country are varied, and depend to a large extent on local factors and the specifics of the powers and structure of each. But many of the challenges they face are similar. Autonomy is the question of how autonomous ICB’s are or should be. This is initially a policy issue that requires a state to determine if it wants to create a chartering board that is fully independent of the state board of education? Additionally, the state must decide if it should it be quasi-independent and serve as an office of the state board or be overseen by the board? Another consideration is whether applicants to the ICB should first be required to apply to their local district. The right to apply to the ICB could be contingent on the local district refusing to approve the initial

application. Unless the laws and regulations addressing these issues are explicit and clear, a more practical problem may arise in the form of challenges to the actions of the ICB. For example, does it have the authority to make the decisions such as: approvals, revocations, and non-renewals? Local Control is an important aspect of autonomy. Districts may resent approval of charters without their consent or even knowledge. The ability of an ICB to unilaterally approve a charter school application both undercuts district autonomy and impacts district budgets. Push back against ICBs in states like Colorado, Florida, and Georgia has been largely based on concerns over local control and a belief that state constitutions in many states provide districts with an exclusive right to create and oversee schools within their borders. Funding is another contentious area, both in terms of the source of funds for ICBs and the amount of funds needed to support their work. In New Jersey and other states, considerable resistance to the idea of creating an ICB has been rooted in a reluctance to fund the chartering board out of public funds that would otherwise remain with districts. Most commonly, ICBs are funded from a small percentage of the funds attributable to the charter schools they oversee, but this can be unpopular with those charter schools and with the districts where they are located. Without adequate funding, it is not possible for ICBs, or any authorizer, to do high quality work. In fact, one common reason why some district authorizers struggle in their responsibilities is a lack of resources devoted by the district to chartering. Ideally, one of the strengths of an ICB should be that as an organization entirely focused on charter school authorizing, it has the funding and other resources needed to do the job well. In practice, this may or may not be the case. In order for ICBs to be attentive and effective in their work, they require sufficient staff to attend to the application reviews, oversight visits, investigations of various sorts, renewal decision-making, and other functions that characterize this work. Staffing is partly a function of the level of funding available but may relate to the perspective an ICB or other authorizer brings to the work. A more hands-off approach to oversight, for example, will likely require fewer staff to do that work. As with funding, adequate staffing should be a strength of ICBs, as compared to other types of authorizers that may have to stretch personnel between various priorities, including authorizing. ICBs and other authorizers committed to fostering high quality charter schools may encounter a tension between respecting the autonomy of the schools they oversee and taking it upon themselves to improve those schools. Especially where staffing is plentiful, they may be tempted to involve themselves in programmatic decisions that are more appropriately the province of the school leaders, or to offer support services designed to improve schools. The ICB's primary role as a gatekeeper, holding schools accountable for their performance, can be compromised by such proactive steps. The discussion of ICB litigation, above, attests to the reality that chartering boards are vulnerable to law suits. The degree of vulnerability of any particular ICB will depend to a great extent on the language of its state constitution. States with an explicit local control clause are most at risk, but the suit in Colorado demonstrated that even such clauses can be successfully defended. Whatever a state's constitutional language, care should be taken to draft legislation, regulations and ICB rules that carefully articulate the roles and responsibilities of the ICB in a way that is as respectful as possible of state legal precedents.

After Mr. O'Neill gave background, benefits, and concerns of ICBs, he presented several recommendations to the Authority. These recommendations are listed below:

Given the benefits and challenges described in this memorandum, the following considerations may be worth considering in trying to ensure strong statewide ICBs:

- The singular purpose of ICBs should allow for maximum attentiveness to charter authorizing and for a high level of expertise in that work.
- ICBs have the potential to be more independent and less politically sensitive than district and state education authorities.
- Competence and effectiveness should not be assumed – ICBs that are underfunded, understaffed, and insufficiently attentive to their responsibilities are likely to struggle to be successful.

- ICBs can be shut down for poor performance. While other types of authorizers could lose the ability to approve and oversee charter schools, all of those types – LEAs, SEAs, universities, non-profit groups, etc. – have a larger role beyond authorizing that would continue.
- The presence of a strong ICB as an alternative to other authorizing options can provide an important element of choice for charter applicants and, where other authorizers are weak, can raise the quality level of authorizing within the state.
- Despite the unique aspects of ICBs, their work is in many respects no different from that of other authorizers, and it is essential that they understand and follow best practices for strong authorizing generally. To that end, NACSA's *Principles and Standards for Quality Authorizing* is an essential guiding resource. NACSA's newly developed *Performance Frameworks* that collectively provide a rubric for assessing quality in the academic, financial and organizational management elements of a school's program can be very useful tools for ICBs developing their own approach to school accountability.
- One area in which ICBs and other authorizers commonly struggle is special education. The complex and comprehensive compliance and program requirements imposed on schools, LEAs and SEAs by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and other applicable laws can be daunting and many authorizers are lack the expertise to fully understand how those requirements play out in their work. A new resource has been created by the National Charter Schools Institute called *Charter School Authorizer Rubrics for Special Education*. These rubrics identify all of the important steps an authorizer should take at each phase of the authorizing process – application review, oversight and renewal/closure decisions. These will be made available soon and ICBs should consider using them as a tool.

During the discussion between Mr. O'Neill and the Authority, Deputy Attorney Chesney asked if Mr. O'Neill looked at the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) with regard to the local educational control issue in Nevada. Mr. O'Neill said he had and opined that NRS does not appear to conflict with the recommendations and future work of the SPCSA. He said that it is the kind of provision that if it was in the Constitution then there could be challenges, but since it is not then it should not become an issue.

Member Mackedon asked if there could be an additional interview from applicants to gauge their capacity to operate a school. Director Canavero said that as of now, the SPCSA has taken the issue into account and will be vigilant of that during the interview process that is already in place. Director Canavero finished up by saying that after the meeting Mr. O'Neill would be sending him a report about the Local Education Agency status of the SPCSA.

Agenda Item 4 – Director's Report

Director Canavero began his report by detailing staffing at the SPCSA. He said that he is still working to fill the open positions that have been discussed at prior meetings. Hiring of the Administrative Services Officer was completed and all that was left was salary negotiations. He also talked about the upcoming National Association of Charter School Authorizer Leadership Conference that will be taking place in Memphis October 22 through October 25. He said that President Conaboy and Member McCord would also be attending the conference with him.

Director Canavero then moved on to student health in charter schools. He said that Tom McCormack met with Assemblywoman Smith to discuss maintaining a safe and healthy environment for students in charter schools. The main question during the meeting was the self-administration versus school-administration of EpiPens.

Director Canavero acknowledged the Charter School Association of Nevada (CSAN) for holding a records retention meeting at Nevada State High School. Wendi Hawk organized the meeting and Director Canavero also took part. He said that the main concern of the meeting was to ensure a smooth transition of student records when students change schools.

Director Canavero finished with an update on the Legislative Committee on Education and the bills they chose to move forward on behalf of the SPCSA. He said they chose to move the facilities bill, lottery enrollment, and performance framework bills to the 2013 Legislative session.

Discussion turned to the weighted model funding when Member Wahl asked about the percentage charter schools pay as a fee to the SPCSA. She said that Mr. O'Neill's presentation said that many states receive 3% from their charter schools and whether the SPCSA was going to move to 3% with its charter schools. Director Canavero said that the SPCSA has the authority in NRS to charge charter schools up to 2%. He said that currently the SPCSA is charging 1.5% and the upcoming three fiscal year budgets were built with the 1.5% fee built in.

President Conaboy wanted to clarify that the scope of the weighted funding study was to review the possibility of weighting categories of students -- such as English Language Learners and students eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch -- to receive funding beyond the DSA. The interim study did not deal with infrastructure funding or the funds collected by the SPCSA via a percentage fee charged to authorize schools. .

Agenda Item 6 – Approval of Conversion of the Subsection 7 Charter to Subsection 5 Charter of the Pinecrest Academy

Director Canavero began by detailing the conversion process that Pinecrest had undertaken. He said the school had satisfied the conditions for conversion and the SPCSA staff recommended to the Authority full conversion to a Subsection 5 Charter from a Subsection 7 Charter. The conditions satisfied by Pinecrest Academy are listed below:

1. *"The School has not yet obtained a facility."* All health and safety requirements are satisfied –
2. *"The School has not yet established a governing body."* -The Governing Body was formally established and officers elected
3. *"The School has not yet demonstrated enrollment that can result in a financially viable charter school."* Allyson reviewed our list of students and confirmed 752 (121 in K) students signed-up to attend Pinecrest Academy.
4. *"The School's special education plan requires amendment."* The proposed amendment language was reviewed and approved by Angela Blair. The Board of Pinecrest formally adopted the amended language on August 9th.

Member Mackedon asked where Pinecrest would be located in Clark County. Director Canavero asked that Ryan Reeves, Pinecrest Academy, give some background to the location of Pinecrest Academy. Mr. Reeves said the school would be located in Henderson, Nevada. Mr. Reeves also said that east Henderson has not had a facility-based charter school available to the community, and because of that Pinecrest Academy's enrollment was very strong.

Member Abelman made a motion for approval of conversion of the Subsection 7 Charter to Subsection 5 Charter of the Pinecrest Academy. Vice President Wahl seconded the motion. No discussion took place. The motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 7 – Overview of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver as submitted by the Nevada Department of Education and conditionally approved by USED

Dr. Katherine Rohrer began by giving a brief background of the approval process that the Nevada Department of Education and the United States Department of Education went through in order for Nevada to be approved for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act waiver. Dr. Rohrer said NACSA has been working closely with different states and USED to help clarify what the ESEA waiver would mean to charter schools. She also said that Director Canavero has been very diligent in working with the Nevada Department of Education to make sure the assurances in the ESEA waiver extended to charter schools without interfering with Nevada's charter school autonomy as defined by NRS. The framework will be implemented in a way to protect charter school authorizers in their ability to close charter schools due to lack of performance, as provided for in their charter agreements.

Director Canavero also said there is a concern among charter schools that the ESEA waiver will require LEAs and school districts to limit charter schools' autonomy. One of the limits may be the requirement of charter schools to implement a teacher evaluation system that was spelled out in the Nevada Department of Education's ESEA waiver application. The other loss of autonomy could be how a charter school can respond to its own underperformance. Schools through the ESEA waiver can be identified as reward, priority, or focus and that would mean schools that were classified as "priority" or "focus" would be required to put into place some measures to correct the lack of performance. Director Canavero said the concern of this requirement is it might impose upon a school and its autonomy along with imposing on the authorizer's ability to hold the school accountable. Director Canavero then gave some examples of how these scenarios might come to fruition. He said that when these questions came up, NACSA worked with USED to help sort out how the waiver wouldn't decrease the autonomy of the school or decrease an authorizer's ability to act upon low performing schools. Discussion then continued between Director Canavero, Dr. Rohrer, and the Authority about how autonomy loss would be avoided at the SPCSA-sponsored schools.

Agenda Item 8 – Overview and discussion of the leaver and cohort graduation rate formulas and Authority-sponsored charter school's graduation rates

Dr. Rohrer then moved onto an explanation of the leaver and cohort graduation rate formulas and the Authority-sponsored charter school's graduation rates. Dr. Rohrer worked with all the schools in order to reflect the most accurate graduation data available. She said that some of the data from some of the schools was missing and that affected their cohort rate. Dr. Rohrer said the average graduation rate for Authority-sponsored charter schools was 27.84%. Data was based on the 2010 – 2011 school year. Dr. Rohrer then detailed how the formulas for graduation work for the Authority. Director Canavero also added that the data set used for the cohort graduation rate originates with the school. When a pupil enrolls they are entered into a student information system and that system tracks the progress of the pupil through their route to graduation.

Dr. Rohrer continued her presentation by comparing the differences with the leaver rate and the cohort rate and why the two rates had different graduation percentages. Dr. Rohrer said the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate was defined as: a graduate considered a student who graduates in four years or less with a standard, advanced, or adult diploma. A student who leaves school after four years with a certificate of attendance, adjusted diploma, or high school equivalency diploma is not considered a graduate. Dr. Rohrer then explained the leaver rate as: the percentage of students leaving high school with a standard, advanced, or adult diploma compared to the total number of students leaving with a certificate of attendance or other completion credential, or who have dropped out. She then added that the biggest change between the leaver rate and the cohort rate was how the graduate was defined in the student information systems. The cohort graduation rate considers a graduate to be a student who completed high school in four years or less.

Member McCord expressed some concern with the four year cohort graduation rate and how it measures ninth graders. He said that in his thirty years in dealing with 9th graders they will sometimes perform under

expectations and this is not reflected in the four year rate. He was also concerned that schools may try to push kids out of there school if they know that pupil will not be able to pass and graduate.

Member Wahl asked if there had been any backlash in the public after the graduation rates were released to the public. Dr. Rohrer and Director Canavero then detailed the charter school's graduation rate and the reaction by the public to the data released. Dr. Rohrer said that she had received an inquiry from a local newspaper in regard to one of the charter schools but no story in the paper was ever found. She said most calls went to the Nevada Department of Education, but she did receive one direct inquiry from the press regarding one specific school.

Chair Conaboy asked if there was a way to provide a message to report a deeper meaning of this data. Dr. Rohrer responded by saying yes, retention is also a good indicator of the success or failure of our charter schools. She said that schools' realized that their graduation rate numbers are low, but this year schools will be graduating their first full four year cohort and their rates would begin to reflect the proper data. Dr. Rohrer said that she agreed with that assessment and is hopeful that we will see the graduation rates increased over time.

Member Mackedon said that right, wrong, or indifferent this is the data that has been reported and the SPCSA-sponsored schools need to be on par with the rest of Nevada's public schools.

Agenda Item 9 – Discussion of the draft performance frameworks for SPCSA-sponsored charter schools. The discussion will center on the Financial framework as well as update the Authority on the Academic and Organizational frameworks.

Director Canavero said that the development of the Financial framework has progressed well. Staff, with the help of a small group of charter school administrators, was able to put together the framework to measure the long-term financial stability for each charter school. Member McCord asked how the financial information was collected. Director Canavero said that is was collected by an independent third party audit that each charter school is required to complete annually. Member McCord also asked about the variance of each individual audit. Member McCord said there is not a real specific standard that has been established by audit firms with regard to 501(c)(3) type organizations, and this is concerning for SPCSA staff with regard the variance in audit results that may come about.

Director Canavero called for more discussion regarding the due diligence of SPCSA staff for the independent audits. He said he also recognized that the Authority will have some liability in trusting the results from the various independent audits. Discussion continued between the Authority and Director Canavero.

Director Canavero finished the discussion by saying the most important thing for the schools was clarity in the frameworks. To have clear benchmarks established that schools and the SPCSA can agree on, and when some of those marks are met then certain procedures begin.

Agenda Item 10 – Overview of the SPCSA's FY14/15 budget. The discussion will include the performance measures as required by the Priorities and Performance Based Budgeting.

Director Canavero explained to the Authority the process that SPCSA staff has been taking part in with the Governor's office in setting up the Fiscal Year 14 and 15 budgets for the SPCSA. Each agency is required to create a budget using the Priorities and Performance Based Budgeting measures that were established by the Governor's office. The FY14/15 budget for the SPCSA is broken down into two principle activities: Quality Charter School Authorizing and Technical Assistance and Support. Within each of those activities there were performance measures set to help gauge whether the SPCSA has met its two established activities.

Agenda Item 11 – Update on the successful administration and implementation of federal entitlement programs.

Angela Blair updated the Authority on Title I, Title IIa, and Title III money the SPCSA has received on behalf of the schools. Ms. Blair said that seven schools had been selected to develop and distribute Title I funds. These schools were chosen based on the population of Free and Reduced Lunch pupils at their schools. She said that each of the Title I eligible schools were required to set three goals in distributing the Title I money and each school would be required to develop and turn in a School Improvement Plan.

Ms. Blair then moved onto discussion regarding Title IIa money. She said that Title IIa funds target schools with the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers, the largest class sizes, or are identified for school improvement under Section 1116(b) of the Title I-A [Section 2122 (b)(3)]. She then gave a few examples how she, and the SPCSA staff, has been gathering data to consider whether to target funds to help meet with the Title I responsibilities. Member Mackedon asked if only Title I schools would be eligible for Title IIa money. Ms. Blair said no, all schools are eligible, but Title I schools would be first.

Ms. Blair then spoke about the Title III funds that target English Language Learners (ELL). She said that SPCSA-sponsored schools had only identified 66 total students who require ELL services. She said that Nevada required a minimum of 87 to 90 ELL students to qualify for the minimum of \$10,000. She said data collection was probably one of the main reasons the SPCSA-sponsored schools reported such a low ELL student population. As the data collection becomes more accurate she believes our schools will qualify for more Title III funds.

Ms. Blair closed by saying the SPCSA had qualified for \$5,200 for the Migrant student population numbers. She said these funds would target professional development for teachers in sheltered instruction.

Agenda Item 12 – Report on the Letters of Intent received by the Authority as of August 24, 2012 and discussion related to the application review process and timeline.

Director Canavero reported that staff had received 12 Letters of Intent, which meant staff was expecting 12 charter school applications:

- 1. Sterling Charter High School**
 - a. Lyon
 - b. At-risk
- 2. Promise Academy**
 - a. Clark
 - b. At-risk
 - c. ELL
- 3. American Preparatory Academy**
 - a. Clark
 - b. At-risk
- 4. Legacy International**
 - a. Clark
 - b. Distance Education
- 5. Doral Academy**
 - a. Clark
- 6. Nevada Performance Academy**
 - a. Carson City
- 7. Imagine Centennial**
 - a. Clark
- 8. Silver State Virtual Academy**
 - a. Clark

- b. Distance Education
- 9. Ben Gamla**
 - a. Clark
- 10. Northern Nevada High School**
 - a. Washoe
- 11. Leadership Academy of Nevada**
 - a. Clark
 - b. Distance Education
- 12. Las Vegas Preparatory Academy**
 - a. Clark

Member McCord asked if there were any charter school replications. Director Canavero said, while there is not an exact definition of replication, yes there were some schools which could be considered replications. Questions from SPCSA members were asked with regard to specific letters of intent that had been received. Discussion about how to schedule the charter school applicants at the next SPCSA meeting was had.

Agenda Item 13 – Discussion and possible action related to the consideration of an independent third party evaluation of the operation of charter schools in Nevada. Discussion may include the purpose of the study and interaction with strategic plan.

Member McCord wanted the Authority to consider looking into conducting a third party study of Nevada charter schools. He said the school districts were very much in favor of having such a study. Member McCord said he understands the cost involved with undertaking such a large study, but he would like to see some third party data that could be used to set a baseline for charter schools in Nevada. Member Abelman voiced his support for the idea.

Director Canavero said he understood the appetite of the Authority for this type of data, but wondered if SPCSA staff might have the capacity to gather some of the information, depending on what type of information the Authority was looking for. Then from the data gathered by staff, the Authority could then decide if they would want the additional third party study.

Members of the Authority offered reasons in support of the idea and also not in support of the idea. Member Mackedon asked who would be doing the study. Member McCord said that he didn't have anyone particular in mind. He wanted the Authority to remember that charter schools in Nevada are growing extremely fast and he thinks now would be the best time to establish the baseline data.

The Authority decided not to take action on the item. They said it would be better to keep the item on future agendas to explore the details further. Member McCord thanked the Authority for considering the item and Member Van wanted to ensure this would stay on the agenda at future meetings.

Agenda Item 14 – Discussion and possible action on the development of a subcommittee of the Authority empowered to speak on behalf of members at the legislature.

President Conaboy began discussion by explaining why a formation of this legislative subcommittee was necessary. She felt it would be beneficial to the Authority to specify which members would reach out to the Legislature on behalf of the whole body. As she was explaining, Deputy Attorney General Chesney said that a subcommittee would probably not be the best idea for this situation. He said a subcommittee would be required to meet under Open Meeting Laws and he didn't think that was the intention of the chair. President Conaboy agreed and Deputy Attorney General Chesney recommended calling the members Legislative Liaisons who would have the power to speak on behalf of the Authority to Legislators.

Member Van made a motion for the appointment of Member Luna, Member McCord, and President Conaboy as Legislative Liaisons. Member Abelman seconded the motion. No discussion was had. The motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 3 – Authority Update

President Conaboy started by explaining some of the issues that came up at the Legislative Committee on Education's meeting. One issue that was discussed was when Member Wahl asked where the initiation of the pay-for-performance legislation originated. President Conaboy said she was unsure, but looking into it.

President Conaboy said that Director Canavero's performance contracting presentation was well-received by the LCE and received unanimous support. President Conaboy said that Assemblyman Stewart and Assemblyman Munford were very supportive of this during the LCE meeting. President Conaboy said that there was no motion on the evaluation process.

Director Canavero was then asked to update the board on the weighted funding model that had been discussed at the LCE meeting. The new models all will significantly increase Distributive School Account funding to the SPCSA-sponsored charter schools with regard to special education. The lowest increase in special education funding would be 453 percent. Member McCord added that the adequacy of weighted funding was the basis of litigation.

Agenda Item 15 – Future Agenda Items

President Conaboy asked the members if they had any agenda items they would like to see on future agendas. Member Van said he would like to see the Independent Auditing issues on a future agenda. Member McCord asked that charter school replication grants be on future agendas. Member Mackedon asked that the Student Achievement data that was yet to be released be included on the agenda when the information is made public.

Agenda Item 16 – Member Comment

Member Luna passed out invitations to the Nevada Hispanic Legislative Caucus. Member Wahl asked if the SPCSA budget included bill tracking funding. President Conaboy said there is a free service located at the Legislative Counsel Bureau's website.

Agenda Item 17 – Public Comment

None

Agenda Item 18 – Next Meeting Date

The Authority decided to have a two day meeting for the charter school application review. The next meeting will be October 18 and October 19, 2012.

Member Van made a motion for adjournment. Member McCord seconded the motion. No discussion was had. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.