## NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

## TELECONFERENCED OPEN MEETING

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2016

## CARSON CITY, NEVADA

THE BOARD: ADAM JOHNSON, Chair

PATRICK GAVIN, Executive Director MELISSA MACKEDON, Vice-President

NORA LUNA, Member

KATHLEEN CONABOY, Member

JACOB SNOW, Member

STAVAN CORBETT, Member JASON GUINASSO, Member

FOR THE BOARD: GREG OTT, Deputy Attorney General

ROBERT WHITNEY,

Deputy Attorney General

TANYA OSBORNE,

Administrative Assistant III

KATIE BALDWIN,

Management Analyst II

REPORTED BY: CAPITOL REPORTERS

BY: NICOLE J. HANSEN,

Nevada CCR #446

——CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 ——

1		AGENDA/INDEX
2	AGE	NDA ITEM PAGE
3	1.	Public Comment #1 5
4		
5	2.	Approval of the September 23, 2016, SPCSA Board 6 Action Minutes (Adam Johnson, Chair, SPCSA)
6		(Information/Discussion)
7	3.	Approval of Consent Agenda 7 (Adam Johnson, Chair, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)
9		A. Renewal Process, Timelines, and Forms for
10		2016-17, including but not limited to Expedited Renewal
11		(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)
12		B. Staff Approval Pursuant to Delegated Authority of Technical Amendment to Legacy
13		Traditional Charter Contract to Acquire Initial Facility. (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director,
14		<pre>SPCSA). (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)</pre>
15		
16	4.	Consideration and possible action regarding 49 Beacon Academy's amended contract reflecting the
17		school's desire to revise enrollment criteria and become eligible to be evaluated based on the
18		Alternative Framework. Possible actions include acceptance of contract negotiated between Beacon
19		Academy and SPCSA staff, rejection of contract, or direction to renegotiate. (Patrick Gavin, Executive
20		<pre>Director, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)</pre>
21	5.	Consideration and possible action regarding the 57
22		Notice of Closure issued to Beacon Academy on September 30 by SPCSA Staff at the direction of the
23		SPCSA Board. Possible actions include dismissal of the Notice of Closure or no action allowing the
24		Notice of Closure to proceed as issued (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA)
25		(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)

1		AGENDA/INDEX	
2	AGEN	DA ITEM PAGE	
3			
4	6.	Consideration and possible action of the American Preparatory Academy charter amendment request to move facilities. (Patrick Gavin,	
5		Executive Director, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)	
6		(Information, Discussion, For Fossible Action)	
7			
8	7.	Consideration and possible action of the <b>69</b> Founders Academy charter amendment request to move facilities.	
9		(Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA)	
10		(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)	
11	8.	Executive Director's Report 89 (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director,	
12		SPCSA) (Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)	
13			
14	9.	Quest Academy and Silver State Charter School 26 receiver update (Josh Kern, The Ten Square Group) (Information/Discussion)	
15		(INICIMACION/DISCUSSION)	
16	10.	Consideration of Revised Infinite Campus 93 Database Split Proposal	
17		(Melissa Mackedon, Vice Chair, SPCSA) (Information/Discussion)	
18			
19	11.	Update, discussion, and possible action 99 Regarding the State Public Charter School	
20		Authority's Strategic Plan (Patrick Gavin, Executive Director, SPCSA)	
21		(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)	
22	1.0	Dublic Comment #2	
23	12.	Public Comment #2 111	
24	1.0		
25	16.	Adjournment (Action) 113	

——CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 ——

1	CARSON CITY, NEVADA; FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2016; 10:04 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIR JOHNSON: Good morning, everybody.
4	Looks like we are all here, so I will call our meeting to
5	order at 10:04 a.m.
6	Deputy Attorney General Robert Whitney, have
7	you reviewed the agenda?
8	DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: Yes, sir. Mr. Chair,
9	this is Robert Whitney. I have reviewed the agenda, yes.
10	CHAIR JOHNSON: Is it in compliance with the
11	open meeting law?
12	DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: It is, except one thing.
13	The room number we're actually meeting in 4401. Just
14	a de minimus change, though.
15	CHAIR JOHNSON: Okay.
16	DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: So I believe we're good
17	to go.
18	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Thank you so
19	much. I'll start with roll call. Vice-President
20	Mackedon?
21	VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Here.
22	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Corbett?
23	MEMBER CORBETT: Present.
24	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Snow?
25	MEMBER SNOW: I'm here.

——CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322——

1	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Conaboy?
2	MEMBER CONABOY: Present.
3	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?
4	MEMBER GUINASSO: Present.
5	CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Luna?
6	MEMBER LUNA: Present.
7	CHAIR JOHNSON: Perfect. We will start with
8	the Pledge of Allegiance.
9	(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)
10	CHAIR JOHNSON: I'll accept a motion for
11	flexible agenda.
12	MEMBER CONABOY: So moved. Member Conaboy.
13	CHAIR JOHNSON: Is there a second?
14	MEMBER SNOW: Second. Member Snow.
15	CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of establishing
16	a flexible agenda?
17	THE BOARD: Aye.
18	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Agenda Item No.
19	1. We will take public comment that deals with anything
20	that has to do with our agenda today.
21	Do we have any public comment in the north,
22	Danny?
23	MS. OSBORNE: Actually, Danny is not here.
24	This is Tanya. Hi.
25	CHAIR JOHNSON: Good morning, Tanya. I

```
1
     apologize.
2
                 MS. OSBORNE: That's okay. Good morning.
3
     have no public comment here right now.
 4
                 CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Is there any in
5
     the south? There appears to be none. All right. We
 6
     will go to Agenda Item No. 2: Approval of the September
7
     23rd board meeting minutes. Member Mackedon?
8
                 VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Move to approve the
9
     September 23rd SPCSA board meeting action minutes.
10
                 MEMBER CONABOY: Second. Member Conaboy.
11
                 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor?
12
                 THE BOARD: Aye.
1.3
                 CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Luna wanted some
14
     discussion. I apologize.
15
                 MEMBER LUNA: I am listed as absent, and I
16
     was there, so it just needs to be corrected.
17
                 CHAIR JOHNSON: Can you restate your motion
18
     with the request for the amendment, please?
19
                 VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Yes. I move to approve
20
     the September 23rd, 2016, SPCSA Board meeting action
21
     minutes with the amendment that Nora Luna was present,
22
     not absent.
23
                 MEMBER CONABOY: Actually, Chairman, I just
24
     realized I watched the video, but I wasn't actually
```

there, so I probably can't second the motion.

25

1	CHAIR JOHNSON: Do we have a second from a
2	member who was present?
3	MEMBER LUNA: Nora Luna. I second.
4	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. All in favor?
5	THE BOARD: Aye.
6	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We will move to
7	Agenda Item No. 3. Are there any items that need to be
8	pulled for discussion?
9	MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could
10	we please pull 3B?
11	CHAIR JOHNSON: Will do.
12	VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: And also 3A. Sorry.
13	CHAIR JOHNSON: So it would appear that we
14	have no consent agenda, and we will discuss both of those
15	items. We will take those in order then. So Item 3A is
16	the renewal process, timeliness, and forms for 2016-17,
17	including but not limited to expedited renewal.
18	VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Chair Johnson, I'd like
19	to recuse myself from Item 3A, please.
20	CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Is there any
21	other discussion that needs to take place? All right.
22	MEMBER SNOW: This is Member Snow. I'll move
23	for approval of the consent agenda.
24	CHAIR JOHNSON: On item 3A.
25	MEMBER SNOW: Thank you for that correction.

Yes. Item 3A.

1.3

2.4

2 MEMBER CORBETT: Member Corbett. Second.

3 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Item 3B: Staff
Approval Pursuant to Delegated Authority of Technical
Amendment to Legacy Traditional Charter Contract to
acquire initial facility. Member Gavin or, sorry, not
Member Gavin. Director Gavin?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Legacy Traditional School was approved by

the Authority in the fall 2015 cycle. The school is

scheduled to open in the fall of '17. While the school

had initially been approved for a tentative location in

Henderson, it was unable to identify a suitable and

affordable location that local governments would permit

the school to occupy.

Consequently, the governing body has conducted a far more extensive search of the valley and has expanded and identified a location in North Las Vegas which it has determined would meet its needs. This school has provided us with a technical amendment to acquire this location pursuant to regulation. Based on our review, the request appears to comply with all applicable regulations and is administratively complete

and answers all questions that are required by staff and the Authority in consideration of such questions.

1.3

2.4

Additionally, the school has made a request for a name change for Legacy to change the name of the school from Legacy Traditional School of Henderson to Legacy Traditional School of North Valley.

Staff recommends -- staff brings this to the board primarily because of the fact that it is a significant material change in location. While I believe my delegated authority from you would permit this, I think it is important from an informational perspective, if nothing else, that this body be aware that the school is moving a 10- or 15-mile difference in location, and that that is something that I do think that merits at least some public discussion or notification of. But we absolutely support this change in location, and we request further delegated authority to approve any subsequent technical amendments to permit occupancy.

I would note with regard to the name change, this is an area just of minor concern for me. Given that the school currently has notified us of its intent to pursue a second campus, I would argue that perhaps the name should be more broad to just Legacy Traditional School of Nevada or Legacy Traditional School of Southern Nevada or something like that so that we're not

constantly having to change the legal name of the entity as the school opens new locations. We've typically done campus designations on a local basis. But that's something where, again, I'd delegate authority to make that to approve whatever change they ultimately decide on.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. asked that this be pulled because I noticed that in the staff report that we received that this was significant enough that it merited Board review and consideration, and if you think it's significant enough for review and consideration, I would think that we would not want that on the consent agenda, but we would want to be able to discuss that and review it. And so in the future with these sorts of things, let's make sure they're not in a consent agenda, but on the regular agenda.

But more substantively, I'm trying to understand what the difference is between a technical amendment and a substantive amendment. Because we have -- like in our agenda today, we have amendments to contracts where the schools are relocating, and there's a whole host of questions that they have to answer, and I'm trying to understand the difference between an established school that's moving and requires an

amendment to move and a school where we approve the charter contract, they haven't opened yet, and now they want to change their location, and it's not just a minor change, it's a significant change in terms of geography.

1.3

2.4

Why aren't they answering the same questions that we ask with regard to our schools that change locations? Because it seems like the same issues are at play whether they're a school that hasn't opened versus a school that's been opened for a few years.

Guinasso, for the question. So in terms of the -there's sort of two different questions there, as I
understand it. One is the distinction between sort of a
technical versus a more material amendment. With
relation to that, the statute does provide that there are
some items which must be considered by the Board in a
public process, and those include amendments to acquire
new facilities for the purposes of increasing enrollment
and significant changes to academic programs, etcetera.

I will also note that our draft regulations attempt to differentiate between the things that -- to further clarify items that require board review, such as a significant relocation of an existing school, to ensure that there is a public process for that because that can -- especially in the case of a school that is up and

running, there are huge impacts on parents and families, potentially -- parents, students, and families for a significant change in location. So I think that does bear a public process or public discussion.

1.3

2.4

With relation to new schools, I think that the board has historically not wanted to have to tie schools' hands with the preopening execution issues related to getting a new facility and making all of the other sort of operational decisions that happen following charter approval and prior to occupancy of the school, especially given the kinds of timelines that schools are off and on to acquire a facility within a very tight startup period. So I think that has been -- that has historically been the reason why we had requested and the board has granted delegated authority for the facilities' occupancy and acquisition of items related to a charter -- to a new charter school.

In this case, given that it was a significant change in location, I felt it was important to at least bring this to the board's attention, but they've already done almost all of -- other than the change in the actual location, they've done all of the other preopening work. This isn't something where they're going to have to go out and tell families, "Oh, look. We've moved, and now you're going to have to move your kiddos up from

Henderson to North Las Vegas." They're not at that point in the process where they have actually opened an enrollment process or whatever else. They have certainly provided public information and meetings and whatnot, but there's been no covenant made with kids and families relating to a school in a particular location, which I think is the thing that particularly concerns us as a -- you as a body and me as someone who wants to make sure our kids and families have appropriate schooling options. So that's really the intent. And it's something where I think, especially at the November 4th regular discussion, it's certainly something we could dig into and figure out if there's a better way of dealing with these issues.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Two questions. This is more technical than not. As I was looking through the budget again, I came across the student fees that will occur in years one through five, the total amount \$300,000 a year for each of those years, and that's ten times the amount of private fundraising they're going to do.

I'm just trying to get clear on what those two fees are because that's considered as revenue, and in each instance, it's a significant amount of revenue, so I don't know if you're able to answer what that is or a member of the body would like to come up and help us understand what those student fees are and how you're

going to -- why they need to be collected at a clip of \$300,000 a year.

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: So I can't speak to the specifics of that particular -- of the budget assumptions for this school. I will say that the statute does permit charter schools to charge any fee that is permissible for a district to charge. There is also an expectation that we outline in our charter application as well as in the statute that there be some mechanism to ensure that the imposition of such fees does not become a barrier to either initial enrollment or ongoing enrollment. So, effectively, a scholarship. Many schools use the free reduced lunch eligibility as the criteria for that.

If you wish to invite an individual representative of the school or of their management company to come up and speak about that and get more details, I think that would be perfectly appropriate.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Mr. Bressler, I saw you shaking your head, so I'd love to have you or any of the representatives come up and just help us talk through that a little bit, please.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. President. My name is Corey Kennedy. I'm the treasurer with Legacy Traditional Schools Nevada, and the local revenue that

```
you're referring to in the budget is actually primarily
1
2
      related to lunch fees. And in addition, there are
3
     before- and after-school programs planned, and there is
 4
      revenue associated with those. There are a number of
5
     other things, sports fees, participation fees in sports,
 6
     but the lunch and the before- and after-school programs
7
     make up the majority of those dollars.
8
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: And then how easily
9
      discernible is it for families to understand that if they
10
     aren't eligible, if they don't have the means to pay for
11
     those, how clearly is it laid out in the admissions
12
     process if those fees are waivable for them, if at all?
1.3
                  MR. BRESSLER: William Bressler, Chief
14
     Academic Officer, representing the Board. I work for CFE
15
     the EMO for Legacy Industries.
16
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: Mr. Bressler, I apologize.
17
     Mr. Kennedy as well. For the sake of our court reporter,
18
      if you could also spell your last names and your first
19
     names at an appropriate point just so that we can ensure
20
     that they're reflected accurately in the record.
21
                  MR. BRESSLER: Absolutely. Bressler:
22
     B-R-E-S-S-L-E-R.
23
                  MR. KENNEDY: It is Corey: C-O-R-E-Y
2.4
     Kennedy: K-E-N-N-E-D-Y.
```

-CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 —

MR. BRESSLER: Mr. Chair Johnson, yes.

The

25

fees are outlined in the handbook, and these are all voluntary as well. However, there are scholarship opportunities available for those who do qualify.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: One of the last questions I had was with the significant location change, so you'll be going from the Henderson area up to the North Las Vegas area, and if I'm not mistaken, some of the closest high schools may be Cheyenne High School and then Mojave High School is relatively close as well, and what I know of those high schools is that it's a fairly diverse population of students, many of whom are on free and reduced lunch, etcetera.

And so how do we -- I know you said that within 60 days of this approval, you'll have an amended -- approved amendment recruitment packet that you will be putting forward to Director Gavin. And one of the things that I had a question about initially when we approved the charter earlier in the year was around ensuring that there's a really, really comprehensive recruitment plan so that we can ensure that the school represents the community that it's going to be sitting in.

How do you plan on changing your recruitment strategy now that you'll be in a different community than one in which you thought you would be in initially?

MR. BRESSLER: Chair Johnson, thank you.

Good question. The Board is fully prepared to, upon approval of the Authority Board, to do a study and make sure we are adequately and effectively communicating with the community and meeting and going out, and prior to even beginning the enrollment window process, prior to the enrollment window, then you have a lottery.

1.3

2.4

The 60 days, definitely, we feel -- the Board feels it's a reasonable amount of time to gather all of those artifacts. You know, we do have a very good understanding of diverse communities based off of the network of schools that we manage in Arizona, and certainly there's diversity among communities geographically and, you know, what method of engagement in the community that works in one community certainly is different than another. And I fortunately have a tool belt filled with things that I feel will be able to engage the community and draw their interest in Legacy Traditional School as well as charter schools in general.

And, you know, right now, we have over 850 students on the interest list in the valley, and that's without any kind of marketing campaign whatsoever. So we're feeling fairly confident that we're going to be able to employ a lot of these strategies in North Las Vegas, be able to recruit the students or at least once

again draw their interest in school choice.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

1.3

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank
you. Do you anticipate any changes in the charter
contract that was approved earlier this year as a result
of the relocation?

MR. BRESSLER: The Board anticipation of changes to the contract other than the name change -- clearly Henderson isn't going to work in North Las Vegas. No, there has not been any change whatsoever. And my understanding is that we would have to come in and ask permission anyway as the contract has been executed, and so we've been in communication with Director Gavin throughout the whole entire process. If we feel, at any point, that anything that would need to change from the original application to the execution basically of the new location then certainly, we'll be back in front.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Mr. Chairman, Director

Gavin, this feels like more than a technical sort of

amendment. I appreciate you bringing it back to the

board, but I feel somewhat disabled in terms of making a

competent decision.

We've delegated a lot of authority with regard to what's happening on the ground with the school. But the memorandum that we were given just kind of

provides a basic outline and doesn't address all of the different questions that could come up in a significant relocation. And I think that Chair Johnson's question is one of probably several questions that would get asked that would have us re-look at provisions in the contract and whether they still apply in any location.

1.3

2.4

I don't think that's going to be a barrier to me approving what you've asked us to approve, but I just want to note for the record my discomfort of being put in a position where I don't feel like we have been -- that we're put in a position where we can make a rational decision based on a whole set of facts that give us assurance that the relocation isn't going to -- can't substantially impact the contract that was the charter that was approved earlier this year.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Can I just respond to that really quick? I think part of the reason that you feel that way is because you haven't -- you weren't there for the initial application approval. And I think once you've sat through that process with the Board, you know, one round of it, you'll see how comprehensive that process is. And I think it will help, you know. I don't feel any of what you're feeling, and I think that's the difference, is having gone through the actual application process. I think -- not that these aren't legitimate

questions, but I think once you've gone through that with a school, you'll see how rigorous that is, and I think it helps, you know, alleviate some of what you're talking about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Director Gavin, is there a CHAIR JOHNSON: way that we can get -- I would love to have an update on the recruitment plan. I mean, again, I don't necessarily have any concerns with the school being able to fill its seats, but I certainly would want to ensure that the seats are filled in a way that mirrors the community. And so again, that's going to be a step that the team has to take, and so we won't be abreast of that again if they don't submit that until 60 days later. So is there a way that we can still kind of understand or monitor the methods that they're going to use so that again, once they're successful in helping to mirror the community they're in, we can then use that standard of practice and direct other new schools to use that same kind of -those same kinds of steps?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: So I just want to make sure I'm understanding what you're asking for. So assuming that this body chooses to approve this amendment, you would like staff and the school to come back to talk about both what the recruiting plan is and then some evidence of success? Is that a fair summary of

what you're asking for?

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: That is correct.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think that that would be completely appropriate. This larger issue of how our schools go about enrolling a diverse population that is representative of their local communities is one where I think there is a real opportunity for us to all improve.

The only thing I would caution is what works for one particular model and one particular operator and one particular scale is probably a bit different than what would work in another community. So as long as we don't create something that's extraordinarily prescriptive, I think that that's fine. But yes, I think it's a really valuable conversation.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Just to clarify, I'm not asking for anything to be prescriptive. I'm actually asking for us to have some standard operating procedures or some best practices that any new operators that would come to our community can look at to say, "You know what? These practices worked when we moved to North Las Vegas or in Las Vegas in general," because again, I think our challenge that we face is that many of our schools don't mirror the community that they currently sit in, and so

we want to ensure that that doesn't continue to happen moving forward.

1.3

2.4

MR. BRESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman

Johnson. I absolutely do appreciate it. And I think

it's also fair to say on record that the -
unfortunately, we are subject to the results of a

state-mandated lottery, so to come back and say, "Yes,

indeed, you know, we have a mirror of what the community

is," unless we are not oversubscribed, you know, it would

be disingenuous for me to say otherwise.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Well, I think the steps that you can take proactively around reaching out to different communities, you know, circumvent the lottery. So once the pool is diverse enough, then by lottery, by default, you'll get more of a diverse group of students because you will have taken some very aggressive proactive steps to make sure more students understand your schooling.

Any other questions? I know we've kind of belabored this a bit or we -- I belabored this a bit.

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Chairman, not to belabor further, but Patrick, Director Gavin used the phrase "preopening requirement," and maybe just for the sake of our relatively new board members, you could explain that process because what we have done, starting with the last cycle, is execute the contract and then allow staff to

have a checklist of things that we've all agreed will have to happen before the school actually opens and receives its DAS. And I think that's where this issue falls, at least it would have in the past if perhaps the move weren't quite so -- the distance wasn't quite so far.

1.3

2.4

So, Patrick, I don't know if you'd like to talk a little for two minutes about what a preopening agreement is, but I think that would help clarify and alleviate maybe some of Member Guinasso's concerns.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Yes. Thank you,

Member Conaboy, for the thoughtful question. So as part

of the standard charter contract, we have an exhibit -- I

believe it's Exhibit 4 if I'm remembering correctly -
which is that preopening checklist, which is a laundry

list of different requirements related to basic startups,

including, but not limited to: facilities inspection for

health and safety, Certificates of Occupancy, etcetera,

but also enrollment by certain points in time, some

ability for our staff to go out and essentially do a free

count of students to determine what the school is

eligible for for early payment of distributive school

account funds in the summer so that it has some dollars

to begin to pay teachers, etcetera.

It's a relatively lengthy list, and I think

actually one thing that I would like at some point to really dig into is what else, perhaps, should be on there, if nothing else as suggested elements. So, for example, I believe Infinite Campus training comes to mind as something we're observing as some area that some startup schools struggle with because they don't plan for it or governance training for board members or whatever it might be. So I think there's certainly room for that list to evolve.

1.3

2.4

But the preopening checklist is incorporated into the contract, and then staff basically reviews each of the items on that via an Epicenter submission or via a site visit. Virtually all of this is done via Epicenter at this point, which is a document process which is used to produce evidence of these particular items or the "artifacts," as Mr. Bressler termed them.

With regard to sort of why we do this, it is extraordinarily difficult for schools to make -- to open bank accounts and to do a host of other things, not the least of which is to secure financing for a facility or enter into a lease without an executed charter contract.

There was a point early on in the existence of charter contracts where we were bringing contracts before the Board in July and August prior to opening, so schools were essentially doing everything on a wing and a

prayer up until then. And I think we've heard representations from a number of schools that are in the audience today who were part of that early process that it created extraordinary difficulty. It also created, in some cases, some instances where some actions took place that in retrospect, would have been -- could have been -- we would have liked to have had the authority of the contract to be able to hold people accountable under it. So for that reason, we've tried to front-load the execution of the contract.

1.3

2.4

Indeed, it's worth noting that there's at least some draft language in the draft regs related to requiring execution of the contract within a certain number of days after approval to ensure that we're not stuck in this limbo period. So that's kind of what we're thinking about, but we are an evolving agency. We're still quite young, as we've discussed in other contexts, and I think there are certainly opportunities for us to revisit some of these areas and also figure out how to ensure that we're doing our job both as staff as and you as a body in conducting appropriate due diligence for all of these difficult elements without excessively burdening schools with regulation and paperwork.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Any further questions or discussion? Member Snow?

1 MEMBER SNOW: I'm going to move for approval 2 of Item 3B. 3 MEMBER CORBETT: Member Corbett. Second. 4 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of approving 5 Item 3B? 6 THE BOARD: Aye. 7 CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We will move to 8 Agenda Item No. 9, which is our update from Mr. Kern and 9 the Ten Square Group on Quest Academy and Silver State. 10 MR. KERN: Good morning. 11 CHAIR JOHNSON: Good morning, Mr. Kern. 12 MR. KERN: Good morning. My name is Joshua 1.3 Kern, and I am the receiver for Quest Academy Charter 14 School and Silver State Charter School. 15 When I was here before you last month, I 16 spent some time talking about accountability in the 17 charter school movement generally. It's one thing to 18 talk about accountability. It's another thing to be 19 subjected to it. And today, I'm here with Mabel 20 Lajes-Guiteras to turn the spotlight inward on the work 21 that we are doing at Quest. 22 Now that we have addressed many of the 23 operational, legal and financial issues that we inherited 2.4 last year, we have both the opportunity and the

responsibility to address the academic program. To start

25

the school improvement process in earnest, I commissioned a comprehensive performance audit of the school. Over the last few weeks, Mabel led an expert team to perform a comprehensive review of the school's program. We submitted that comprehensive review, and it's now part of the agenda.

1.3

2.4

And at this point, I'd like to turn the floor over to Mabel to introduce herself, explain the audit process, and review the findings and recommendations.

Thank you.

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: Good morning. My name is Mabel Lajes-Guiteras, and I'll spell that. Mabel: M-A-B-E-L, Lajes: L-A-J-E-S, hyphen, Guiteras: G-U-I-T-E-R-A-S.

A little bit about myself. A little bit of background. I have over ten years of teaching experience both in New York City and Boston schools, and I was the founding principal for Bedford Stuyvesant Charter School in Brooklyn, New York, which is an uncommon school. And during my five years of tenure as the principal there, we achieved an "A" on our report card from New York City, which is the highest grade that you can receive on your report card. This is my third year as part of the Ten Square team, and I lead audits across the nation working with different schools and authorizing boards as well as

I have led our school improvement team efforts and provided leadership coaching for our school leads.

1.3

2.4

Tell you a little bit about our audit process. So Ten Square's audit process is a practitioner-based audit process. Every member of our team has expertise, both teaching and leading schools, and we have concrete, actionable recommendations. We want to make sure that these recommendations are leading towards a clear school improvement plan that will lead to results for all of the students and families and staff members at Quest. So our team members collaborate.

We came on site for four days, and previous to that, we spent some time looking at data web requests and management requests previous to arriving, and after our arrival as well, to work together to complete this audit that you see before you today.

The structure of the audit is separated into several different sections. Each section is focused on an important critical area of student and staff achievement and school growth. You will see culture, student performance, academic and leadership sections. Each section has a summary finding at the end, as well as recommendations that follow.

Let me turn to the Quest audit specifically. So a few items I want to impress on everyone. Overall,

Quest has been through a difficult but necessary transition this year, and we recognize that. The school leader and the receiver have understandably focused their energies and time on stabilizing the school. And now, these efforts have led to a strong foundation that Quest can grow on to launch the next phase of its school improvement with an emphasis on instruction. And so we recognize that this is a multi-year process that requires a team approach to achieve the excellent results that we all want for our students and our families. And you'll see as we go through the report that some of these challenges that Quest faces are common challenges for schools that need school improvement efforts and plans, and so we are going to deep dive a little bit into some of this report, but we're confident that with training and support, that these changes can happen for the Quest school.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

As I dive through the audit, please, I invite you and encourage you to ask questions as I go through, and please let me know your thoughts as we are going through that process. Great. So our first section has a little bit of background that you're familiar with on Quest and its needs. We even had our methodology report, which we detail all of the different documents that we reviewed prior to and subsequent to our arrival, and all

of the different classroom observations that we did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

We did 39 classroom observations. All the core content teachers were observed except for one due to a schedule change, but we made sure that we spent our time in there. And as you'll see, we spent over 737 minutes in classrooms observing instruction and making sure it was at the level that would provide student achievement.

Our next section looks at student performance. One thing that I do want to highlight is we know that there's a limited release right now of state results for the last year's assessment, so we weren't able to do a granular analysis of that, but we were able to take some takeaways away. And as we're looking at the smarter balance assessment results for the last school year and previous to that with the Nevada State testing program, we can see that there were some large fluctuations in student performance throughout. we go through that, we can see that generally, the proficiency rates right now at Quest are below the Nevada state average, which is concerning. And there were several grade levels where we saw that the difference in the gap was rather large. And so that was something that we definitely took notice of, and as you'll see later on as we go through the report, you can see how instruction

really needs to be at the core now of the next phase of school improvement to really impact these scores.

1.3

2.4

I'm going to skip ahead to our school culture section, which starts on page 13. And as I said previously, our school culture, we found a very strong school culture in place. Typically, when we go to schools who are in need of turnaround, we see schools that do not have transitions that are well run, we see students who are running around the hallways. There isn't a clear vision for that. That is not the case at Quest.

At Quest, we saw very clear transitions. We saw orderly movement from one class to the next class, from one activity to the next class. Adults were present, they were mindful of how students were doing, they went and intervened whenever students had trouble, so we really saw that that was a very positive force here at the school. And again, it lays a very strong foundation to now taking the next step for instruction. We also saw a very warm and welcoming atmosphere. All of the young adults and students on campus smiled, they were welcoming to all of us, they welcomed us all into the classroom, and I think that though it might seem like a small thing, it actually speaks volumes to the work that the leadership has done after such a year of turmoil to

be able to have that positivity and that warm environment, especially for outsiders coming in to do what may seem a bit of an intimidating audit process for them. So that was a pleasure to see.

1.3

2.4

Turning to our leadership findings, we recognize that the school leaders again are in a state of transition, and they have done a very admirable job of strengthening that culture and dealing with putting out the fires that existed as late as this summer to really get everything going and underway to open the school year. So we absolutely recognize that, and we had many staff members in our interview, so we do an extensive interview process where we interview teachers as well as leadership team members, and teachers in their interviews did point to the current leadership as being welcoming and supportive for them and setting a stability -- a necessary air of stability for everyone on the campus.

So as we turn to one of the main things that we do see is that the leaders do lack some clear vision for what the academic program should look like right now. They, right now, have been putting out the fires. They have not set that clear vision for clear classroom expectations. What should it look like when you walk into every classroom? What is the teaching and coaching process? What should that look like for feedback for

teachers so they're continually growing in their craft as well as meeting all of the needs of all of the students?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And so right now, what we're seeing is that the academic leaders are -- really did not have the capacity beforehand to deep dive into that. They also lack the expertise right now, and so they'll need some extensive training on what are those best practices? What does an extensive professional development program look like? What does it look like to go into a classroom and do a walkthrough? So right now, we have some walkthroughs that are a bit cursory in nature. We're going in to make sure everything is okay in the classroom, instruction is happening. Great. However, that's not going to take you to the level that you need to get to. The next level you need to get to is what exactly does that direct instruction look like? What are the questions that are being asked? What are the student responses in response? What is up on the board? the visuals that are up in the room that are providing concrete anchors for student learning and really taking that to the next level? And so that's what we'd like to -- you know, that's an area of growth for these leaders. We need to train them on how to go in and be effective to give those bite-sized actionable feedback so as a teacher, I can walk in and say, "Here's where I am

right now in my craft. Here's what happened in my classroom. Here is my leader giving me two things that I can do tomorrow to make instruction better." Not just "Oh, in a month, in two months, but tomorrow, I can walk in, and I can change this small piece of my instruction, and it's going to make a big difference." And so that's what we need to train our leaders on pushing that piece a bit further.

1.3

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Just a question.

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: Of course.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Just looking at the Nevada
Report Card as you're going through, and under
professional development funding, it has \$130 for ACT ed
and workforce research and then \$198 for a director's
meeting. So to your point about professional
development, it doesn't appear that there's been a lot of
resources dedicated to that effort by the school. Is
that right?

MR. KERN: I think that's right.

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: I think also we need to look at the type of professional development and leadership given to the teachers and skill training.

We're looking at a very specific skill set for school

improvement. And so we want to make sure that that specific skill set is what they're getting, not just general good practices, some of which is general good practice, but some which is very specific to school improvement. We want to make sure they have access to that.

1.3

2.4

Returning to the academic program, we also found that there are some elements of their curriculum which are not updated to meet Common Core standards and the Nevada state standards. And so some of that is as simple as because of the mismanagement and finances from previous years, they were not able to purchase and to investigate which sources they needed. But there are resources, most notably, the GO Math! curriculum, that need to be updated and the middle school ELA curriculum, which is woefully out of date. It's a 2009 curriculum. So they absolutely need to have those resources in order for teachers to be implementing a curriculum that's rigorous enough for student instruction.

When we visited classrooms, we saw that the majority of our Quest teachers, 66 percent, were delivering instruction at a basic level. "Basic" would mean that students are in the class, they're answering some questions, they're delivering some content, but it really isn't pushing it to that next level where we have

students actively engaged in the thought process that is required for them to be able to have success in the future. So most notably, we saw this in the older grades. In the lower grades, K to 2, there was a lot more interaction, there was a lot more thought process put on the students. In the older grades, especially when you look at the middle school grades, that was really fading away. Students were much more passive in their learning, sitting there receiving information, answering some worksheets, answering some questions, not really engaged in the thought process behind the academic work being presented to them. And so we saw that.

1.3

2.4

As you see in the data, that also bears out in that the scores drop off the older the students are in the grade levels at Quest. And so that aligns with the instruction, that we see the instruction is much stronger at the lower levels, grade levels.

Another piece that we want to highlight is the need for a data-driven instruction, and I know that that is a very popular buzzword that we use right now, and I know many people like to toss that word out, but really, what they need is truly data-driven instruction. The staff members do not actively engage in gathering data from their students on everyday visits, whether that be through exit tickets or other pieces of data they

collect in the classroom or their benchmark assessments.

Many teachers said, "Well, I sort of look at this, but I don't look at it until later in the year." Or, "We don't really have a process where we sit down together and we look through that."

1.3

2.4

Now, Quest has let me know that they are trying to implement that process, but they still don't have one in place. And that is essential. You can't expect a teacher to just keep teaching in a vacuum if they don't know: What do you understand? What is going on? Okay. So half of you understand this piece, half of you don't understand this piece. What do I need to do to get to that other half in the classroom? And so it's essential that teachers get that data-driven instruction professional development and have a set regular meeting time where they actively look at the data, analyze it. What did it mean? And then come up with actionable steps that come out of that data meeting.

Often, we will see schools that will have a nice data meeting, but they don't have an action step that goes with it. It has to be paired with an action and then follow-up, accountability. We must have leaders who then say, "Oh, so you wanted to re-teach this topic. How are you going to re-teach it? What date are you going to reteach it? I'm going to see part of it, and

then what does your data look like after you retaught?"

Not just, "Oh, I retaught it. They should have gotten

it." Let's go back to the data. Did they actually get

it, and was our re-teach effective? And if it wasn't,

what are we going to do next? And so that's a type of

strategic thinking right now that Quest should be looking

at in their next level of instructional development.

1.3

2.4

Technology is a huge piece, as we know. As we've moving forward in technology now, we must have our students not only understand how to use a computer, but be comfortable using a computer in a myriad of ways now, especially when we're looking at testing. And testing results have shown that if students do not have active, regular exposure to all of the different tools that they will have, the different ways that the computer screen is set up, something as simple as how to scroll down and read through, you'd think that would be obvious. It's not obvious to many students. So that's something you have to teach.

And what we found at Quest was that that was not happening yet, although they do have one-on-one laptop correlation for students, which is fantastic, we did not witness any integration of technology into the lesson-planning process, nor is there an active plan for how to integrate technology across the school.

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Chair? I'd just like to ask whether in your report it states that having children take computerized tests, which ASPAC is, without giving them instruction with technology is problematic. So do you relate the decline in scores to this lack of technology integration?

1.3

2.4

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: That's a great question. I think it's twofold. I think part of it might be lack of integration of technology. We definitely have seen that in other schools. If a student doesn't know how to do some of the basic elements during testing, a teacher can't teach them how to do that. They just have to let them figure it out as best they can. So that can pose problems, especially for younger students when they go through that.

But I think the second part is if they have not had the strong instruction to teach them the content, even if they have a lot of technology skill, they don't know the content. So I think they both have to go hand in hand to be able to have success.

Teacher coaching and evaluation. Teachers love that they have, enjoy a lot of freedom in the classroom, but again, with freedom comes accountability, so we want to make sure that teachers are being held accountable through a consistent coaching and

professional development feedback cycle. We want to make sure that teachers know, hey, this is our school-wide goal. This is our goal for your classroom. This is our goal for this grade level, for the subject level. How are we meeting that as a team? And then making sure that we're all working together on that. Their professional development should also then tie into that.

1.3

2.4

We did find that their professional development was lacking this year, for teachers. In years past, it was nonexistent, and so this year, they are trying to put it into place, but it still needs a ways to go on that level.

We also found that their preservice time was not dedicated on the right measures of success. So for preservice, we recommend and we have seen that the most successful schools spends 70 to 75 percent of their preservice time with teachers on instruction and curriculum. What we found was less than 4 percent of Quest's preservice time was spent on curriculum and instruction. Most notably, we saw only one half-hour session that was dedicated to curriculum and instruction expectations. In half an hour, you cannot set that expectation for teachers and really give them the chance to deep dive into what that means and practice. An essential part of professional development for teachers

is to practice what we just thought about. We don't want to just have it in our head space. We want to put it on bodies, we want to try it out, write it out and make sure that we're going to be effective. Those were the general findings that we saw overall, and I invite you to ask questions.

1.3

2.4

MR. KERN: I also want to thank the body for giving us time to present the report with. I know that was longer than expected, but I thought it was important for you to hear it.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Are there any questions?
Member Corbett?

MEMBER CORBETT: Very informative information, if I can put those two words together. You know, just kind of listening to your report, you really identified just weaknesses in overall systems, it sounded like, and that each system was contingent on the success of the other, and there was a leveraging or breakdown based on what you articulated. Is this something that the school itself is able to absorb?

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: Great question. So yes, absolutely. It's a lot of information, and it does all tie together. And that's the tricky part about school improvement. You can't just improve one area. You need to improve all of the areas together, but what we do is

you do it in phases over multiple years. So that's why the first phase, our receiver was going through all of these pieces to stabilize everything, and now we enter the next phase.

1.3

2.4

I think what -- I think there are great people who work really hard and who are dedicated to the school. I think the next level is they need some outside expertise to come in and to take them to the next level of what is needed and set those systems up with them and for them.

MEMBER CORBETT: And just listening to you in my own mind, I'm like, "Okay. Here's the strategies to begin to intervene, so to speak." And so very well done. Thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Vice-Chair Mackedon?

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: I was going to say
essentially the same thing. It refreshing to see we're
in phase two. No offense. It's been fascinating --

MR. KERN: No offense taken.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: -- the whole financial process. And obviously, mission critical, but it's really good to see this phase starting and see, you know, it affecting classrooms on a day-to-day basis is awesome. So thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Snow?

MEMBER SNOW: For the record, Member Snow. I noticed in the report that it seems that eighth grade performance overall is just really a concern, is really a dip there. Can you give us any insight without being too specific in a public forum why that is the case and what can be done about it?

1.3

2.4

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: I think you're right.

There is a big dip, and it's extremely concerning. I

will say, those eighth graders were on a different campus

that is now closed, so I don't have insight on to what

was functioning or not functioning on that campus. So I

do think that is a big impact on it.

I will say 7th grade is not doing -- knocking it out of the ball park either, right, so we need to look at those 7th graders who are now the 8th graders and see where they're going to be. I think the biggest problem is the academic instructional delivery piece right now, and so we need to get that and a reminder that our middle school ELA, the Quest Middle School ELA curriculum is out of date. If you don't have an updated curriculum that is significantly different from a 2009 curriculum, you're not setting up the students for success. So they're just not exposed to that material.

MEMBER SNOW: Thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Conaboy?

-CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322-

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Chair, you're making me think when Member Snow asks about the data specifically, your report on the shift, dramatic shift in student population, students leaving -- so how will we -- since we're probably dealing with a lot of different students than the original data, that are reflected in the original data, how will we determine progress?

1.3

2.4

MS. LAJES-GUITERAS: And that's very insightful and true. I think there are a couple things that we need to look at. One, it's understandable that, as a parent, when you hear that there's a lot of turmoil going on, you may not be sure that this is where you want to stay. So it's understandable, and we hope it's a one-time blip for data and that efforts are out now in the community and building those relationships so that those students do stay on long-term at Quest.

It speaks to another need, which is a data management need at the Quest campus. It's essential that they have the ability to pull out which students are still currently our students from this data and then create instruction based on those students who are still there. Right now, we did not see that they have the capacity right now. They need someone who is going to come in and be able to really mine that data and cut it in different ways so that they can -- the teachers can

them have that information as something that's useful and tangible for them.

1.3

2.4

MEMBER CONABOY: May I just do a followup,
Mr. Chair? Director Gavin, I'm just wondering, since
this is our first experience to this point with
receivership and we may face the same challenge in the
future, how -- maybe this is just a question to ponder
for future implementation, but how will now -- where will
we set a baseline for a school that's been through this
process and measure from that baseline, measure growth
and student progress from a new baseline? Because it
seems to me that the historic data will be totally
irrelevant. So I don't think there's probably a good
answer today, but I'd like us to think about that and
perhaps deal with it in another meeting.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: It's actually kind of perfect timing, if you will, because really, every school is in that situation right now because we just all switched to ASPAC for the first time, so we don't really have any school that we can, you know, rely on. Even though my students are the same, we're at square one with this ASPAC. So really, the timing is almost perfect for these schools because of that. I think every school, it's like where is our benchmark? What are our expectations now?

I mean, the ASPAC state averages, as we all know, are significantly lower than what they were with the traditional CRT. So I think we have to do that for all of our schools and use that state average sort of as our guiding light. So it's almost perfect timing, really.

1.3

2.4

MEMBER CONABOY: I hear you, but I'm concerned that we're talking about different populations, too. I mean, there's constant change in your populations. This is not only old data with an old population and new tests now, it's just everything old is new again, but everything new is new.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Just building off of these questions that
were just asked, when you can talk about the phased
approach to improvement, when we get subsequent reports,
will there be benchmarks associated with that phased
approach so that we can discern that you're making
progress towards whatever the goals are?

MR. KERN: That's an excellent question. I think what we need to do now is come up with a school improvement plan that's based on this audit, and in that plan, we will include benchmarks for where we expect the school to be and when.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Thank you.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: I had a question about one of the things that you mentioned that's really glaring to me is that you mentioned systems that were in place and lack of vision for leadership and then teachers that, you know, wanted to do well, but they needed some more training, etcetera.

How do you plan to ensure that you can find a leader or have a leader in place who can set a very clear vision for what happens next and can take the set of recommendations and really own them and then implement the type of professional development that's necessary? And then the second part is -- how do you find leaders is number one. The second part is, how do you reallocate a budget so that professional development is prioritized, because that then leads directly into classroom results.

MR. KERN: That was a great question. I'm not sure that we have a great an answer. You know, finding exceptional school leaders is challenging. I actually think we have some very good administrators at the school now, but as Mabel said, they haven't necessarily been trained and coached to be -- to have an exceptional practice and to lead an exceptional school.

And so part of what I think the school improvement plan will have is kind of a team approach of

how do we train the leaders, how do we coach the teachers so that we can really move the needle of the school.

It's not necessarily the case that we need to go out and find a whole new set of administrators, but there does need to be a lot of training and coaching.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Director Gavin?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I would -- at the risk of delving far too deep into operations on the operating side, I would concur with Mr. Kern's assessment. The fact of the matter is that if we look at schools across the board in this state and many other states, they are over-managed and under-led. And that is -- and so we have schools where I think things function at a relatively basic level, people are happy, etcetera. Everyone may be happy, not enough people are learning.

And this is -- and so the critical piece is the only way we get the leaders we need is by growing them because there isn't some magical garden where leaders are just waiting to be brought out and put into schools. This is something where -- this is some of the hardest, most intentional work we need to do across the education sector, both public charter and traditional public, is that paradigm shift from principal as building manager to principal as instructional leader and visionary leader. And so this is -- identifying this

stuff right now is critical.

1.3

2.4

It's also why, in our charter application process, we dig so deeply into if there is a leader, who they are and what their capacity is, or if there isn't one, what the board's understanding is of what an actual school leader does.

to thank you both for coming. This was incredibly informative. It was very helpful. I think we all really learned a lot about how do you identify down to the very granular level, what is going to actually lead to student achievement, which is what we all want to see here for all of our schools if they are achieving at the level that we know that they can. So thank you very much. Looking forward to the next update when it comes next month.

MR. KERN: Thank you again for the opportunity.

CHAIR JOHNSON: You're welcome.

MR. KERN: I have a couple of extra copies, hard copies. Do you want me to leave them with you? Is it at all helpful or no?

 $\mbox{ \begin{tabular}{lll} EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: & I think on the \\ \mbox{ \begin{tabular}{lll} back table would be great. \end{tabular} }$ 

MR. KERN: Okay. Great.

CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We will move on to agenda Item No. 4, which is consideration and possible action regarding Beacon Academy's amended contract reflected in the school's desire to provide enrollment criteria and become eligible to be evaluated based on an alternative framework. Possible actions include acceptance of the contract negotiated between Beacon Academy and SPCSA Staff at the direction of the SPCSA Board. Possible actions include acceptance of contract negotiated between Beacon Academy and SPCSA staff, rejection of contract, contract, or direction to renegotiate. Director Gavin?

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. At the August 26th, 2016, Authority

meeting, the Authority directed staff and Beacon Academy

to negotiate an amended charter contract by September

19th, 2016. Staff and the school did agree to mutually

agreeable terms by that deadline. Pursuant to NRS

388A.330 and NAC 386.330, the Authority directed staff to

issue a Notice of Intent to terminate the charter

contract for Beacon Academy based on having a graduation

rate for the preceding school year that was less than 60

percent.

Subsequently, the agency and Beacon representatives negotiated a contract staff believes will

be acceptable to the Authority. The contract language provides a mechanism for Beacon to transition to serving more high-need student populations via an amendment to its admissions policy to exclusively serve at-risk youth. This would then be accompanied by revisions to the graduation rate benchmarks to provide appropriate and rigorous achievement goals for that new population. amendment would permit the school to eventually qualify for the alternative performance framework sponsored by the State Board of Education. This contract has already been executed by the chair of the Beacon governing body following a public meeting where the contract was approved. Staff is already in receipt of the draft admissions policy and amendment request and intends to begin re-negotiating revisions to the benchmarks for those new students who will enter the school based on the new admissions policy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Based on our review of the proposed -- of the contract that is before you, staff recommends approval of this amended charter contract and execution by the Chair effective today.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Any questions? Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to commend staff on their -- and Beacon for

coming together to work on a solution that met our needs as well as the needs of the school. I think what we have is a creative solution to a very difficult set of problems, and I think everybody engaged in good faith to reach the solution that we have before us and would recommend that we approve it.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Is that a formal motion, Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: I did want to have discussion.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Okay. Just making sure.

MEMBER LUNA: This is Nora Luna. We're very happy that you reached an agreement. I just wanted to point out, I noticed that you changed the language on section 2.4.1, page 11, to reflect the State language on nondiscrimination, but it's also referred in the next section, 2.52, and it wasn't changed there. So if you were going to change it, I don't know.

Ott. That would be my omission. The school is not responsible for that. I was doing that to update the language to be consistent with the statute. I think everyone anticipates there will be another revision when the enrollment and revised benchmarks get worked out, and so I'll make a note of that and look for other places

where it may not be consistent, but thank you for mentioning that.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Conaboy?

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask Director Gavin to remind us of the time frame and the process for the school getting a designation from the State Board as an alternative school, because I'm just wondering with the change in the recruitment policy, will that go into effect for next school year? And again, what then will we do with this school year's data relative to these benchmarks?

excellent question. So I would note that that is the subject of a subsequent amendment which is not before you, so I don't wish to precook it, but generally speaking, there would be a date upon which that amendment would become effective and students enrolled after that date would be part of that exclusively at-risk population.

That essentially, in my view, requires a bifurcation of the benchmarks, so students who are in the school prior to that date are subject to the benchmarks that are in the current agreement, and students who enter the school after that date are subject to the revised benchmarks which are more appropriate to an alt ed

population.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And with regard to the transition to the alt framework, the statute provides that at least 70 percent of students must meet one of those criteria. Based on the end size of students who are currently in the school, we anticipate that that will take somewhere between 12 and 18 months to accomplish to reach that point in time where it's 70 percent of students are at that. So essentially, the school would be in an interstitial place where our contract governs, and then once they get to the -- once they're eligible for the alt framework, then it would be my hope that the State Board would approve the benchmarks in this contract and the plan in this contract as that school's performance framework. So this is going to continue to evolve, and we need to make sure that we are leading versus following here.

MEMBER CONABOY: That's exactly my point. I think the whole concept of alternative schools, and certainly the design and implementation of the framework for alternative schools, is evolving. So I just want to applaud the school making this effort with us. As Member Guinasso said, I think you're pioneering in charter schools now with, you know, seeking this designation, but I'm not sure what it means for them and for us as we've set sort of hard-and-fast benchmarks, and I'm not sure

what our mindset needs to be during an evolutionary phase because I wasn't even aware until last week when I heard it just in passing that the alternative school framework was available. So anyway, just a caution for all of us as we go forward.

1.3

2.4

And I request, Director Gavin, would you have staff send us a link to the alternative framework if it's available through the State Board?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: At the present time, Member Conaboy, there are I believe only two schools that are in the alternative framework, and they are essentially being judged on what is effectively a binary "you're good" or "you're not so good" metric.

There's not much to it at this point, so that's why I think we have the real opportunity to shape what this looks like for a truly alt ed school versus something that is more appropriate for the two schools that are currently in the alt framework are effectively -- I believe they're for essentially prison schools or other like extraordinarily highly mobile populations versus what we're thinking about here.

MEMBER CONABOY: I may have misunderstand

Deputy Superintendent Brett Barley, but I think he said

there was a framework that's been published, so if you

could help me understand just a little bit better because

I think it's going to be important to the execution of this agreement that we all sort of have something as -- that's becoming my favorite word today, but as a baseline, okay? Thanks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chair. Member Conaboy's point and probably something we should say out loud is that this route that we're taking isn't without peril. I mean, there are risks being taken by the school in unchartered territory. And so inasmuch as we can be flexible within our authority going forward in helping navigate the school through this creative solution to their set of problems, I think it will be incumbent upon us, if we're going to approve this course of action, to exercise some patience over the next year or so as they go into unchartered territory, and I think -- but alternatively, I think it's important for the school to understand that that doesn't mean that we relax standards, that we don't have accountability along the way. And we've had that discussion as well, so it's going to require us balancing the need for flexibility with the need for accountability and to do that in a patient and responsible way.

But just to end where I began, and that is, this course of action isn't without its risks, serious

1 risks, and we just have to exercise some wisdom in how we 2 manage the risk going forward. Mr. Chairman, if I may 3 add, I'd just like to make a motion to approve this 4 amended charter contract. 5 MEMBER CORBETT: Member Corbett. Second. 6 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of approving the 7 charter contract? 8 THE BOARD: Aye. 9 CHAIR JOHNSON: The motion passes 10 unanimously. So we will go to Agenda Item No. 5. 11 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Mr. Chairman, if 12 possible, I would suggest that we do a brief two-minute 1.3 recess so we can get a hard copy of this contract and you 14 can see it, which will then allow us to go to agenda Item 15 5 with that done. 16 CHAIR JOHNSON: We will break until 11:20. 17 That gives us four minutes. 18

(Recess was taken.)

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: We're all back and ready. We will reconvene at 11:24. Now we will move to agenda Item No. 5: Consideration and possible action regarding the Notice of Closure issued to Beacon Academy on September 30th by SPCSA Staff at the direction of the SPCSA Board. Possible actions include dismissal of the Notice of Closure or no action allowing the Notice of Closure to

proceed as issued. Director Gavin? 1 2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you, 3 Mr. Chairman. As you'll recall at the August 26th, 2016, 4 meeting, the authority directed staff and Beacon Academy 5 to negotiate an amended charter contract by September 6 19th, 2016. Staff and schools did not agree to mutually 7 agreeable terms by that deadline. 8 Pursuant to 380A.330 and 386,330, the 9 Authority directed staff to issue a Notice of Intent to 10 terminate the charter contract based on having a 11 graduation rate for the preceding year that is less than 12 60 percent. As discussed under agenda Item 4, the staff 1.3 and the school have agreed upon mutually acceptable 14 terms. As you are now aware, that contract has now been 15 executed, and it is in the hands of both the agency and 16 the school. So my recommendation is that contingent upon 17 -- based on that approval and execution, we recommend 18 that the Authority dismiss the Notice of Intent to 19 Terminate the charter contract. 20 MEMBER GUINASSO: Mr. Chair? 21 CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso? 22 MEMBER GUINASSO: Counsel, do we have the 23 authority to dismiss the Notice of Intent? 2.4 DEPUTY AG WHITNEY: Mr. Chairman, this is

Robert Whitney. Yes, the Board would have that authority

25

1 to direct staff to dismiss the notice. 2 MEMBER GUINASSO: Okay. Then I'd like to 3 make the motion that we dismiss the Notice of the Intent 4 to Terminate the charter contract of Beacon Academy. 5 This is Member Snow. MEMBER SNOW: T will 6 second that motion. 7 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of dismissing 8 the Notice of Closure? 9 THE BOARD: Aye. 10 CHAIR JOHNSON: The motion passes. 11 move on to agenda Item No. 6: Consideration and possible 12 action of the American Preparatory Academy charter 1.3 amendment request to move facilities. Director Gavin? 14 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you, 15 Mr. Chairman. American Preparatory Academy has previously requested approval to relocate and consolidate 16 17 its Oakey campus with its Patrick/Sunset campus. 18 American Prep's Board Chair, Lee Iglody, subsequently 19 requested this item be tabled, as the school required 20 additional time to develop a complete and responsive 21 document. The agency is in receipt of that document and 22 has determined that it complies with statute and 23 regulation, including NAC 386.362 -- 3265 and NAC 2.4 386.3266, and that it is complete and responsive to the 25 questions asked by the agency pursuant to its authority

under those regulations.

1.3

2.4

Mr. Iglody has also requested the opportunity to briefly address the board regarding lessons learned and answer any questions from members. Staff recommends this relocation and consolidation amendment be approved, and we also recommend that should the Authority wish it, Mr. Iglody be invited to the table to answer specific questions or any questions the Authority may have regarding lessons learned from this process.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Mr. Chair, in reviewing this application, I was just really impressed with the effort that went into answering the questions from a member standpoint. I know all of you do the same thing. We read these things and try to understand what's going on and understand the school and understand some of the risks associated with the decisions that they're making and all of that, and this version of the application is like night and day compared to the other version we got.

I felt like I really understood what was going on versus the other version of it where I didn't really understand, based on the questions, what was going on with the school, why we were getting applications after the fact.

And so, Mr. Chair, the only thing I think I'd

like to understand is why didn't we get an application before the move? And then when we did get an application, why didn't we get this version of it versus the other version? Insomuch as maybe we could invite the folks up to address those questions, that would be appreciated.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Yeah. I think it would be appropriate to have Mr. Iglody come on up and help us get some more clarity on that.

MR. IGLODY: Good morning. My name is Lee Iglody: I-G-L-O-D-Y, chairman and president of the American Preparatory Academy Governing Board.

Would you like me to answer the question or do you want to -- okay. First and foremost, I'd like to say it's been a very educational process. You know, this is my first rodeo, so to speak, and originally when we were asked by the Charter School Authority to submit an application, we misunderstood the scope and depth of what they were asking for. We had looked at some other applications and said, "Oh, well, we can put this together." I did not -- since I am the chairman, I should have been a little bit more proactive in monitoring staff assemblage of the original application packet, and to the extent that I failed in that measurement, I do want to apologize, and I thank you

again for your patience and guidance in this matter.

1.3

2.4

Once we understood truly what was going on here -- and for that, I thank Mr. Gavin for giving us the additional guidance and taking the time to walk us through this a little bit -- we were able to put together a package that we think addressed what you wanted to hear from us about this campus consolidation. And so once again, it's been a learning process, and next time, I'm going to be significantly better at this.

about the transition. So number one, the campus, the new campus, is beautiful. Thank you for having folks in the meeting there a couple of weeks ago. You mentioned that students who were at the Oakey campus were offered a seat at the new campus on Patrick Lane, and so their seats were still saved.

Was there any accommodations for the nine-mile difference or so, about nine-mile difference between the two campuses? I don't know for certain. So do you know if the population of students who were at the Oakey campus lived in and around that school? And if so, was there any accommodations for them to get to the new campus, or no?

MR. IGLODY: The short answer is, our original demographic -- we always intended to be in the

southwest. Unfortunately, because of financing and other problems, we weren't able to commence construction in time, so we had to do a temporary campus on Oakey. As a result, we received a higher proportion of students who just happened to be geographically in that area.

1.3

2.4

When we announced the consolidation of campuses, the families that originally intended to go to our Patrick/Sunset location, of course they were ready to do so, and we get a lot of people from Mountain's Edge and whatnot, so they were like, "Woo-hoo. I'm saving a lot of time and money here." We did have some parents who were at Oakey who said, "You know that? I just don't want to drive nine miles. I'm just going to go to another school."

In terms of accommodations, we have a very active carpool community in our school, but we don't have access to school district buses or anything like that.

We never really got much of a demand. We had a couple of parents who said, "It would be really nice if we could do something." But other than that, I think our retention number was very, very high in terms of the ones who wanted to stick with our program did. The general attrition rate for Oakey versus Sunset, or Patrick/Sunset, was pretty much the same. In other words, you get a certain amount of, you know, attrition

every year anyway. So we were pretty satisfied with that. Of course when we first announced it, we had that board meeting, I think it was probably the most attended board meeting we ever had. It went about like three hours. But overall, it's been very positive. And yes, some people are commuting a little bit longer, but then a lot of people are commuting far shorter distances to get to the school.

1.3

2.4

noticed is you laid out your demographics of the school and that of the neighboring zoned schools around it. I know one of them is Sawyer Middle School and Durango High School, and then in all of the categories with special populations of students, students who have IEPs, students who are learning English as a second language, students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch, in all of those categories across the board, American Prep is significantly lower. And you mentioned in the application here that you're going to be trying some strategies to make sure that again, student population mirrors as you grow to the 3,000 seats that you'd like to have filled.

Can you talk a little bit about -- I don't know if you know this or if any of your team knows it, just the strategies you're taking to, again, ensure that

your school population does mirror the schools of the sending schools that would be in the surrounding area. So Sawyer Middle School, Rogers Elementary School, Durango High School, etcetera.

1.3

2.4

MR. IGLODY: Yes. When we first received our charter, we undertook a marketing campaign. We did some signs on the 215 and whatnot. Fortunately, based upon our reputation in Utah, we were able to get a significant wait list pretty much from the get-go. When we moved to Patrick/Sunset, or we opened Patrick/Sunset, like I said, that was delayed for a while, we actively marketed in the community.

What's interesting strictly from the marketing perspective -- and this once again has been educational for me because I come from the private sector, that you'd be surprised what actually works. So, for example, what we found is when you do -- because we sent out volunteers with flyers to just paper up the doors. Well, lo and behold, everybody is kind of like me. When I get the flyers, I just throw them out. It turns out the flyers are not necessarily working for us. The 215 sign, right, a little bit pricey, we got some pretty good returns on that because people drive to and from work, the supermarket, you know, visit friends or whatever the story is. So we're still sort of

experimenting with what works, because in the end, I
think every marketing company has the same problem: how
am I going to sell more Diet Coke, or whatever it is.

1.3

2.4

In regards to the demographic, I think overall, compared to, for example, other charter schools, I think that, you know, we have a fairly decent representation of a fairly diverse student body. We had our fair yesterday. It was a little fund-raising fair. We had popcorn and rides and all of this good stuff, and I mean, if you take a look around, we reflect pretty much the area that we're in and actually reflect, in a lot of ways, the demographic of Clark County, the valley itself very well. But we're aggressively working forward through our parent groups. Here's what happens. The best marketing is the parents talking to other parents. "Oh, my gosh. My little girl/my little boy goes to APA. You've got to get on the list. It's amazing."

Our only problem is we're full in almost every grade expect for high school, so it's through natural attrition, going through the lottery, that we're hoping to eventually settle into something more -- it's never going to be perfectly aligned, but very closely aligned.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Conaboy?

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Iglody, I was interested

-CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 —

in your description of your EMO and their -- or maybe it's the CMO and the costs for bonds. This is on page 7 of your application. You talked about their long-standing track record of success. And in 2003, facility costs at their schools were 5.54, and it went up to 10.6 and 9.4, and you're at about 9. So I'm just -- 9 percent -- I wanted to -- I'm assuming some of that's just escalation in costs over time, but I wanted to ask Director Gavin because I haven't seen a report in two or three years probably, but I remember the percentage of spending on facilities was a huge range, and unfortunately, some of it was in the double digits. So is this quote about right? I mean, is this somewhere in the middle of what our schools are spending? I just hate the thought of that much money going into facilities without a stream of funding for those facilities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: So excellent question, Madame -- sorry. Member Conaboy. Someday,

I'll remember you're not the chair. Sorry. It's been a -- we worked together for such a long time in that role.

So with regard to the occupancy cost, a 12 percent occupancy cost would actually be extremely favorable for a school. If you look at what the harbor master is currently projecting as a subsidized occupancy cost for the schools that she is looking to incubate,

that is -- they're looking at 15 percent -- (Brief interruption.)

1.3

2.4

percent cost of occupancy. 15 percent is sort of right around the sweet spot where most networks look for.

Certainly, if you can get it cheaper than that, it's great. Clearly, APA has been able to do that in part through a competency scale and what have you.

multisite, we often see initial occupancy costs that are closer to 18 percent, but then as those schools build out and add more kids, those occupancy costs drop, go to somewhere between 12 or 15 percent. So this 9 percent number, especially for those who have not been to that building, it is quite impressive. I want to go to a choir practice there and just see how -- because I just can only imagine what the acoustics are in that facility. It's quite wonderful, I would have to say.

MEMBER CONABOY: Is this a favorable rate compared to what B&I is offering in their RF bonding?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: So B&I offer -there is an interest rate based on what one finances. I
can't speak directly to what the cost of occupancy is for
that. I believe we only have one school that has gone
through the B&I bonding, and I believe that their overall

1 occupancy cost is significantly higher than 9 percent, but I would not -- but it's not the interest rate. 2 3 the whole package of what you're spending and how you use 4 that facility and allocate your resources. 5 MR. IGLODY: Did you want me to address the 6 board? 7 MEMBER CONABOY: No. I was just asking. 8 just wanted to know where you were in the range of 9 things, and so what I'm learning is that 9 percent is 10 So congratulations. very good. 11 MR. IGLODY: Thank you. 12 CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Corbett? 1.3 MEMBER CORBETT: Thank you, Chair. I'd like 14 to make a motion that we accept Staff's recommendation 15 for relocation and that consolidation would be approved. 16 MEMBER CONABOY: Second. Member Conaboy. 17 CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor of the approved 18 recommendation? 19 THE BOARD: Aye. 20 MR. IGLODY: Thank you. And I'm going to be 21 e-mailing you to invite you personally to come visit our 22 campus whenever you can. We're proud of our work, and 23 we're proud of our campus. We hope that you can witness

—CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 —

Thank you. Move to agenda

CHAIR JOHNSON:

it yourselves. Thank you.

2.4

25

Item No. 7: Consideration and possible action of the Founders Academy charter amendment request to move facilities. Director Gavin?

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Patrick Gavin, for the record. Founders

Academy has requested approval to relocate its existing

campus to a new facility which will be purpose built for

the school a short distance from the current campus. The

agency is in receipt of the amendment request submitted

pursuant to NAC 386.3265 and NAC 386.3266, and has

determined that it complies with statute and regulation

and that it is complete and responsive to the questions

asked by the agency pursuant to its authority under those

regulations.

It is important to note that this new facility will be financed through an industrial development authority which will issue a bond to generate the funds necessary to fund -- to loan the Founders money for which to construct the facility. The school itself is not issuing the bonds. Thus, this financing mechanism does not violate any statute or regulation related to charter schools directly issuing bonds.

There is also ample precedent for such mechanisms. For example, Coral Academy of Science in Las Vegas used a similar financing structure to fund some of

its facilities. While the State of Nevada does offer a bond conduit through B&I, Founders does not currently qualify for access to the conduit due to the lack of multiple years of academic data. While the school has been up and running for two years now with the ASPAC and other issues, we have not issued -- the state has not issued updated frameworks that would permit the school to qualify for the B&I conduit. Consequently, financing of this facility through an industrial development authority has been deemed an attractive option by the school, which the school has determined will lower its occupancy costs.

1.3

2.4

I would note that one element also of this school's particular financing arrangement is that it will have to pay no payments for the first year of occupancy of the facility, which will allow the school to stabilize its finances and not rely as much on some of the short-term bridge loans it has had to get through, given its current occupancy costs and other start-up costs related to the school. Consequently, staff recommends approval of this relocation amendment.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Is there any discussion?
Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yes, Mr. Chair. Director Gavin, on page 29, there is a discussion of the SB 509 changes regarding ethical standards and procedures. And

the way that they answered the question, it seemed like they were looking for guidance from us and that they said that in the event that the Authority requires FALB to develop additional technical amendments and contractual changes in statutory and regulatory requirements involved. I'm just trying to understand what we might be asking of them relative to SB 509. I guess it's a two-part question.

1.3

2.4

One, is what they have in their conflict of interest statement consistent with the requirements of SB 509? And if yes, do we anticipate any changes that we -- or additional requirements we would be imposing upon them as a result of SB 509?

think that's a very thoughtful question. So with regard to the school's current bylaws, code of ethics and conflicts of interest policy, Founders is not -- it has a relatively standard set of language on this that is incorporated primarily into its bylaws. At this point, we have not issued any guidance and there's certainly no regulation requiring that these be separate documents. I have encouraged schools to actually treat them as separate items because I do think that they are -- that for example, the conflict of interest policy is one document that -- the code of ethics has to do with more

sort of behavioral outcomes that are also really critical.

1.3

2.4

This, I think, really sort of meets certainly the intent and spirit of what we've asked of schools to date. I think it's certainly something where we can continue to look at how this should evolve over time.

The idea behind the code of ethics policies is to ensure that there's sort of a common set of values and expectations that sort of go above and beyond what's undergirded in the legal document of a set of bylaws, and I think this gets at a lot of that. And I think this has got to be an ongoing conversation that we have with schools as we get -- as we think about how we do this.

Again, I don't want to be in a position where we are over-regulating or micromanaging schools and how they choose this work, choose to do this work. But I think where we can provide clarity and guidance to individual circumstances, that's certainly appropriate. I have no quarrel with what's in here right now.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Okay. That makes sense. So, Mr. Chair?

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: There were some things in the application that I had questions about. I'm not sure if Director Gavin can answer them or if they're better

directed toward the school, other members of the school that we could have.

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: There's at least one eager to come up.

MEMBER GUINASSO: I think I was supposed to go on a tour of that school yesterday, and I missed that. I apologize.

At page 26 on question 6, it asks about the systems you'll put in place to ensure that staff members are knowledgeable about all legal enrollment requirements pertaining to special populations and servicing of particular populations of students and can answer parent inquiries in a manner consistent with the spirit of state and federal law. And the response says, "Consistent and ongoing training are included" in your staff development to ensure compliance. I just want to understand better what "consistent and ongoing training" meant.

MR. MORENO: This is Richard Moreno:

M-O-R-E-N-O. I'm the chairman of the governing board.

What we're trying to get across here is that we do our best to stay up to date with the requirements. As you know, this is a moving target quite a bit from working with the State Department of Education, federal laws, etcetera, etcetera, so I have my cell phone on speed dial to Director Gavin, and as things come up, we get

excellent guidance. We have a registrar that is very meticulous about these requirements, and so I'm very comfortable that we keep up to date with the requirements and we're just very active in that field to make sure that we comply.

1.3

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Director Gavin, why do we have this question here? You know, what are we looking for? Is this the kind of response we're looking for? We're looking for something more -- because I would expect a school to say, "We're going to comply with the law," but is there anything else we're expecting from this question?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think it's a couple of things. One is the law has evolved, and I think it's an attempt to make sure that schools actually go and check and see what are the rules now, so there's an element of that.

In an ideal world, I would like to see a bit more specificity here, but we have not sat down and said this is sort of what the minimum standard is for this. I think again, this is an area where it is a moving target. Two and a half years ago, we weren't thinking about these issues of sort of equitable enrollment practices in as much of a focused a way as we are now.

I think with relation to some of the areas

that I would certainly like to see schools evolve towards would be their own mystery shopping element, so having a friend call and say, "Hey, my daughter has got a disability" and then seeing what the school secretary tells them, those kinds of sort of proactive ways of monitoring what's actually happening and looking at opportunities to retrain and retool. I mean, I think it's a minimally responsive response, but again, I think there's a danger of sort of like dictating what schools should -- how schools should respond at this point.

Again, this is an area where I would love us to think of how we can articulate more clear and coherent suggested guidance for how to do this that's based really on behavior and mindset as much as it is sort of basic compliance.

1.3

2.4

This is really -- this is about -- you can comply with the law and still have a pretty -- and still have a result that isn't what you want it to be. That isn't what we would like to see because of mindset and behavior and beliefs of individual staff members or other folks. And I think there's a real danger that we can legislate compliance as much as -- because this is really about -- this is about the individual mindsets and behaviors and values of the men and women who govern the school and work at this school. And so I think this is

an area where it's -- I would love to see more really strong modeling from schools sharing how they're doing this, and I think this gets back to what Chair Johnson was speaking of with regard to the folks at Legacy and what they are doing in this area so that we can start to share what best practices should look like in this area, both on the operational side, but also in the heart as well.

1.3

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Thank you for that answer. I think that my consternation with this isn't so much in the response as it is as much when we ask folks to answer questions that we would have some idea of what we're looking for in a response. And when I dealt with that question, I was I thinking well, this seems like a vague answer. And then I reread the question and reread the question and I thought well, how would I answer the question if I were running a school, you know?

And I would look to some set of, you know, minimal standards like training, you know, in the spring and in the fall, you know, or some sort of thing that I could sink my teeth into and know that this was being responsive to the question and really meeting the needs of the Authority to ensure, you know, that the enrollment processes and procedures were really complying with state law in reaching these populations that we're concerned

about.

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think the long-term way we deal with this, as with many of these other documents that we've been rolling out to schools, is that we also have to be aligned and look at what are the things that we're looking for here so that people have a clue of what that is.

They still have a lot of autonomy for how they answer that and how they choose to do things, but we have not built a plan for this yet. I think we're trying to get ahead of rapid changes that are happening on the ground with schools that are making legitimate business decisions while also still trying to figure out -- these documents, I think, will resolve and get tighter in some ways over time and will also be able to be much clearer about what it is that -- why are we asking these questions and what are the things we're looking for so that people have a clue about that.

What I will say about this document is that there wasn't -- with some documents that we've talked about in the past, the tone was somewhat in cases like dismissive or was deliberately nonresponsive. This seemed like an attempt to -- at least a reasonably good-faith attempt at an answer, and that was the spirit in which I took it, at least.

MEMBER GUINASSO: I appreciate that. Just a few other questions. On page 33 at question 2 dealing with facilities, this answer caught my attention just because we've dealt with charter schools and disputes with landlords about honoring leases, not honoring leases, and I guess what I was wondering was is your school prepared to carry the lease in the event that you can't find somebody to assume it?

1.3

2.4

MR. MORENO: Part of the whole funding process is based on taking care of these existing leases. We will not be able to receive any funds from the bonds until the leases are taken care of, so we are actively working on this.

We have a couple of interested parties, and we have a plan B, so we understand they're not going to lend us any money until we get this taken care of, and I can ask for further clarification if you'd like from our banker who is handling the whole transaction, if you'd like, but that's the bottom line. And we wouldn't be this far if we didn't feel that we could take care of those situations. And to answer the question, we could not be in the new facility and pay for the old one. So we have to make sure that that's taken care of.

MEMBER GUINASSO: That makes sense. Thank you. And then on page 36 at section E -- oh, my question

was answered. You referred to a construction plan, and that's attachment A, right, in that response?

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Yes, that attachment is attachment A, sorry. And then it's actually basically repeated in attachment 9 because they did a consolidated chart that reflected all of those critical path items as a single chart.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Okay. And then on page

37 -- and this is more a question to just educate because

I've not dealt with this. What is this tax exempt and

taxable bond mechanism for funding school construction?

Could you just help me understand that?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board, my name is Terry Warren: T-E-R-R-Y W-A-R-R-E-N. I'm with Warren Charter Law, and I represent exclusively charter schools in finance transactions. So hopefully I can answer that question for you.

There is a mechanism because charter schools across the nation are typically not permitted to bond directly. I think there was one state that lets them issue corporate bonds but not tax exempt bonds. But in any event, in Nevada, they can't issue directly any type of bonds.

And so when we talk about bond transactions, to be very clear, that's really a misnomer with charters.

What they're really doing is simply getting a commercial loan because all of these processes are two-step processes. So you have an industrial development authority which is either a governmental or quasi-governmental entity within the state, and they actually advertise, offer and issue bonds. They then collect the proceeds from those bonds. That's one transaction that's essentially complete.

1.3

2.4

Then they take the proceeds of those bonds, and they commercially loan them to a charter school. And the only reason we refer to them as a "bond transaction" is that essentially, the loan agreement for the charter school requires that they pay sufficient debt service to the lender, the industrial development authority, such that the industrial development authority can then pay the principal and interest on the bonds that were issued.

And so remind me again. Have I answered your question? Okay. So the difference in taxable and tax exempt bonds, all of the industrial development authorities issue tax exempt, either government or 501(c)3 bonds, and that's the goal, is to issue them tax exempt because, obviously, the cost of capital to the school will be lower than a tax exempt setting.

The only reason that we ever issue really taxable bonds is in the event under federal law there is

some reason that the use of those moneys cannot be legally used as a tax exempt bond, for example, in fact, in Founder's situation, there are some -- as Director Gavin mentioned -- some interim short-term loans. Well, some of those short-term moneys were used for operational purposes. In qualified bond use, use of bond fund proceeds, you can't use them on operational issues. only use them for capital expenditures, so there will be a small taxable piece on the Founder's financing so that money can be borrowed from this larger long-term, low-interest rate loan so that they can pay off the short-term, higher interest rate loan. But because those funds aren't qualified to be used in that manner, if we use tax exempt bonding, we'll put -- it's called a taxable tail, and we'll put a very small taxable piece on it so that those funds can legally be used to pay off that prior loan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

you clarify one item? And I'm going to -- I believe this is true. The entity that actually gets taxed on this is the entity that owns the bond, not the -- so while the school is doing sufficient debt service to pay those costs, the school itself is not paying taxes; correct?

MR. WARREN: They're tax exempt bonds, so no one is paying taxes on them.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: On the taxable tail.

1.3

2.4

MR. WARREN: Oh, on the taxable tail, no.

The person that is actually paying the taxes on those is the bond investor, the individual or entity who actually purchased the bonds from the industrial development authority. That's actually an income tax, you know.

It's like you would pay tax on interest income from a bank. So that bondholder is the one that pays the tax.

The school pays none of those type of taxes. The school pays no tax.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Just one last question,
Mr. Chair. On page 39 at question 8, there's a question,
or we're dealing with an emergency management plan, and
in your response, it wasn't clear to me who is the
primary responsible person for maintaining and executing
that management plan. Can you provide an answer? I just
wasn't sure like if there is a go-to person for this
important piece of the application.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I would just note, Member Guinasso, that while we ask this question about the emergency or the crisis response emergency management plans, because it is important when there's a facility change, that schools are being planful about this.

By statute, the emergency management plan is

actually a confidential document. So, for example, we receive a copy of it to ensure compliance, but it is not a public document, so hence, we don't ask people to attach a piece of it for the simple reason that if some bad actor were to find out what your emergency response plan was, they could possibly use countermeasures if they wanted to do some, God fordid, some kind of nefarious act.

1.3

2.4

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yeah, my question is not really so much toward what the plan is, but who is the responsible person? Where does the buck stop? I'd imagine that would be a piece to how you would want to answer or at least the kind of information we'd want to know in that kind of a question.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Generally, it's the site administrator who is going to have to, you know, execute the plan. The buck is going to stop with that person executing it.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Is that accurate, Mr. Moreno?

MR. MORENO: Richard Moreno, for the record.

We have a two-step program basically from the board

aspect. We're very lucky to have our board member,

Starbucks Anthony, who was a former -- he's currently

counsel for the City of Las Vegas, formerly a captain in

Metro, and so he was involved with both Metro personnel

and in designing of this plan and then explaining it to our administrator who is on site at all times and some subordinates.

1.3

2.4

We have a couple of Metro families in our school, and so they've taken it upon themselves to come in and so -- and firemen. So I'm very comfortable with the plan as it was designed and ready to be implemented in the unfortunate situation that it would need to be.

CHAIR JOHNSON: I guess the question, though, is who is ultimately responsible for the execution of the plan or responsible for the success or failure?

MR. MORENO: The principal. The school leader.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yeah. Thank you for that.

It sounds like you have a committee, but the ultimate responsible person is the principal.

And then the next question below that has to deal with insurance. And in the question, it says that the schools requesting an amendment are expected to research the level of and types of insurance coverage typically required of and obtained by large schools and districts in this and in other states. And then in response, it says that you currently hold all required insurance and will increase liability coverages as enrollment increases and will increase worker's

compensation coverages as staffing increases.

1.3

2.4

And so I was just wondering -- well, I'll ask this of Director Gavin before I go to them. Were we looking for something more in an answer? Because if we're asking them to research, are we then asking them in their answer to give us what their research revealed, or are we just asking them to affirm that they actually have insurance right now and they'll get whatever appropriate insurance is appropriate that fits the need later?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Sure. Great question, Member Guinasso. So sometime back in the misty past, the State Board of Education adopted minimum insurance requirements for charter schools, a certain level of umbrella coverage, certain level of liability coverage, D&L, etcetera.

Historically, it has been our experience that schools have simply adopted that minimal coverage, which in my view, was intended for relatively small schools, for the 300- 400-kid school that was getting started up in 2002 or 2004 or what have you when the state board actually adopted these regulations. So the intent behind this is basically to have schools look at is our level of insurance coverage sufficient given our scale, both on the education or the liability side, for example, and on the per-pupil side because, clearly, your risks increase

as your complexity increases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So I would say that a school actually saying that we're going to increase based on -- in line with enrollment and with staffing is actually pretty responsive. I think it gets at the core question, which is: are you thinking about what the -- about whether you're actually -- whether your risk management actually works? Yeah, someone could actually go in and say yes, we engaged with, you know, with an outside insurance consultant and benchmarked against X, Y and Z. would be great. But this gets at the thrust of the question for me right now. At least they're thinking about it not sitting there going, "We had no idea that we didn't have enough insurance" when something bad does happen. So I'm reasonably comfortable with where we are right now. Again, I think we need to evolve on this stuff.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead.

MR. MORENO: If I could just add to that just part of good fiscal management, when you have a new contract or an old contract expire, we go out and we bid at least three times, three different companies to give us a bid on insurance, and then we ask them to tell us, you know, what are the state requirements? What are the

```
1
      -- obviously, they want to sell you more, but we just say
2
     what are the requirements, and we try to meet that or
3
      exceed that in any situation. So any contract that we
 4
     have, and these are usually for a year, we renegotiate or
5
      rebid everything.
 6
                  MEMBER GUINASSO:
                                    Thank vou.
7
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: Did that answer your
8
      questions, Member Corbett?
9
                  MEMBER CORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
                                                           I'd
10
      like to accept staff's recommendations that this
11
     relocation amendment be approved.
12
                  VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: I'll second.
1.3
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor?
14
                  THE BOARD: Aye.
15
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Thank you.
```

MR. MORENO: Thank you very much. We appreciate all of the hard work that you're all doing and staff support, and we appreciate it.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Moreno.

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Chair, may I make just a comment? I think it's nice to hear a school, or it was in writing, I think, thanking the staff for their support. I was weary of this very lengthy application when I first saw it, but when I realized that it demands of the school that they do some introspection and sort of

rethink their strategies for themselves, I think it's very, very useful both of us in reading it, but also for the school, and I think the few that have come before us using this application have essentially affirmed that. So I'd like to say thank you to Director Gavin for pushing this format.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. We will move to agenda Item No. 8: the executive director's report.

Director Gavin?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. I don't have a particularly lengthy

executive director's report at this time. A couple of

bullet points that I want you to be aware of. One is

that as of October 15th, the agency's budget request to

the Governor's Office actually became codified by

statute, so we will get a copy of what we did ask for

back in late August out to you folks.

We have not yet seen, as a staff, any feedback on our core budget account for what the Governor's recommendations will be. I will note that by statute, that remains confidential, I believe, until the State of the State. So while staff will have some knowledge of what the gov. rec. is likely to be, that's not something I will be able to share with the body, certainly in a public setting. So I just want to sort of

put those two pieces out there.

1.3

2.4

I will also note that we have had -- I'm notified as of this morning that one of our applicants -- actually, we have two applicants who have withdrawn, I believe. I briefed the board the last time that the Marzano Academy had withdrawn its application to us. As you may have noticed from the papers, Dr. Marzano and his team have actually built a relationship with the Clark County School District and will be doing an innovative lab-type model school in conjunction with Clark County as a traditional Clark County school, not as a charter. So that's the disposition of that one.

We also do have one group that participated in a recent capacity interview that, based on the initial feedback, has elected to withdraw and ultimately, I believe, intends to resubmit their application, and that is Vector Academy, which was a school based here in Clark County. Again, I think some very promising ideas were in that application, but I think they recognized that there's a need for more focus, coherence, and also a stronger and more invested potential governing body as well. So I want to thank the folks from that board in that applicant group who have really taken this very seriously, and I want to make sure that if and when they are approved, they're able to knock the cover off the

ball. So while it's never a great thing to have someone withdraw an application, I think people doing it because they know they want to do a much better job in the future is always a good thing.

1.3

2.4

Let me think what else. The other one point is we continue to have a vacancy in our federal program education specialist. While we did make an offer to an individual, that individual ultimately did not respond to the offer after multiple deadlines, so we've had to rescind it, and we are reposting things, most likely effective Monday with the division of human resources management. So if you know anyone who knows educational federal programs and wants to steer them our way for either Las Vegas or Carson City, please do so and send them our way. Thank you.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Conaboy?

MEMBER CONABOY: I'd like to ask that the executive director -- tracking bill draft requests and I'm seeing a lot of activity around education going into the next session, so are we going to at some point have a discussion -- maybe this is for the executive director and Mr. Chair -- about legislative initiatives that authorize Patrick to speak on behalf of the board even though we don't have bill draft requests, privileges?

He's often called upon as the expert in a lot of areas.

So how are we going to handle that issue going forward?

1.3

2.4

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I would suggest we make that an agenda item, but not for the December meeting, certainly for the January meeting so that we have a plan on that. I am a little surprised given that we had an earlier -- significant earlier BDR deadline this time around that we're not seeing more substantive information on some of the initiatives. I think LCB is continuing to work incredibly hard on creating language for all of these different proposed bills, and then of course depending on what happens in three weeks or so, there may be some of those folks carrying those bills may no longer be here, and so whoever succeeds them may decide to pick up those bills or do their own initiative.

So I would anticipate that from a legislative perspective, we're looking at some ways in terms of almost a redo of the 2015 session in terms of having a significant number of new legislators, which will mean that some of the stuff that's currently out there in bill draft form or proposals may not even get carried through the session based on changes in who is actually sitting in those seats.

MEMBER CONABOY: So short answer, may I request a December or January agenda item so that we can deliberate about this? I think it's best for Patrick to

go to the table empowered by the board's endorsement of certain concepts or intention to work against certain concepts. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: Duly noted. Anything additional? All right. We will go to agenda Item No.

10: Consideration of Revised Infinite campus Database Split Proposal.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Where should I start? There is interest, I think, among the schools, of splitting off our individual databases for a variety of reasons. I won't get too far into the weeds with it, but it behooves the schools to have their own separate databases because it's really difficult the way it is right now to actually do their day-to-day operations because you don't have the authority to do it. requires putting in a help ticket and getting help from the SPCSA to make really what should be very simple things like adding a staff member or a new teacher, removing the teacher who is no longer there, just really minimalist, mundane tasks are held up by the process as it is now. However, it is a really big deal, and we have started the process.

We've met with NDE and SPCSA and Infinite campus, but to do this in haste without our schools fully comprehending what this change really means for them

individually and having a really firm understanding of that and the roles and responsibilities of the SPCSA versus the individual school including the costs associated would be a huge error. So it is something that's happening. It's going to be slow and steady. I know that's a disappointment to a lot of schools. However, I think that we need to, you know, as a school leader, I want to go into this with my eyes wide open and make sure I fully understand what it is I'm committing to and what this change really means. So that's where we're We're talking back and forth with Infinite campus and working through that, so I suspect it will probably be several months before we're really -- NDE has given us some very specific requirements of a plan of how this is -- they really hold -- I mean, they really have to ultimately give the approval, so right now, we're developing a plan based on answering the questions NDE wants from us, and then we'll see if they give it the green light once that plan is formalized.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: More broadly, I would just note that I want to thank Member Mackedon for -- Vice-Chair Mackedon for shelving her understandable impatience and the impatience that I know that other school leaders have to fix this immediately and recognizing that we don't wish to compound our current

problem by simply just sort of changing the responsible parties.

1.3

2.4

I think one thing that whether the Department of Ed approves this transition plan or not, I think that the degree of understanding and knowledge that our schools will gain through this process and that frankly, more than that, I think our staff has at this point related to how this all really should roll out, can only help to make this -- however this rollout happens or this implementation continues to happen -- a much smoother and much more collaborative process. Because right now, it is really being regulated by the vendor and by the Department of Ed based on their business needs, based on -- versus our ability to really do the -- either our ability or our schools' ability to make appropriate strategic decisions because we're just up to our eyeballs in things like this.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: Yeah. May just be because I'm new, but what was the original intent behind having a shared database? And if the intended goal was met by breaking it up, will we still be able to accomplish the goal that is set up for that program?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think there's a couple of things. So just to be clear, this predates my

tenure as the authority director. So there is -- to some degree, this is based on what has been related to me by members of this body as well as by members of our staff and former staff members.

1.3

2.4

I think there were a couple of things. One was a desire to see if there were abilities to pool certain costs so that schools would not be overly burdened. I think that what we have discovered, at least with the current way that we've implemented this program, is that while the actual dollar cost, you know, is something we are subsidizing, the opportunity cost and the inefficiencies and the organizational challenges that come with rolling it out as sort of a single monolithic database that is centrally controlled have actually resulted in probably greater costs to schools than I think we've really understood. So there's that piece.

Secondly, there is the desire for greater data integrity. And I think what we've found is that partly due to some of the challenges we've just alluded to, and partly just due to the sheer magnitude of the system, it is the -- I would posit that if anything, our ability to actually determine whether the data is of high quality is more limited now because we are so focused on day-to-day blocking and tapping and operation versus actually auditing or reviewing or creating customer

reports to look at hey, are these fields actually like all mapped out the way they're supposed to be?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

The fact that I have two special ed staff members who are having to go through every single individualized educational program for students to determine whether all of the data fields are filled out correctly because we just don't have the capacity to build some of the more robust reporting functions that could identify those kinds of errors on the front end, right now, because we're so focused in the weeds of day-to-day implementation, I think is an area where it's been -- for our staff, especially in the last eight months, it's been quite an eye opener to realize just how much of what we're doing with this system is work that really is the accountability of individual school leaders and teachers versus what we're supposed to be doing in terms of monitoring and oversight and performance management.

So I think that that's something where the other piece that really, I think, drove a lot of this is sort of the, you know, the one ring to bring them all together and bind them, as I quote from "Lord of the Rings," but there was this holy grail idea that one single system will solve all of our problems. Single systems, absent really clear other infrastructure and

capacity -- and we're 1 percent of our school's budget, and we're doing all of this work for them -- that's not efficient for anybody, and it's not helpful for anybody. So trying to figure out what's -- even though there's a cost to us associated with having 22 or 27 or 37 databases versus one, that is nothing compared to the complexity associated with being on the hook for everything because it's all our system. So I think that's really, I think, what we're trying to think through, I believe, at the end of the day.

1.3

2.4

We used another system called Power School, which was a far less robust system, but it was relatively user friendly. It's formally an Apple product that folks knew what they were getting, and it was a relatively easy reporting tool to get to the department. It didn't meet the State's needs, and it didn't meet some of the Authority's needs. We went from basically having a Macintosh from 1982 to having essentially like a massive like huge server effectively on the other side. We hypercorrected in the other direction, I think. That's one thing we've really worked on with schools, and I think it frustrates schools because they know there's more power and more customization, but you can't customize without breaking stuff if you aren't really systematic and thoughtful about it.

bought a product and our state has now bought a product that can meet virtually any need we may want to ultimately fulfill, but it requires a lot more investment in personnel and time and expertise to be able to actually use that system effectively, and we're just not there yet. And I have to believe that crowd sourcing expertise from the schools with a hundred times our resources and our capacity and our expertise to do this work will, ultimately, inure to a better and more functional product for the state as a whole.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Snow?

MEMBER SNOW: I think it's a great idea. I think it's worth exploring it and seeing if it's going to be beneficial for the Authority and for the schools to proceed. So I think that's what can be a problem in government is that we don't -- we're not willing to try things. I think it's worth it to make the attempt.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Any further discussion? All right. We will move to Agenda Item 11: update, discussion and possible action regarding the SPCSA strategic plan. Director Gavin?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Over the last four meetings, the Authority
has approved the objectives and goals and metrics related
to the strategic plan, and those really sort of

encapsulate what we are trying to accomplish and how we are going to measure it. As part of the final piece of this project, I also wanted to make sure we went back and revisited the mission beliefs, core functions and theory of action that really undergirded that process that we started talking about first in 2013 and then as a result of that very impassioned and spirited set of conversations we had beginning in May of this year at the board retreat, because I just really think it's important that we also think about the why as well as the what.

1.3

2.4

And so as you will recall, I mentioned at the last meeting, that language had already been updated, so I wanted to make sure that you had the full month to study and think about that and consider what, if any, changes you felt were merited based on our best understanding of what you came out of that strategic plan, of all of our strategic planning conversations.

And so this is really that opportunity to do that again. If you wish to adopt this as is or with minimal changes, great. If there is a desire to dig into this more deeply, that is something we can also -- much like we did with the goals, we can go through this on a slightly slower path and timeline. And I really want to defer to you folks in terms of how you'd like to do this.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Conaboy?

MEMBER CONABOY: Mr. Chair, before we get into the philosophy, may I ask just two quick questions? Under goal two, when we talk about four- and five-star schools, how will that interface with this framework for alternative schools now? Are they going to have -- this is why I asked my question earlier, Director Gavin, about may I see that framework? Because are they stars? Is it the same kind of ranking system as we have now, or is there -- I mean, I don't mean to belabor that, but if we tie ourselves into putting in here four or five star and the specifics of the rankings change --

1.3

2.4

there's a reason why I said four- or five-star level or equivalent in bullet No. 1, and it was certainly not my intent with the other -- simply a matter of space on a tiny, tiny page. There's the explicit reason for saying "equivalent" because we don't know what -- I mean, it could change from stars to lunch boxes. It could go from five stars to three stars. We don't know. With relation to the alt framework in particular, the rating level is really something that's still something to debate.

MEMBER CONABOY: I see the wording. The other quick business, which is just the editor in me, but under the "goals," we have verbs in two of the statements and not in the other two, so could we just like in number

two, add, "maintain unwavering commitment," and then number three, say, "assure fulfillment"? I mean, I kept reading those and thinking that the construction of those goals was different. That's a little tiny, itty-bitty point. I know that.

1.3

2.4

appreciate that point because it's the kind of thing that I usually get super -- to use the David Foster Wallace term, I get astute about. So yes, I think that's a really great point. So maintain unwavering commitment to high-quality schools and ensure fulfillment of public school obligations.

CHAIR JOHNSON: My question actually stems on our measures. When are we going to determine -- at what point will we determine what those targets are for ourselves? So since percentage -- imagine if goal No. 1 is percentage of open enrollment schools weighted lotteries, what is that percentage that we are seeking to obtain? When do we determine those specific measures so that we can know -- so we can evaluate ourselves on success?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: That sounds like a really great next step, Mr. Chairman. This is the -- by the time we finish the strategic plan, it will be time to do the next one, and I say that tongue in cheek very much

so. Not at all as a critique, but yeah, I think that is a very fair point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

One of the things we definitely need to do is figure out what our baseline is in these areas. In this particular one, a zero. And I will note that the department right now seems super eager to do the weighted lottery thing, and I believe Steve has a sense of urgency on that as well based on some of the needs for a whole bunch of reasons that his team has articulated to me in just the last 72 hours, actually following up on our conversation at the Las Vegas City Council meeting. So I am confident that will very quickly become a reality, those regs, and then we can begin that process of figuring out how we deal with this. I think the way we do it is we look at the schools that have the -- that are the most divergent from what their sending schools are and sort of start the conversation there.

CHAIR JOHNSON: I guess that was one specific point, but I think we have three, six, nine, almost 12 measurements we need to actually have some numbers towards. So if we could get some clarity on that so we can actually start measuring our progress. We don't want to look up and be 2020, time to make another strategic plan, and we don't actually know if we've been successful or not. And I mention all of that because over the past,

I don't know, I guess ten days or so, I've had lots of opportunities to talk to various stakeholder groups about charter schools and helping people understand our performance and debunk some misconceptions, and it's very difficult to do that when you don't have some very concrete metrics.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

I talk a lot about our philosophy and things that we want to achieve, but if you don't have data to back up those conversations, especially in public spaces, it becomes difficult for us to, as a body, to talk about why we exist or why we are a good alternative to other options that exist for families today. And so I want to make sure that we are holding ourselves to the highest standards, just like we are trying to hold our schools to those standards, so that when in fact we do go to public spaces like the city council meeting or talking to any of our legislators and we have to defend our presence, we can say and point to hard metrics that we are changing the lives of students every day, day after day. Hopefully, the priesthood is converted. Any other -- I know we wanted to talk about actually moving this so we could actually move to the next step of that. Any other questions, points?

MEMBER CONABOY: I'd just like to support what you just said because I was looking for the numbers

in that column, and I recall that when we had NACSA in when we were beginning the review of ourselves and of the executive director and dealing with the issue of how to evaluate, the issue was not having concrete goals. So I think we have some good goals. I think we have a good philosophical approach. My reading of it is that it's still very, very valid and maybe others have other insight, but I think it's really important for us to set the measures. And I don't know if, Executive Director Gavin, is it something that you would like to make a stab at and make a recommendation to us? I mean, do you see on the horizon the possibility or capacity again, capacity, to do these things, or do you want to do it over the next one, two, three, four, five years? might behoove the conversation for you to make a recommendation to us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think that -- so assuming you meant months and not years, Member Conaboy?

MEMBER CONABOY: Accomplish this over -setting the measures over months, but maybe what we need
is a five-year rollup, just like benchmarks for our
schools, because some of these things aren't possible
until, for instance, we have a weighted lottery.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Yep. I think

that's a very --

1.3

2.4

MEMBER CONABOY: Yeah.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: I think that makes

-- so the answer is yes, take a stab at it, absolutely.

And I think doing it in an iterative fashion also makes

sense with at least one of those buckets of stuff,

something we talk about each meeting, and in some cases,

perhaps two because I also -- I've got one member who is

signalling me that she wants it too, so I'm more than

good with that because we don't want to basically be

sitting here and it's taken us to a year to get this

done.

The good news is we knew going in that this was something that was going to -- we needed to get this done by the end of 2016. We are on track to do all of this work by, if not by the end of 2016, certainly by the first month of 2017. So we've -- I think we're doing good work here, and you guys are doing good work here in continuing to push this process along.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER CONABOY: May I just follow up? I think it would be really important to have this in place going into the legislative session. I will say that we've had a couple of news releases lately, and they're all bad news. I think we have some good news to relate

to people, and I'd like some of it to be a narrative and some of it to be quantifiable. But, I mean, the progress that some of our schools are making that was evidenced today is something that we need to be able to talk about and be ready to talk about in a very firm and concrete way before the session starts or during the session. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR JOHNSON: Member Guinasso?

MEMBER GUINASSO: As you all are talking, one of the things is one of the public bodies that I represent, what we do with every board memo that comes to the board in support of a particular agenda item is we ask the staff to connect that agenda item to some long-range principle or goal that we've set so that we're clear every time we look at our agenda, how is this particular agenda item advancing our set of long-range principles or goals? And so if we do that as a matter of practice, it helps keep us on course so it doesn't become just a set of goals we've discussed and ratified and a set of benchmarks that we've all agreed to, but as we go from agenda to agenda, we can see that we're on track, you know, addressing piece by piece the goals and the benchmarks that we've set forth. We've found that to be a helpful practice in kind of keeping us focused, and I would suggest that as a practice that we adopt because

I think it's a productive practice.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: I appreciate that. Actually,
I'll kind keep that mind as we move forward in the
future. That's actually really helpful to make sure we
keep these goals in mind.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: Yeah, I couldn't agree more. I think it goes back to what Mr. Kern and his colleague were discussing with professional development. And so spending 75 percent of your time on actual teaching and learning and curriculum instruction versus on sort of on administrative minutia because that's the core business of school. And it's very much the same conversation you have with governing bodies of schools. Are you spending your time dealing with lunch policy or like, you know, lunch line stuff, not necessarily the income stuff, or are you looking at the stuff that are actually value drivers for your organization?

And if you're spending your time dealing with the minutiae of a particular set of complaints on relatively minor issues versus the global issue of how are our children doing and how are we making sure that we're delivering the best possible outcomes for them, that's -- you can go through just a school district board agenda or a charter school board set of minutes, and you

get a very clear sense of what people's actual values and priorities are. And I think that's -- so I couldn't agree more. I think that's brilliant.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: Thank you. Take a motion. Unless, Member Conaboy, you had something else to add there? Please ask your separate question.

MEMBER CONABOY: They're speaking about organizing ourselves. Just maybe it's the way I think, but I'm wondering how difficult it would be tomorrow or even the next day, but over the short term to update our website -- and I know we've done a lot of work on it, Director Gavin, but when I read about a school, it would be really useful for me to go to one place on our website, not their website, and see all of like their applications and other amendments.

Would it be difficult to do that, Patrick, to extract that from -- I know there are huge databases of documents out there, but frankly, I don't have time to plow through them when I'm looking for something -- just to have a document history about each of our schools at a place on the website that we can quickly access?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GAVIN: It is something we have been actively trying to work through with both enterprise integration technology and with the Governor's Office of Finance. We actually do have some request for

one of the pieces of the enhancement request that we did make was to purchase a performance center and other elements of the Epicenter platform that would allow for creating some of those dashboard elements, for example.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: That would be so wonderful.

And I noticed in your briefing document, you've tried to put history more and more. That's very useful to me, so I thank you for that. But it would be really nice to have sort of a reference file about each school.

the capacity within Epicenter to actually make those documents automatically transparent, both on our website and on the school's website. The challenge has been working through our non-ADA-compliant state publishing platform to make those scripts actually work in a way that is -- the focus -- they're not unsupportive of it but also have zero bandwidths as well on how to help us build that on a custom level. In an ideal world, I wish we had a different publishing platform. That would make things a heck of a lot easier, but we don't have that flexibility as of yet, so maybe some day.

CHAIR JOHNSON: Any other questions? Then I will take a motion for approving the recommendation of staff here. Entertain a motion.

VICE-CHAIR MACKEDON: Member Mackedon. I

would move to approve the revised mission, core beliefs, core function and theory of action and final approval of the full strategic plan.

MEMBER GUINASSO: Member Guinasso. I'll second that.

CHAIR JOHNSON: All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

1.3

2.4

CHAIR JOHNSON: We will move to our last item, which is public comment. I have one sign-up for public comment here in the south, Dr. John Hawk.

MR. HAWK: Chair Johnson, Members of the Board, John Hawk, chief operations officer for Nevada State High School, for the record. I just wanted to update you on December 4th for some new members that are on the board, there was a renewal and expedited renewal of our application for another six years. Two things that came out of that was number one, this board charged us with a responsibility to disseminate information to other charter schools, and number two, there was a very strict ask from the Authority Staff to not go below our ending fund balance. So we just finished our annual audit with \$50,000 to the positive.

However, I do have to put the caveat of GASB 68 for public agencies that have to report on PERS, you will notice that we have a huge ending fund balance in

the negative as a liability. However, if you were to take that out, we ended up \$48,000 to the positive. So \$227,000 plus \$50,000, approximately \$50,000 over that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Number two, with the dissemination, we made a commitment to disseminate information and allow for a deeper dive into some of our best practices, and two things came out of that. You charged us with holding ourselves accountable to meeting up with at least a hundred administrators from around the State of Nevada. We're at about 95 administrators that we've touched base with and asked them if they would like to do a deeper dive. We wrote for the charter schools' program dissemination grants. We were awarded \$120,000, and basically, that is going to focus on -- we don't do a lot of things. We don't do a lot of things at our school like a normal school, but I think that the things that we do do well, we do really well, and we're focused on the mission, on monitoring and interventions with students, and we're going to disseminate that information to best practices through a workshop of 35 people around the state for this year, 35 people next year, and then follow it up with a deeper dive to allow ourselves to go in and work with some of the schools to implement it back at their school. That's my update for you at this particular time. I know that it wasn't requested by you,

```
1
     but I felt compelled to come up and let you know it was
 2
      great news on our behalf, and I just reported that to our
 3
     board last time.
 4
                  CHAIR JOHNSON:
                                  Thank you, Dr. Hawk.
                                                         Ιs
 5
      there any public comment in the north?
 6
                  MS. OSBORNE: No, there is not.
 7
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Any additional
 8
      comments, Member Conaboy?
                  MEMBER CONABOY: I just want to end on a good
 9
10
      news note here. This is the kind of good news about the
11
     work of our schools and the Authority that I'm talking
12
     about. Actually, Dr. Hawk and his team are taking us to
      another level now where some of our schools are mature
1.3
14
      enough and have a proven track record long enough that
15
      they can turn around and nurture those coming behind
16
      them, and it is like music to my ears. So thank you,
17
      Dr. Hawk, for coming forward today.
18
                  CHAIR JOHNSON: All right. Well, then, I
19
     will call this meeting adjourned at 12:41.
20
                                 -000-
21
22
23
2.4
25
```

1	STATE OF NEVADA, )
2	CARSON CITY. )
3	
4	I, NICOLE HANSEN, Official Court Reporter for the
5	Nevada State Public Charter School Authority,
6	do hereby certify:
7	That on the 21st day of October, 2016, I was
8	present at said hearing for the purpose of reporting in
9	verbatim stenotype notes the within-entitled public
10	meeting;
11	That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1
12	through 113, inclusive, includes a full, true and
13	correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said
14	public meeting.
15	Dated at Carson City, Nevada, this 25th day of
16	October, 2016.
17	0000001, 2010.
18	
19	
20	
21	NICOLE HANSEN, NV CCR #446
22	
23	
24	
25	

—CAPITOL REPORTERS (775) 882-5322 —