



**Department of Education  
Charter School Accountability Meeting**

**March 14, 2013  
Modification Application  
Initial/Preliminary Meeting**

**New Moyer Academy Charter School**

Ms. McLaughlin called the meeting to order. For the purpose of the record introductions were made:

**Attending Committee Members**

Mary Kate McLaughlin, Chairperson, Chief of Staff  
Deb Hansen, Education Associate, Visual and Performing Arts, Charter Curriculum Review  
April McCrae, Education Associate, Education Associate, Science Assessment and STEM  
Paul Harrell, Director, Public & Private Partnerships  
Karen Field Rogers, Financial Reform & Resource Management  
Mary Ann Mieczkowski, Director, Exceptional Children Resources

**Support to the Committee**

John Carwell, Director, Charter School Office  
Catherine Hickey, Deputy Attorney General, Counsel to the Committee  
Patricia Bigelow, Education Associate, Charter School Office  
Chantel Janiszewski, Education Associate, Charter School Office

**Other**

Donna R. Johnson, Executive Director, State Board of Education  
Kendall Massett, Executive Director, Delaware Charter School Network  
Keith Saunders, DDOE  
Brian Curtis, DDOE

**Representatives of Charter School**

Nikia Wongus, Business Manager  
Keith Stephenson, Region VP, K12  
Glenn Clarke, Principal

Ms. McLaughlin stated the purpose of today's meeting is for the Accountability Committee to review the modification application submitted by the New Maurice J. Moyer Academy which has proposed to decrease its authorized enrollment and modify its educational program. She said the Committee will make a preliminary recommendation to approve or deny the application and the school will have an opportunity to respond to the Committee's preliminary report.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that the Committee will streamline the process of the Initial and Preliminary meetings for today. She said during the first part of this meeting the Committee will ask representatives of the school clarifying questions; and the second part of the meeting, the Committee will discuss each of the relevant approval criteria.

- *Criterion 3 – Mission, Goals and Educational Objectives*
- *Criterion 4 – Goals for Student Performance*
- *Criterion 5 – Evaluating Student Performance*
- *Criterion 6 – Educational Program*

- *Criterion 7 – Student with Special Needs*
- *Criterion 8 – Economical Viability*
- *Criterion 14 – Management Companies*

Ms. McLaughlin stated that at the end of the meeting, John Carwell will provide the next steps. She named the following criterion that will be discussed after the question and answer review, during that time she requested that the applicant refrain from answering or participating in the discussion with the Committee.

**Criterion 3 – Mission, Goals and Educational Objectives.** Ms. McLaughlin said the mission statement highlights online learning as a different and innovative feature of the approved charter. She said this modification fundamentally changes the innovative nature of the school. She asked what is the difference or innovation at New Moyer.

Mr. Stephenson said the New Moyer Academy was previously contracted by K12 and State of Delaware and there were things that were pushed to have modified and this being one of them. He said they plan to continue online education but for elective classes such as foreign language after the students have the State of Delaware mandated credited requirements. He said there is innovation where the students can select from a variety of four hundred courses that are offered through the K12 course catalog. He said they would work with online teachers that are certified. He said they felt that the online and the core courses were vastly unpopular with the folks of Delaware including the Secretary of Education at the time. He said they talked with the Board and this is why they decided to push to have it modified and that's the rationale behind it and it still speaks of the innovation that you questioned.

Ms. Hansen said she would comment on what he said about vastly unpopular and she felt that she would represent her colleagues in the Curriculum Workgroup by saying more than vastly unpopular in terms of determining to what extent was K12 course work aligned to Delaware Standards. She said it is absolutely critical because the Delaware students will be tested through the DCAS and also in the course expectation for high school students and it is important that we just acknowledge that.

**Criterion Six: Educational Program.** Ms. McLaughlin asked if the evidence that K12 curriculum has been effective in traditional schools and has the school considered other instructional models.

Mr. Stephenson said when you say traditional schools...K12 runs a variety of schools. He said most of them are online virtual schools. So when you say traditional schools that don't use the online curriculum. He said as an example they currently have a school in Chicago that specializes in second chance students and they use online curriculum coupled with face to face traditional instructional program model that has been effective. He said he doesn't personally know any other ones throughout the country.

Mr. Harrell said as a follow up question, the model that you are proposing now for Moyer hasn't been used much at all, only by a few incidents by K12, would be a fair statement.

Mr. Stephenson said yes, however for the sake of clarity, there have been modifications to the online programs and some of the virtual schools throughout the country. He said they have satellite canvases where students come and actually receive instructions face to face. He said this is probably a multiple location within thirty states but not this exact model where actual people are responsible for delivering the same instruction.

Mr. Carwell asked if this was referred to the flex school model.

Mr. Stephenson said the flex school model is all online with breakout classes which are different from this model.

Ms. Mieczkowski asked how do you ensure students with disabilities are receiving their special education services and if their IEPs are being followed.

Mr. Clarke said they have special education teachers that have teacher aides that are pushing the students to make sure that those services are being met. He said also they meet on a constant basis with the director for special education from K12 to make sure they are on point in doing exactly what they need to do to make sure that the services are being given to the students with special needs.

Mr. Stephenson said they are contracted with school psychologists also provide special education support that are required through the students' IEP.

Ms. Mieczkowski said so goals are being written and progress is being monitored to ensure that the students are routinely at school.

Mr. Stephenson said absolutely.

Ms. McCrae said correct her if she is wrong, last year previous to this modification, all students were receiving their core curriculum online and what you are proposing to do now is to take them off line and give them face to face instruction to teach them the same curriculum they received online.

Ms. Hansen asked if today are the students receiving core content area classes online or face to face today.

Mr. Stephenson said face to face.

Ms. Hansen asked for her understanding if they were proposing this, but have already put it into place.

Mr. Harrell asked how long ago.

Mr. Clarke said yes since August.

Ms. Janiszewski asked what professional development did they provide the teachers making this transition a success.

Mr. Stephenson said most of the teachers that they had last year had to be trained for the online piece. He said the teachers that came to them this year, because of the hurtful turnover of staff, many of them are already familiar with traditional instructional program. He said however, they did work with Innovative Schools for Project Based Learning to get some conceptual framework on how they could deliver this instruction practice. He said the overall professional development was writing lesson designs around this. He said it is not that the teachers needed a ton of professional development around the transition because the newly hired teachers had not experienced the online curriculum.

Ms. Janiszewski asked if they used a consistent framework worldwide or are teachers doing their own thing from classroom to classroom.

Mr. Clarke said no they have a data coach that has been coming in since the beginning of the school year and she has been working with the staff and they all are following the same type of curriculum and it is moving in the same path. He said they are also in the process of implementing the common core and they have a professional development schedule that they have been working on so that they will follow through the alignment to the state requirements.

Mr. Carwell asked as a follow up in terms of the instructional framework and the school being a six through twelve; how is it different between six through eight and nine through twelve if any.

Mr. Stephenson said they use a standard based classroom that have certain components of the lessons that are expected regardless if they are sixth grade or twelfth grade. He said the components of the lessons are similar however the content is different.

Ms. McLaughlin asked what steps has been taken to transition the students around this.

Mr. Stephenson said very little to be honest. He said in terms of the implementation of the online program, based on his understanding because he wasn't apart of Moyer when they implemented it; they implemented the program without input from the parents and students. He said as a result from it the students had a really hard time catching on to the online piece. He said it might have been a flaw and he accepted that as his responsibility. He said to do an orientation for the traditional program; he assumed it wasn't done because they never were successful with the online program. He said they didn't do a great deal of orientation other than meeting with the parents and students before the school year explaining what the instructional model would be and so forth.

Mr. Stephenson said the online program was vastly unpopular with the parents and students, so it was one of these things to make common sense to satisfy the needs of the request from the school community and the community at large.

Mr. Carwell said as a follow up questions as you transition from the online to the traditional; please explain the online instructional resource versus the traditional approach resources on how the delivery is different.

Mr. Stephenson said within the K12 curriculum they have thousands and thousands of instructional lessons; packaged lessons, the online classes were required to work at your own pace. He said the teachers still have access to those lessons; however they are delivered through whiteboard for interactions. He said they could access it through teachers directing it as opposed to student directing.

Ms. Hansen asked if he could give them a sense of teachers using the interaction of the whiteboard as a tool. She asked to what extent are the students using interacting whiteboards. She said it was in their application that the teachers were using the laptops and whiteboards but research shows the real connections when the students are using that technology.

Mr. Clarke said as he does his walk through the rooms to do his evaluations sometimes he sees the students, but not as much as he likes, he sees the teachers have some of the students come up to apply

some of the applications to the whiteboard. He said they are using it, but not as much as he like and he would have to push the staff to do more going forward.

Ms. Hansen asked did he have a professional development on high level usage on the interactions of the whiteboards.

Mr. Clarke said they have done a little bit on it but not as much as he would like. He said this is something they plan to do.

Ms. McCrae asked if the curriculum they used online was the same curriculum they are using now and the difference is the variable that has changed is the one that was online is now face to face and the content of the curriculum has remained the same.

Mr. Stephenson said the content of the curriculum has remained the same. He said another important variable that needs to be pointed out is when you have students who were able to pace themselves. He said if you have a high achieving student they might go through ten lessons within a week and when you have a teacher doing it. He said once again it comes back to a traditional classroom where they need to find out where students are to teach at their level. He said the content is the same but the delivery is different, so the outcome could also be different. He said in terms of the content, the content is the same.

Ms. McCrae said she is concerned because of the alignment of their curriculum. She said in the tenth grade, the fall scores were higher than their spring scores last year. She said the fall scores for mathematics seven percent of your students were meeting or exceeding and in the spring you were at zero percent. She said in reading fifteen percent of your students meeting or exceeding, but by fall only nine percent were meeting or exceeding. She said she is concerned about the alignment even at their own pace over an entire year of instruction, if the curriculum is aligned with the goals set forth by the standards, your students would have shown growth but they have declined. She said that is a very serious concern.

Mr. Stephenson said that is a very big concern to them also. He said they met with Mary Kate and John a few weeks back and one of the mandates was to make sure that things were aligned in regards to what is taught; scope and sequence and natural content. He said since then he had conversations with Deb Hansen and they have a team at the school that is working to align this. He said he agrees with her and that it is a great concern of his. He said there were some miscommunication between K12 and DDOE. He said there was a two part process, Phase I and Phase II, scope and sequence and unit of instructions. He said he was under the impression that the information that was given, not through DDOE, but through K12 that it was completed, but in actuality it wasn't and they didn't satisfy that requirement and that's what they are working to do right now.

Ms. Hansen said they had this conversation before and asked who will be the point person at Moyer that will lead this effort. She said this is an ongoing process, it isn't a start and stop process for the purposes of submitting an application. She said he just indicated in his comments a minute ago that part of the professional development your staff training, including teachers would have had this information if they had training in their method classes an ongoing curriculum. She said they really need to engage the teachers more in this process of aligning K12 curriculum to the needs of the students in Delaware. She said ironically in the course of the couple of years they have been working with them she has given instructions that were developed or aligned and Susan Long who worked with Dr. Freely spent

a long time working on it. She asked where it was and why are they not using it in the school currently. She said she just hates to start at square one and there was a lot of curriculum that they worked on that the school could have used.

Mr. Stephenson said he doesn't have an answer for her and it is the first time he had heard Susan Long's name. He said he knew there were a number of people that worked on it. He said the same question came up from K12 during a follow up phone call and a lady named Jill said they worked on this before and asked where they were at. He said since it is an ongoing process of who they have now they need to know who will be implementing it and move forward. He said because the past two years there has been a tremendous amount of turnover. He said in 2011-12 school year they were literally running a school instructional with first year teachers with an exception of special education teachers and PE teacher. He said the work they have ahead of them is steep and they are willing to set the foundation and get it moving so the school will be successful.

Ms. McLaughlin said the Delaware graduation requirements have changed since the charter application was approved. She asked if the foreign language requirements are not reflected in Moyer's graduation requirements.

Mr. Stephenson said he believes that Delaware requires two years and Moyer requires three years because he wanted it to reflect what the colleges were using but he was not for certain.

Ms. McLaughlin said they would clarify it in the Preliminary Report.

Mr. Harrell asked with the changeover from 2011-12, did you lose or retained any teachers. He asked what was the turnover.

Mr. Stephenson said there was one teacher that moved and they had to replace her.

Mr. Harrell asked at the end of this school year, 2012-13, do you expect to have any turnover.

Mr. Stephenson said yes and Mr. Harrell termed it very well, but it will not be as great as it was from the past couple of years. He said they are looking to retain all the teachers they have except for two or three that is not a good fit for them.

Mr. Clarke said this is part of their goal to become hundred percent highly qualified.

Ms. Janiszewski said in the application they provided for their modification appeared to be a copy pasted from the new application submitted for the New Moyer application in 2012-13, which is their current year professional development plan; which is giving the impression that it is retroactive. She asked what is their plan moving forward for 2013-14 for professional development.

Mr. Clarke said they don't have the courses out yet. He said what they plan to do is get the assistance from their reading and math specialists to make sure that their staff is trained in the common core and aligned to the K12 curriculum.

Mr. Stephenson said in addition to that they will continue to train their teachers effectively use data and entail the instructional program to meet the students' needs based on data. He said this is probably the biggest piece that has been missing at Moyer creating a data cycle. He said in Delaware having multiple

State assessments which gave them an opportunity to create an authentic data cycle around students and teachers effective use of data. He said that would be a thoughtful plan moving forward.

Mr. Clarke said as a culture in the school they have started to do this in their math classes where you will have some of the students come in and go see what their average is versus the other classes; they use this to help motivate them to do better.

Mr. Carwell asked as a follow up, you mentioned before that Innovative Schools is consistent with project based learning; he wanted to know how does look like at Moyer if it is schoolwide or specific grades.

Mr. Stephenson said it was schoolwide.

Mr. Carwell said what professional development are they using to make sure that the teachers are incorporating project based learning practices.

Mr. Stephenson said there were a few things; follow ups with Innovative Schools and collaboration between staff.

Mr. Carwell asked if there was a specific school they are looking at that is inspiring them.

Mr. Stephenson said they have not done that yet and that would be the next step. He said at this point it is the only collaboration within the school.

Mr. Carwell asked what was the transitional engagement with the students helping them thrive once they added project based learning in the traditional school setting from the online classes.

Mr. Stephenson said the qualitative response they received was the students are more interested in the instructional program this year than the last. He said other than the orientation there was not a whole lot that was done to orient students to the process.

He said another piece is that the administrative team would delivery training for science coalition and project based learning. He asked what was the capacity of the administrative team to deliver the training and how do you determine that.

Mr. Stephenson said delivery and support goes hand in hand. He said the administrative team is taking the lead on some of the data talk. He said there is a data coach that is assigned to the school.

Ms. McCrae asked have they done so in support of the science coalition trainings.

Mr. Clarke said the science coalition has scheduling conflicts where they were not able to get the staff to the trainings this year. He said they contacted the director to make sure that staff will get the training done the summer time. During the year it is a real task to get things done.

Ms. McCrae said it was important to have something done in the meantime because looking at the science scores they are at zero percent.

Mr. Stephenson said to answer her question it would be no. He said Ms. Mayer and Ms. Mauro were a part of the science coalition from last year and they both have remained at the school this year; unless there is vastly new information, they are aware of the science coalition meetings. He said it was a great burden for him last year to release them week after week was a lot.

Ms. McCrae said understandingly, but if it is a great burden then there has to be an alternative in place in your school in the meantime while they are waiting to get that training or working on something else because your science scores are at zero percent. She said in terms of being a responsible educator for the children in your care you would need to make sure there is a well rounded education and not just focusing on math and ELA, and that goes for social studies as well, even though social studies scores were higher than zero but they are not that good.

Ms. Hansen said the school said they were members of the science coalition and by signing the memorandum of understanding, both parties are in agreement to send their teachers to the coalition training and the understanding is that it is primary professional development and the receipt of those science kits and those consumables are secondary to the professional development for teachers. So I have to say that it has to be a part of danger in losing those resources because if you do not have teachers attending the training and it is not very mindful not to deliver to the school without the training.

Mr. Stephenson said they would have to follow up on this.

**Criterion Eight: Economic Viability.** Ms. McLaughlin said one of the assurances of the charter is a requirement that the school meets 80% of authorized enrollment by April 1<sup>st</sup>. Based on current authorized enrollment (365) the school was at 46% last year, which means the school is currently out of compliance. She said if the modification is approved, 80% of the new authorized enrollment (225) would be 180 students. She said it is where the current enrollment is 180 (includes 16 seniors on track to graduate). She asked if there was a contingency budget if enrollment does not reach 225?

Mr. Stephenson said he does not know who created a contingency budget currently but in the past they created a contingency budget.

Ms. Wongus said based upon the task that she has right now a contingency budget was not created. She said however in this budget projected the students that they currently have. She said any students that they would receive would be regular education students. She said in the event, finance wise, it has been projected conservatively in this budget to have a backup in case they run out of money.

Ms. Field Rogers said they just did a unit count of their budget and as of the other day instead of being at the 182 where you were at in September; you are actually at 161 now. She said you have lost 21 students since September.

Ms. Wongus asked if they were the seniors graduating.

Ms. Field Rogers said looking at where the projection is in two weeks you will have to submit where they are. She said they also saw some students leaving. She said she did not see any new six graders registered or pre-registered. She asked how do they anticipate getting up to 225.

Mr. Clarke said they hired an enrollment manager who has been asked to help with the advertisement, news ads and other sorts of things so they can improve enrollment.

Mr. Stephenson said his role is vast and he was just hired last week. He said in addition he will be running regular open houses, regular tours of the school, radio ads to begin in a few weeks, billboards and he's building relationships with some of the feeder schools and the board voted against the yard signs. He said they will still be doing door to door sales within the local community. He said they found that last year, in terms of enrollment plans, in the summer they received thirty to forty students who enrolled between June and August and their goal is to enroll and attract students early so they are not waiting for the last minute. He said they believe they will enroll 225 students; he said there is no way that they could enroll 365 students and including not be 600 students in four years that was projected in the original application.

Mr. Carwell said 180 is an aggressive number and does he think that he will reach that benchmark by April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Stephenson said he will continue to pray and work hard. He said they know it is a projection to hit that benchmark, it is more critical to reach that count day at 225 and he is confident that they will reach 225 and he hope to reach 180. He said they started open house last night and they are working with some of the feeder schools, boys and girls clubs, and so forth and they hope to be able to hit it. He said if you would have asked him yes or no within two weeks, he would have said no; and do you think they will hit 225 by September, yes.

Mr. Harrell asked in your marketing plan do you have a different approach beside the norm of going out and putting signs on the buses, you have a lot to be done.

Mr. Stephenson said there is no question and he has spoken to people in the past. He said they have a very difficult job because they are trying to reverse the negative culture of the school. He said the community has been involved in watching them in the newspapers, by local politicians, etc., and it is a very difficult task. He said they had a plan throughout the entire year to open the door to the community by having dinners at the school, civic service, college fairs, and basketball tournaments. He said that was an attempt to change this whole mindset that Moyer is a place where your child is not safe and they won't learn anything. He said your question is understandable and if he was sitting where he was he would ask the same question.

Ms. Field Rogers said she has concerns about the budget. She said in the modification request budget that was put together for the March 6, she sees the FY 2014, 225 students, is showing a deficit.

Ms. Wongus said that was covered by the contingency.

Ms. Field Rogers said it is not clear because she doesn't see the contingency and it is not noted on the budget sheet.

Ms. Wongus said the contingency is actually on a budget itself, in red, underneath it is the contingency budget that they would actually pull from that. She said it was allotted from this budget \$307,000 that they need to put aside for summer pays to cover the teachers' salaries for the surplus they actually received in this budget. She said in actuality the \$307,000 set aside at the end of the year is to cover teachers' summer pays. She said there was a situation where she had to formulate around what was

already established. She said the grants were already situated and set up and a lot of things in the budget were clearly incorrect; however, by the time in which she was asked to correct these corrections that were already formulated the budget will shift. She said a lot of things that should have been billed to Title I was not billed to Title I, and the staff members that should have been in the Title I were not in Title I vice-a-versa. She said it was a lot to come in and fine tooth and go through to resolve the issue. She said this budget will show a surplus and she has to forecast conservatively and also project to make sure that in the event that their teachers are secure and will receive payments over the summer. She said that was her first task to make sure that this happens.

Ms. Field Rogers said that she does not see the contingency; she sees in year one where she ended the first year with approximately \$398,000, but the contingency was not noted on this. She said then when you rolled over to the next year if she subtracts that on her own, \$307,000 in summer pay; she is showing a \$91,831 that should be rolling over to the next year. She said you are only rolling over \$40,275 and she is not sure what is happening there. She said in the budget you are actually showing under year one it is negative. She said it appears to all of the committee that with 225 students you are negative the first year of operation which shows that you are not economically viable at that level. She said this is why the enrollment number concerns her even more; because if you are not viable at 225 you really are not going to be viable at 180.

Ms. Wongus said part of the budget if you look at the budget lines the structural piece is very large. She said she is not predicting that it should be this. She said based upon where they were and what they have spent she could not vary from what this budget was from X, Y, and Z. She said she had to go with what had been spent currently in this fiscal year. She could not make any adjustments to make sure that it was accurate. She said what she plans to anticipate is what they currently have with the numbers is not going to be the surplus of \$42,000 and if you look closely you will see K12 taking their management fees. She said in the event they are running short, K12 will not be getting paid. She said that is one variable that they are trying to progress to in making sure they will be able to pay K12. She said actually when they cover the \$307,000 in summer pays; they will begin to make sure they will begin to secure money to pay K12. She said she had to show in the budget that K12 will be receiving some of the management fees in the budget that she put together; however, if there is a deficit K12 will not be paid.

Mr. Field Rogers asked where does it show because she is having a hard time find where the payments are where K12 would be. She said if she looks at 2014 it appears that you are talking about a management company fee of \$40,275; and if she is correct they wouldn't pay K12 again until 2016 and 2017.

Ms. Wongus said yes as part of the agreement right now is setting aside the \$307,000, because K-12 will not be receiving any money, because K12 wanted them to assure their stability for this year. She said what will happen then is based upon what their fees are calculated under what the remaining amount would be \$40,000. She said in essence there is the \$307,000 plus \$42,000 is what K12 should have been paid for their fees. She said with the carryover of \$40,275, this money would not actually be available because they plan to do hiring, so they have to set aside those summer pays as well. She said what you are not seeing reflected, but is outlined they will have additional hires that she has to put aside for the \$307,000 budget and their money as well. She said therefore she could not have calculated and deems it clearly to say with the new hire that they heard the school is going to have and set aside their summer pays. She said this will be an additional \$25,000; \$6,000 first year, \$10,000 another year and an additional \$25,000 the following year to secure as they hire that they would have the additional

payment for the summer. She said in the budget you are not seeing their payment until the following year because they have to satisfy the requirement to show they are actually covering these economical viability points in what they are bringing on.

Ms. Field Rogers asked based on what you have shown us how much would Moyer be in deficit to K12 over this period of time.

Ms. Wongus said she didn't do a sure line of the debt Moyer would owe K12, because of the contract in itself is that they do not produce a surplus at the end of the year, and K12 doesn't have any fees to collect upon. She said they do have to pay them their ten percent of regular fees along with five percent technology fees. She said what each year would be, she didn't deem outside of this budget.

Ms. Field Rogers said to Ms. Wongus that she mentioned the five percent and ten percent; she asked her could she help her understand what is categorized as program revenue. She said it is in K12 contract that says they get ten percent and five percent of the program revenue. She asked was it from state funds, local funds or federal funds.

Ms. Wongus said it is not considered the federal funds. She said it is state funds; not school improvements, but their educational sustainable funds, minor capitol recruitment funds, local funds, but not their Title I or federal funds.

Ms. Field Rogers said it does include any federal funds just state and local funds.

Ms. Wongus said to her knowledge it does not.

Ms. Field Rogers asked if K12 agrees with this.

Mr. Stephenson said he cannot answer the question because he does not know the answer.

Ms. Field Roger said in the contract with K12 it references that K12 elects to reduce the total amount paid in order to maintain a balanced budget. She said she's trying to reconcile that in the contract with the code which says management fees are not paid at all. She asked how K12 elects to reduce; she's not clear on this.

Mr. Stephenson said that is an interesting term elects. He said in the last two years, based on working with them this past year, Moyer's budget has been in the red and K12 has created a balanced budget and was required a monetary investment of approximately 1.4 million dollars to balance the budget. He said he's not sure if that clears anything, but he assumes what would be done if it ended up in a deficit this year and K12 would cover the deficit. He said if there is a surplus, then K12 would expect their fees to be paid. He said he is unsure of the why K12 used the term elect because it is not an election or vote. He said it is how it was used in the past and how it is understood and this is how he and the Moyer's Board President understand it as well.

Ms. Field Rogers said it is very hard for her to see that in the contract with K12 it says they will be providing an onsite principal, educational and curriculum consultants, teaching recruiting, management, financial and school administration supports, and school recruitment services. She said she is not sure of how these positions mentioned compared to the positions mentioned in the budget under staffing

plan. She said under staffing plan it is mentioned a principal, but does that mean there will be two principals.

Ms. Wongus said what it means under the staffing plan is that once they reach 225 they earn a principal. She said then the state would be able to provide them additional means of revenue. She said right now they did not earn a principal and K12 supplies those positions mentioned which is not included in Moyer's budget.

Ms. Field Rogers said the tabs for federal funds or other funds do not have a list anywhere any kind of support that they are receiving from Moyer. She said when you look at the budget they do not have a real clear picture of what everything it takes to run Moyer. She said it is kind of confusing unless she reads the contract to try and figure it out. She said the budget doesn't appear to be the entire picture.

Ms. Wongus said the additional staff that K12 supplies is not listed in Moyer's budget because Moyer's budget is based upon state and federal revenue that the employees that are employed by the state. No other employees employed by K12 were listed in the Moyer's budget.

Mr. Carwell said he would like to see the total cost from Moyer and also the contribution by K12 so that they could understand what the financial picture is.

Ms. Field Rogers said the lease provided back in December is good until the end of this year and there was no extension provided. She said she wasn't sure in the budget how the lease estimate was provided going forward.

Ms. Wongus said she kept it as it currently is at \$25,000. She said she knows there is negotiation for the lease and right now they have a meeting coming up to discuss the lease next Friday with the TRF to actually finalize the lease.

Mr. Stephenson said the Board of Moyer is attempting to purchase the building and they have been in negotiation with TRF.

Ms. Field Rogers said they would need to have those documents forwarded to them with the updates reflecting mortgage payments instead of a lease. She said also to see if that changes the liability for both buildings.

Mr. Stephenson said for both buildings and the total amount has not been agreed on. He said what they currently pay for lease the mortgage would only be fifty-five percent on the high end. He said it has not been accepted or agreed upon and he is only just telling them second hand information that he has been informed with.

Ms. Field Rogers asked would the building house over 600 students.

Mr. Stephenson said he believes the occupancy does house over 600, but that is not what they are looking to do at this time.

Ms. Field Rogers said the Application's budget worksheet last two pages has listed under other federal grants in 2013; \$22,000 and then in 2014; \$220,000 and she doesn't understand how the amount jumped so high.

Ms. Wongus said basically even with the reduction of the ten percent, what they are going through looking at the current funding that they were going to have come in. She said she did not outline it and actually she did not bring the documentation and she will submit it at a later date. She said it was the additional funding they anticipate coming in.

Ms. Field Rogers said she is really concerned about this because they are really in the time of sequestration where they are giving warnings to all of the charter schools that anticipating funds decreasing up to five and ten percent. She said she questions if you are going from \$22,000 up to \$222,000 and this is not realistic.

Ms. Wongus said she could ensure her that the documentation went through other eyes besides she because DDOE liaison had to verify and looked at every documentation that she had to put together to ensure that it was accurate.

Mr. Carwell said as a follow up to federal funding with the alignment of the modification of the focus school plan was the \$200,000 jump was a part of the focus school funding or not.

Ms. Wongus said now that you mentioned it yes.

Mr. Carwell said the funding is one specific piece but the overall is how this modification aligns with your focus school plan.

Mr. Stephenson asked in terms of the enrollment.

Mr. Carwell said the overall more so of the educational change and performance expectation.

Mr. Stephenson said this was a request from the Board to have a small intimate learning environment of core students and this is one of the reasons why the 600 went down to 300. He said the Board wanted to them to focus on higher performing teachers working with the students. He said in regards to the online instructional program the students rejected the online instructional program for their core courses. He said this year they made better jumps on DCAS in the first half of the year then they did the entire year from last year. He said if the trajectory continues he thinks it will be in decent shape in terms to DCAS and this is the goal of the Board to have an intimate environment. He said many things that were written in the original charter the Board had to assume those things so they felt they could alter some of the pieces within the Charter and they attempted to do so and the modification in terms of the enrollment was one of them. He said as long as the school is financially viable they are requesting a smaller learning environment.

Ms. Wongus said to clarify it is the school improvement and school focus and what you see there notated also is the counselor and social worker that was hired in this budget so this is why you see the jump up to \$222.

Ms. Field Rogers asked how long they would maintain the focus school money.

Ms. Wongus said three years based upon site visits and school performance.

Mr. Clarke said they have been doing this so far in making sure they do the things with the focus school money in their plan.

Ms. Field Rogers said if it is the focus school plan it appears that you have it in the document for four.

Ms. Wongus said it was her mistake.

**Criterion Fourteen: Management Companies.** Ms. McLaughlin said on November 30 the Charter School Office shared the Charter Performance Framework results with the school's administration. She said these results serve as a baseline for the school and highlight the need for dramatic improvement. She asked what evidence will the Board require to justify continuing its contract with K12?

Ms. McLaughlin said if they were not comfortable in answering this with Dr. Curry not being present, then she will add this to the Preliminary Report.

Mr. Stephenson said he knows that Dr. Curry is in conversations with people regarding this and it would be best for him to answer this question.

Ms. McLaughlin said that was the last of her questions/comments and asked the committee if they had anything else that they wanted to raise. She said seeing none, they will be moving into the 2nd half of the meeting which is the preliminary meeting which gives the Committee an opportunity to discuss the application and ask if the school would refrain from speaking as they did in the first half.

**Criterion 3 – Mission, Goals and Educational Objectives.** Mr. Carwell read the mission statement from Moyer "To provide opportunities for students to achieve the highest academic and personal goals. The mission underscores the importance of its research-based curriculum, which offers traditional classroom instruction, K-12 world class technologies, and data-driven instruction while recognizing and meeting the unique, learning differences of each student."

Mr. Carwell said the school's response to the preliminary report should include an explanation of what is innovative or different about the proposed change to the educational program and how it will improve student learning and meet measurable standards of student performance.

**Mr. Carwell's recommendation is that this criterion not met.**

**Criterion 4 – Goals for Student Performance.** Ms. McCrae said the New Maurice J. Moyer application did not address any aspects of the section for of the modification application. She said the school needs to provide the goals of the performances of the students.

**Ms. McCrae's recommendation is that this criterion is not met.**

**Criterion 5 – Evaluating Student Performance.** Ms. McCrae said similarly the New Maurice J. Moyer application did not address any aspects of the section for of the modification application. She said the school needs to provide the measurements of the performances of the evaluations of students.

**Ms. McCrae's recommendation is that this criterion is not met.**

**Criterion 6 – Educational Program.** Ms. Hansen said she will be handling sections a, b, c, l, j, k, & m. She said the school didn't submit scope and sequences and who will be responsible for the submission of the curriculum. She said ELA, mathematics, social studies, health education, physical education, world languages, visual and performing arts, technology does not meet the curriculum approval. She said more details will be stated in the preliminary report.

**Ms. Hansen's recommendation is that these subsections are not met.**

**(d) High Risk Students.** Ms. Mieczkowski said for high risk students, it does include a statement of plans for additional academic support for high risk students by placing them in required after school academic support groups, tutoring and/or an established communication plan with families. She said it didn't seem like a strong statement of what they would be doing for students that would constitute a plan.

**Ms. Mieczkowski's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.**

**(e) Graduation Requirements.** Dr. Bigelow said the response has provided in the modification does not accurately reflect the graduation requirements currently in place of 22 credits and does not address the change in graduation requirements for the Class of 2015, and the Class of 2016 and beyond, which increases the graduation requirements to 24 credits and requires specific courses be taken.

Dr. Bigelow said the school indicates 2 World Language credits and 1.5 Elective. Currently, there is not a state requirement for World Languages (begins with Class of 2015) and 3.5 Elective courses are required. If World Languages is considered Elective, then the school would meet the requirements until the Class of 2014 based on the application. There does not appear to be changes in the modification request to address the requirements beginning in 2015 and beyond.

**Dr. Bigelow's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.**

**(f) Student teacher ratio.** Ms. Janiszewski said the teacher/student ratio has not been provided for review.

**Ms. Janiszewski's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.**

**(g) Unique features of the school.** Ms. Janiszewski said the school within a school model is described in detail; however there are no details around how research-based instructional strategies are being used to deliver or differentiate instruction. There is no detail around how students' needs are identified nor is there sufficient detail to describe how the students are monitoring their own learning. She said in order to understand the school's unique features, more details need to be provided around each of these areas.

**Ms. Janiszewski's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.**

Ms. Janiszewski said the applicant states that instruction will be delivered by core teachers "traditionally", but then goes on to state that instruction in grades 6-12 will be delivered to the whole class via laptop and an interactive whiteboard. It is unclear how instruction will ultimately be delivered and differentiated for individual students' needs. Nowhere is it mentioned how *students* will interact with the technology. Moreover, the applicant states that students will be exposed to

ISTE's technology standards, but measurable outcomes around mastery of these standards are not discussed.

**Ms. Janiszewski's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.**

**(h) High quality professional development and (n) School calendar, master instructional schedule.**

Ms. Hansen said on page 20 of the application the school refers to a professional development calendar. She said none was provided and there were a few questions that she would like for them to respond to as follows; 1) without a calendar it is difficult to determine the frequency or the duration of any of these proposed activities, who the deliverer of professional development is, the intended outcomes for teachers and students and how the school will support and sustain this initiative; 2) is professional development planned for school administrators; 3) what differentiated professional development will provide teachers with the ability to adopt K-12 curriculum for use in virtual classrooms and in face to face classrooms; 4) what professional development is planned to train teachers on high level use of interactive white boards including promoting student use of this technology. Ms. Hansen's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.

**(l) instructional strategies/formative and summative assessments.** Ms. Janiszewski said the applicant did not provide a response. Ms. Janiszewski's recommendation is that this subsection is not met.

**Ms. McLaughlin's recommendation is that this criterion is not met.**

**Criterion 7 – Special Needs.** Ms. Mieczkowski said the school's modification application does not describe how the school will be in full compliance with current federal and state statutes relating to the education of students with disabilities, including how they will provide special education services in an online environment or how they will provide accommodation, modifications and/or support to insure student success in the virtual curriculum. In addition, Moyer does not describe how the school will provide a continuum of education placements for students with disabilities within the online environment.

**Ms. Mieczkowski's recommendation is that this criterion is not met.**

**Criterion 8 – Economical Viability.** Ms. Field Rogers said giving her comments and questions previously this criterion is considered not met. She would like to note that in the documentation, there was a comment that K12 has agreed to allow Moyer to reserve \$307,000 to cover summer payroll and receive a payment in 2014 of \$40,275. She said if this is the case, then they need to provide documentation of this agreement between both parties as an addition to the other clarification.

**Ms. Field Rogers' recommendation is that this criterion is not met.**

**Criterion 14 – Management Companies.** Mr. Carwell said it is his understanding that the Charter Management Company, K12, Inc. subsidizes a number of positions at New Moyer and intends to cancel payment for its management fees. He said however, it is not clear from the budget provided what K12's total spend is to support the school.

Ms. Hickey said when a management company is involved with a charter school application, it is to include a copy of the contract to include detailed descriptions and delineation of responsibilities between the school and management company. She said for modification applications, the original

documentation and any changes are to be provided. She said the copy of the New Moyer application that she doesn't have this documentation and she was unable to find it in the online application. She said therefore she was unable to review this aspect of the application.

**Ms. McLaughlin's recommendation is that this criterion is not met.**

***Ms. McLaughlin said for purposes of the Preliminary Report, her recommendation to the Committee is that the charter modification application for the New Maurice J. Moyer Charter School be considered not approved. A vote was taken. All ayes; none opposed or abstained.***

Ms. McLaughlin asked Mr. Carwell to share next steps. Mr. Carwell provided the next steps in the modification application process.

- Final Meeting – TBD
- Public Hearing – TBD

Meeting adjourned.