



Respectful, Responsible, Safe & Prepared

**JOINT SCHOOL BOARD-GOVERNANCE COUNCIL
CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
November 7, 2023 – 3:45 p.m.
Waupaca High School Community Room and [Live Stream](#)**

Welcome and Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chairperson Dale Feldt at 3:46 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present in the WHS Community Room: Chairperson Dale Feldt and Committee members Betty Manion, Sandy Robinson, and Autumn Beese.

Excused: Committee members Steve Klismet, Megan Sanders, and Becky Lange.

Also Present:

Present in the WHS Community Room: Ron Saari, Mark Flaten, Sandy Lucas, and Carrie Naparalla.

Approval of Agenda:

A motion was made by Betty Manion and seconded by Dale Feldt to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Review of Committee Meeting Norms and Commitments:

The Committee reviewed their collective norms and commitments.

Upcoming Meetings Scheduled in November and December:

Chairperson Dale Feldt advised that the meetings scheduled for November 23 and December 28 are canceled because of the holidays.

Review and Revise Draft Multi-Year Contract:

Section 5.6:

The Committee reviewed the updated language. Committee member Sandy Robinson questioned the last sentence of the first paragraph, particular as it pertains to the community garden and chicken coop equipment. She advised that those items were purchased and are maintained by CEC themselves, therefore they should remain with CEC and not become property of the SDW, and CEC should have the ability to remove those items from District grounds. The items were purchased using funds received from the Waupaca Area Community Foundation, not from District funds or federal grant dollars, for the specific purpose of operating and maintaining the garden for the community. Therefore, the Committee added language to the first paragraph specifically referencing an exception for property purchased with funds raised in support of the community garden.

It was noted that the fencing for the community garden was purchased and is maintained by the District, so any alterations to the buildings and/or grounds would fall under Section 5.6.2.

Because it is important that conversations take place before disposal of any property, some additional wordsmithing was made to the first paragraph. In addition, the previous language pertaining to the right of first refusal was stricken.

Paragraphs (a) – (c) were carryovers from previous discussions. Paragraph (a) was revised and a new paragraph (b) was added specifically setting out the statement that needs to be included on all fundraising forms indicating on whose behalf the fundraising is for, where those donations will go, and who owns them.

The Committee now agreed with the language in this section so the stricken language was deleted and the yellow highlighting was removed.

Section 5.17:

This section relates to the purchasing of property and Administration did some wordsmithing on it, which included listing out the applicable Board policies. This would allow CEC to use the grant writer and not limit it to just grants. CEC Administrator Carrie Naparalla added that she has been following this process. Director of Teaching and Learning Mark Flaten advised that the purpose is to try to ensure that there are no conflicts with other activities among the other schools, and everyone knows what else may be going on at that particular time.

Mrs. Robinson advised that she will need to review this further along with reviewing the Board policies. She was unclear if the GC had the autonomy or does the District have the authority regarding what CEC is doing this year. Mr. Flaten advised that that was not the intention of the language; it is just important to have communications.

In addition, language from Section 5.6 was copied to this section as well.

The Committee tabled this section so that the GC could review it to be sure CEC is not being limited and to allow them time to review the referenced Board policies.

Sections 5.20 and 5.21:

This language came directly from Sections 9.8 and 9.12 of the GC redline contract.

Mrs. Robinson asked that the GC have an opportunity to compare Article 9 of the GC redline contract with the language that is now in the new contract before the Committee deletes it.

Section 6.1:

This language was taken from the WRCCS model contract and is identical to the GC redline contract. Minor revisions were made relating to the timeline in paragraph (a). The Committee agreed with the language.

Section 6.2:

This language was also taken from the WRCCS model contract but the Committee thought it was too wordy. It was pointed out that the measures are already outlined previously in this contract, and Sections 3.5 and 3.11 mention financial performance, so that language can be stricken. Also paragraph (d) is already captured in the measurements as well so it can also be stricken. The Committee agreed with the revised language.

Sections 7.1 and 7.2:

This language was taken directly from the WRCCS model contract, and Section 7.1b was slightly revised to make it more clear. The Committee agreed with the language in these sections.

Sections 8 and 9:

Administration compared Sections 11.4 and 11.5 of the GC redline contract with Sections 8 and 9 of the WRCCS model contract and they are very similar.

The GC redline contract did not have paragraph 8.1g so the Administration added it. It was noted that because it is under the District section, the SDW would have to provide the audit. The Committee agreed with the language in Section 8.

Questions were raised regarding the number of students referenced in paragraph 9.1b. Mrs. Robinson did not think it should be under the Governance Board section but should be under the authorizer section. However, Chairperson Feldt did not think the language was needed at all and the Committee agreed to strike it.

Mr. Flaten suggested and the Committee agreed that at the very beginning of both Sections 8 and 9 a new paragraph be added stating that the GC and SDW will have conversations first prior to initiating revocation.

Section 11.1 of the GC Redline Contract:

Up to this point, the Committee had not discussed the term of the contract. Mr. Flaten suggested and the Committee agreed to move this term language to the very beginning of the contract. However, it did not agree on the length of the term of the contract. Administration is suggesting two years and the GC is suggesting five years.

Administration prefers a two-year contract because the GC and SDW could have discussions more often and possibly change the language more often instead of waiting five years. However, Mrs. Robinson pointed out that the SDW can do an annual review no matter what the length of the term of the contract is. The GC prefers a longer term because it provides families and staff with assurance that CEC is going to be here for five years.

(The Committee skipped Sections 11.2 and 11.3 for now.)

Section 10:

This language was copied from the GC redline contract and is very similar to the WRCCS model contract.

Homework:

Think about the length of the term of the contract (5 years vs. 2 years) and come back with reasons for the five-year contract.

Next Meeting:

Items to be discussed at the December 12th meeting (in this order):

Finalize Section 5.17.

Compare Section 10 of the WRCCS model contract to Article 12 of the GC redline contract.

Review Sections 11.1, 11.2, and 11.3 from the GC redline contract.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Betty Manion and seconded by Dale Feldt to adjourn the meeting at 5:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.