



Respectful, Responsible, Safe & Prepared

**JOINT SCHOOL BOARD-GOVERNANCE COUNCIL
CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 22, 2024 – 1:00 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 12:59 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present in the WHS Community Room: Chairperson Dale Feldt and Committee members Betty Manion, Steve Klismet, Sandy Robinson, and Ben Warren.

Excused: Committee members Megan Sanders, Becky Lange, and Autumn Beese.

Also Present:

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

Approval of Agenda:

A motion was made by Steve Klismet and seconded by Sandy Robinson 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.

Review and Revise Draft Multi-Year Contract:

Review of Comments and Suggested Revisions Made by the CEC Governance Council and WRCCS Director Sarah Hackett:

Committee member Sandy Robinson advised that the Governance Council (GC) reviewed and revised the draft contract, and they also sent it to WRCCS Director Sarah Hackett for her review. Committee Chairperson Dale Feldt advised that he sent the draft contract to the District's legal counsel for their review but he has not heard back from them. Mr. Feldt pointed that the Committee needs to thoughtfully consider these comments and suggested revisions as they would pertain to the District as a whole not just CEC.

Director of Teaching and Learning Mark Flaten advised that in order to make it easier for everyone to review where the changes were made, he added all the comments and suggested revisions directly into the working draft of the contract and noted where they came from.

First Paragraph:

The dates of the term of the contract will be updated when the final contract is sent in.

Addition of Definition of "Educationally Disadvantaged Students" (Section 1.1K):

Mrs. Robinson advised that the definition is from DPI and that although there were some concerns previously with this definition, the GC felt it was important to include it to be sure the CEC is serving those groups of students. However, Mr. Feldt did not want to list the different

groups of students because he was concerned that someone could get missed and they need to make sure they are talking about all groups of students. He added that the Committee had previously discussed this at length and came away with what was in the contract.

Mr. Flaten also had concerns regarding stereotyping and objected to labeling students and families. He added that it creates a negative connotation and should not be in the contract for two reasons: 1) the District works to meet the needs of all students, and 2) the term “disadvantaged” is of great concern because you are labeling groups of students, and the District works hard not to create labels of our students/families.

Suggestions were made to revise the language, and discussion was had regarding whether the definition was needed at all. It was noted that the term “educationally disadvantaged” does appear in the contract in Section 3.5C.

Discussion then turned to defining it using the groups of students as listed in the School Report Cards issued by the DPI. Mr. Flaten advised that the report cards have the breakdown of the students and that the non-public, more detailed report cards are discussed with the principals. The GC members advised that they need to see the more detailed report cards, and the listing of the student groups needs to be in the contract because of the measurables that are set out in the contract. Mrs. Robinson suggested taking this out of the Definitions section and putting it in Section 3.5C instead. However, Mr. Flaten pointed out there is already a link to the report cards in Section 3.5C, which is best as the student types and/or report card format could change.

CEC Administrator Carrie Naparalla advised that she is also concerned with the terms “neglected” and “homeless” that are referenced in the definition because of the minimal number of those groups of students at CEC, so you could be identifying certain students/families. Mr. Flaten added that is why the state report cards won’t report out on less than 20 in a particular group, and the Administration has that information.

Mrs. Robinson reiterated that the GC wants the groups of students that are listed in the report cards listed in the contract so perhaps it could be added as an appendix. In addition, the GC members reiterated that the GC needs to look at the information to be able to see the data and to see the same information as the Administration is seeing in order to measure student success/needs and be able to demonstrate that they are meeting the needs of all students. However, Mr. Flaten cautioned that this is confidential information and GC meetings are open to the public.

Following further discussion, Committee Chairperson Feldt suggested that, as a compromise, to remove the definition of “Educationally Disadvantaged Students”, delete the reference to “educationally disadvantaged student data” in Section 3.5C, and instead recognize the student categories as listed in the school report cards by listing them in Section 3.5C, prefacing it with “such as, but not limited to”. The Committee agreed.

Mrs. Robinson added that the purpose for this is to fulfill the DPI’s requirement to be sure CEC services all groups of students, including those who are educationally disadvantaged. However, SDW representatives pointed out that the District, as a public school, is required to serve and meet the needs of all students no matter the group, label, etc. you put on them.

Definition of Instrumentality (Section 1.1M):

The Committee agreed to the minor revision of this definition that was made by the GC.

Section 3.2A:

Mr. Flaten pointed out that during his review of the contract, the first sentence of this section must have been added somewhere along the line and he has some concerns regarding it. This is not how Ms. Naparalla was employed and is inconsistent with how other employees are hired. Committee Chairperson Feldt advised that this language is not acceptable, and it is not in the benchmarks. The SDW hires the CEC Administrator, so Mr. Feldt suggested that it be stricken or revised. Mr. Flaten suggested that the WRCCS model contract language be used so he recommended that the sentence be stricken, pointing out that it is redundant to language later in the contract where the hiring process of the CEC Administrator is spelled out. The Committee agreed to strike the first sentence in this section.

Section 3.2B:

Ms. Hackett suggested that this section be revised to include a specific listing of the services that the District provides to CEC. However, Mr. Flaten advised that the Committee took this language out previously because the SDW does what is needed, as a public school, and provides the same services to CEC as it does for any other school in the District.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed to revise the paragraph by listing out the services the SDW provides to CEC, prefacing it with “services may include, but are not limited to,” as well as other revisions that were made.

Section 3.3A:

The GC moved the descriptions of Fitness, Healthy Living, and Project-Based Art from Sections 3.4L, M and N to Sections 3.3A (a), (b), and (c), advising that these items belong under the program section rather than in the methodology and measurements section. The Committee agreed to these revisions. In addition, per suggestions made, the Committee agreed to move Section 3.4O-Suzuki to Section 3.3A(d) as well.

Section 3.4A Second Paragraph:

The GC revised this paragraph in order to clarify that it is more of a teacher-led project now with students doing their passion projects, particularly in grades 4K-2nd, with the older students doing more PBL-led projects. Ms. Naparalla pointed out that the required standards need to be met but the students have choices regarding how to meet the learning targets. The passion projects allow students to report out on their own interests and these do not necessarily meet the required standards. The Committee agreed with the suggested revisions.

Section 3.4C:

The title “Community Centered Instruction” was revised to “Social Development”, and the entire section was revised by the GC. The Committee agreed with all of the revisions and agreed to keep it under Section 3.4.

Section 3.4 (formerly paragraph J) – Community Engagement:

The GC broke this section out into three different categories and added language.

The Committee agreed with the language in paragraph (a) Community.

Regarding the language in paragraph (b) Service Learning, Mr. Flaten cautioned against using the term “graduate” at the 8th grade level.

In addition, there was much discussion regarding specifically including the requirement of 100 hours of community service in the contract, and several revisions to the language were suggested. Mr. Feldt suggested that the number of hours be removed as there needs to be flexibility,

particularly if a student does not meet the 100 hours or comes to the CEC at a later grade. However, it was noted that if a student comes to the CEC at a later grade, the 100 hours of community service is adjusted, and the GC members reiterated that it should be in the contract because there needs to be accountability on their end.

Due to time constraints, the Committee will pick up from here at the next meeting.

Homework:

Chairperson Dale Feldt asked the Committee to wordsmith paragraph (b) Service Learning under the Community Engagement section.

Next Meeting:

The Committee agreed to meet again on Tuesday, February 27, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Steve Klismet and seconded by Betty Manion to adjourn the meeting at 2:37 p.m. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.