



Respectful, Responsible, Safe & Prepared

**JOINT SCHOOL BOARD-GOVERNANCE COUNCIL
CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 27, 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 1:03 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: Mark Flaten, Sandy Lucas, and Carrie Naparalla.

Approval of Agenda:

A motion was made by Betty Manion 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 (GC) and WRCCS Director Sarah Hackett:

Section 3.4 – Community Engagement, Paragraph (b):

The Committee was assigned to wordsmith this paragraph. Committee member Sandy Robinson noted that the 100 service learning hours is meant to be a goal, not a mandate, so it was reworded and the Committee agreed to the revisions that were made.

Section 3.4 – Community Engagement, Paragraph (c):

The Committee agreed with the additions that were made by the GC.

Section 3.4 – Digital Portfolio:

The Committee agreed with this section that was added by the GC.

Section 3.5B:

Director of Teaching and Learning Mark Flaten agreed with Ms. Hackett's suggestion that the contract should not specifically name a particular assessment company as it may change. Therefore, the Committee agreed to delete the reference to "i-Ready".

Section 3.5C:

These changes were made, discussed, and agreed to by the Committee at its meeting on February 22nd. Mr. Flaten reiterated that the detailed, nonpublic state school report card will identify less than 20 students in a student subgroup, so the GC needs to be careful not to specifically identify anyone. Mrs. Robinson agreed, adding that having that information will be particularly helpful in recruiting for more diversity.

Section 3.5C, Paragraphs (a) and (b):

In subparagraph (a)(iii), the Committee agreed to delete the reference to “i-Ready”, noting that the assessment company may change according to what the state is going to require the District use for the reading screener per Act 20.

Per the Committee’s request, Mr. Flaten provided an update relating to the new Act 20 mandates, which could mean that the state may assign the District a new screener for reading next year. He also advised that there is no state funding for training teachers on the new assessment. He shared that he will provide more communication regarding this to everyone this spring. Further discussion continued regarding Act 20, the required curriculum, what could be coming, as well as its status at the DPI.

Discussion then turned to revising paragraph (b), again to not identify a certain diagnostic assessment. Mr. Flaten noted that the assessment used in the spring has to be the same as the one used in the fall, and it will be the same assessment for CEC students as non-CEC students in reading and math.

Therefore, the Committee agreed to revise paragraph (b) by striking subparagraphs (i) and (ii), and instead referencing that the same assessments used for Measurable #1 (Section 3.5(a)(i)-(iii)) will be used for Measurable #2 (Section 3.5(b)).

Section 3.6A:

Chairperson Feldt asked why the GC struck out the sentence requiring the GC to be composed of members who live within the SDW boundaries and/or have students enrolled in the CEC, which this Committee had previously discussed at great length. Mrs. Robinson advised that being a charter school, the CEC is not bound by any state legislature to require GC members to live within the SDW attendance boundaries. The GC believes they have the autonomy to encourage people who are interested and willing to put in the time commitment and who may live outside of the community to apply.

Mr. Feldt strongly emphasized that it is important that GC members live within the SDW boundaries (or have students who are open enrolled in the District) because they would have a sense of community. For example, what is good for that person’s community may not be good for Waupaca and CEC, or know what it is like here and the community of parents and students. He was adamant that the sentence remain in the contract.

GC representatives disagreed and suggested that perhaps the language could be revised to state that a certain percentage or a certain number of GC members could be from outside the District’s boundaries. Because they are limited in the resources of people that the CEC has, they do not want to limit themselves to possibly having a member on the GC with expertise (ex. in PBL) and who could offer a different viewpoint. It is very unlikely that the whole GC will consist of people from outside the community, and the SDW needs to have trust that the GC will choose an appropriate member who will represent the CEC and the community they serve well. It was also noted that the GC is different than the School Board as their focus is on the charter school only and not the District as a whole.

However, Mr. Feldt advised that it has nothing to do with trusting the GC to select the right person. He pointed out that the GC can hire consultants to help address certain things and provide information, and it can always utilize the District for support and help with decisions. There is a difference between a consultant and a board member making decisions who has a sense of what works here and what doesn't and knows the values of the community.

Per the Committee's request, Mrs. Robinson explained the process the GC uses in selecting a new member, and advised that the GC has an annual election for parents to indicate who they want on the GC.

Mr. Flaten noted that the CEC is a school for students looking for an alternative method of learning within the School District of Waupaca. The vast majority of funds for the CEC comes from the SDW and, therefore, uses community taxpayer dollars, so the GC could possibly have someone from outside the community influence the use of District taxpayer funds. In addition, there is no recourse identified within the contract if the School Board has any concerns with someone on the GC. He also noted that many times there is work that needs to be done by GC members within the building, so having a member from outside the community could overburden other GC members.

Mr. Feldt reiterated that we have a commitment to the taxpayers to have someone on the GC to run the school according to SDW residents. He pointed out that the GC's autonomy is with who they interview and who they choose to serve on the GC, but reiterated that the individual needs to be from the community.

Mrs. Robinson advised that the GC's committee members contribute to the school but do not have the time to commit to the GC. She further advised that the GC bylaws state that it must consist of five members, so in order to meet that requirement, they may need to look outside the community. She inquired if the Committee would be open to compromise by limiting the number of people from outside the community who do not have students enrolled. It was suggested, instead, that the GC notify CEC parents that there needs to be five members on the GC and most of the time people will step up and become more involved in the school.

Following continued discussion and noting that both sides were passionate about their desires, Mr. Flaten suggested, as a compromise, to keep the sentence the GC had proposed to strike and proposed additional language, because the SDW needs to know who and why that person from outside the community is interested in being on the GC. In addition, since there is nothing in the contract setting out the hiring process of GC members, he suggested adding a subsection that explains that hiring process and sets out the time commitment required.

The SDW representatives agreed to the revisions and Mrs. Robinson agreed to incorporate the hiring process into the contract. She will take the proposed language to the full GC for further discussion at their meeting on Friday.

Sections 3.2A and B:

Mr. Flaten asked the Committee to back up and review these sections which were discussed and agreed to at the last meeting. The GC agreed that the stricken language could be deleted and the highlights removed.

Section 3.6B:

The Committee agreed with the revisions that were made by the GC, and noted that the bylaws will be added as an appendix.

Section 3.6C, Paragraph (b):

SDW representatives asked why the GC changed it from “Daily” schedule to “Master” schedule. The daily schedule is about when you are having a math class, etc., and should be set by the CEC Administrator; the master schedule needs to be consistent with the other schools as it affects busing, shared staff, etc. They also pointed out that the GC does not have autonomy over the master schedule. Further discussion continued as to what is meant by a daily, master, and calendar schedule.

Ms. Naparalla advised that she believes the GC is referencing the calendar schedule, which will be laid out ahead of time and will, therefore, notify families well in advance so they can make appropriate arrangements. The purpose is so that they have the flexibility for staff to attend professional development opportunities as they become known. Mr. Flaten advised that there has to be communication with the SDW regarding any changes requested.

The Committee agreed to revise the language to reflect the “School Year” calendar.

Next Meeting:

The Committee will meet on Tuesday, March 12, 2024, at 3:45 p.m., and will start with Section 3.7F.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Dale Feldt and seconded by Betty Manion to adjourn the meeting at 2:40 p.m. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.