



Respectful, Responsible, Safe & Prepared

**JOINT SCHOOL BOARD-GOVERNANCE COUNCIL
CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
June 22, 2023 – 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 1:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

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

Excused: Committee members Steve Klismet and Megan Sanders.

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 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.

One-Year Contract:

Mr. Saari advised that he had heard back from the DPI and all that they need is our signature on the one-year contract. This has now been completed so it will be sent via email to Cassie and Alex. He also advised that he forwarded to Alex a copy of his previous email to Cassie transmitting the one-year contract.

Governance Council Annual Meeting:

Committee member Sandy Robinson provided a brief summary of the GC's annual meeting that was held last week. No new GC members came onboard but there is a potential candidate who is considering doing so. The GC elected its officers: President – Sandy Robinson, Vice President – Ben Warren, Secretary – Becky Lange, and Treasurer – Autumn Beese. Committee assignments were made and the goals were set for committee work. Events were also planned for next year.

Review and Revise Draft Multi-Year Contract:

Section 3.5:

In reviewing Section 3.5C regarding “educationally disadvantaged” students, Chairperson Feldt advised that he, Mr. Saari and Mr. Flaten looked at the WRCCS model contract regarding accountability/assessments. Their main concern is that students are meeting the required criteria through assessments, but how they get there is autonomy. Director of Teaching and Learning Mark Flaten added that it is important to use how the State disaggregates student groups and be

consistent with the expectations of CEC students as with WLC and other SDW students. How you achieve those expectations is the autonomy piece of it.

Regarding Section 3.5 Measurables, Mr. Flaten pointed out that it is important to note that CEC has latitude on how a method is reported to the Board, so the measurable provides flexibility with the methodology. Mrs. Robinson thought that they seemed to be more of a method and not a measurable. However, Mr. Flaten argued that they approached this from the viewpoint that CEC is going to succeed and continue, so these are based off the WRCCS model contract and GC draft contract. It will show us what is and is not working. It is not about here is the data that must be met; it provides latitude on what is being tracked.

Committee member Becky Lange inquired about continuing the discussion relating to educationally disadvantaged students; however, Mr. Feldt pointed out that paragraph C contains language regarding that issue. In addition, Ms. Lange was concerned that decisions were made outside of this Committee, and added that a parent reading this contract does not know what is on the State report card. Mr. Flaten advised that his main concern is the term “disadvantaged”. He advised that what you do for the student in each category is done at the administrative level and not at the board level. He inquired as to where that term came from, and Mrs. Robinson explained that it came about during the process of applying for the grant. CEC Administrator Carrie Naparalla advised that it was part of the grant and it was meant to address all students, especially disadvantaged students, to provide them with an outlet that they may not have otherwise had. So Mr. Flaten asked what CEC has done to work with those disadvantaged students to date and if there was any data that PBL helped them. Mr. Feldt mentioned that we also have to consider the other end of the spectrum as well – the gifted students.

Mrs. Robinson advised that the demographics of CEC had to be similar to the demographics of the District. She also provided definitions of disadvantaged students that she had found when doing some research. But Mr. Flaten pointed out that it is not consistently defined so he had concerns regarding using the term disadvantaged and insisted that more clarity is needed as we need to collect and report on the same data pieces.

Ms. Lange suggested that perhaps the definition of disadvantaged could be added under the Definitions section in the contract, and Mr. Saari suggested that we could list the subgroups as identified in the State report card as a parenthetical phrase within paragraph C.

Regarding Measurable #4 relating to increasing enrollment, Mrs. Robinson advised that the GC is needing help from the District because enrollment is declining at CEC and suggested adding that language in this measurable. But Mr. Flaten pointed out that if CEC does not succeed, it is a reflection of the entire District, not just the GC, so the District is heavily involved with all students and staff at CEC, and it has a hand in the support of all the measurables.

It was pointed out that the phrase at the beginning of paragraph C is not needed so the Committee agreed to delete it.

Mrs. Robinson advised that they need to meet the DPI benchmarks not the WRCCS model contract benchmarks.

Section 3.6a:

Chairperson Feldt advised that they did some fine-tuning in this paragraph using some of CEC’s language in their draft Article 4 combined with some language from the WRCCS model contract.

The GC members strongly objected to the language requiring that the CECGC be composed of parents/guardians of students enrolled in CEC and/or community members living within the SDW attendance boundaries. For example, some individuals that they are looking at recruiting to serve on the GC are retired teachers who are currently subbing and/or coaching in the District but live outside of the District's boundaries. There are also grandparents who live out of the area but have students attending CEC so we could be missing out on a valuable resource. In addition, we should not prohibit someone who has helped our students in the past just because they are not in the community or prohibit former students who want to help sustain the school. They didn't understand why someone from outside of the Waupaca area couldn't serve on the GC as it could lead to more diversity and provide unique qualifications and new resources from different communities. Finally, the spirit of the CEC is the innovative piece, so that is why they feel strongly about allowing others from outside of the community to serve on the GC.

SDW representatives argued that the GC should consist of people living within the community, or if living outside of the District's boundaries, they should be parents/guardians of students enrolled at CEC because then they have an involvement, know what is going on, and have an invested interest in the school. If you are in this community you are going to do more for the community you live in and have more passion for your own community. As a public school, we have to do what is best for the community and what the needs are of the community, so it is important they are community members. In addition, if they don't live here, how do they attend meetings and evaluate the administrator.

Mrs. Robinson advised that the GC is intentional in selecting a GC member, and believes it is important that they have a connection to the community. However, being a charter school they do not have the same restrictions for people serving on the GC as are required for serving on a public school board.

Mr. Feldt pointed out that these are the people governing your building so they should be here; otherwise, if they have no connection, what is the reason for wanting to be on the GC. Mr. Flaten added that there is a difference between ownership and decision-making regarding CEC from consulting and helping; not that we don't want others to contribute, but these people are responsible for decisions made so there should be some kind of rootedness in the community.

Ms. Naparalla explained that the GC does have a vetting process which consists of an application, a conversation regarding their talents, consideration of where they would fit it, and a personal interview. Committee member Betty Manion suggested that the GC use formal interview questions to help them decide who may be the best fit, perhaps something similar to what the SDW Board used to fill the open Board of Education seat.

Miscellaneous Items:

Chairperson Feldt denied Ms. Lange's request to have access to make comments on this draft contract because of the fear of having too many versions of it like in the past.

Mrs. Robinson commented that she didn't know where they had stopped working on the draft because it is not redlined, in particular the section regarding educationally disadvantaged students. Mr. Feldt advised that it is all still there, it is just below the new language. But Mrs. Robinson pointed out that Assessment #1 is not there; Mr. Feldt advised that was a mistake and it should still be there.

Mr. Flaten asked if he could delete the other assessments that are redlined since this is a working draft but is intended to be the final contract when done. They do not intend to compare it with other previous drafts, so that is the purpose of keeping it as clean as possible now.

Because of scheduling issues, Mrs. Robinson asked rather than trying to meet as scheduled during the summer, if the GC could continue to work on the changes they want and then discuss a larger section at a later meeting. Chairperson Feldt did not agree to do so because the goal is to have this contract completed by September.

Homework:

Chairperson Feldt asked the Committee to review Section 3.6 and come up with proposed rewording of the language regarding living within the SDW attendance boundaries.

Next Meeting:

Chairperson Feldt advised that the Committee will be discussing Article 4 of the draft contract (which references Article 3 in the WRCCS model contract). The goal will be to get through the Admissions section (Article 3 of the WRCCS model contract and Article 8 of the CECGC draft).

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Autumn Beese and seconded by Betty Manion to adjourn the meeting at 2:38 p.m. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.