



Respectful, Responsible, Safe & Prepared

**JOINT SCHOOL BOARD-GOVERNANCE COUNCIL
CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
July 11, 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 3:45 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present in the WHS Community Room: Chairperson Dale Feldt and Committee members Betty Manion, Steve Klismet, Sandy Robinson, and Becky Lange. Additionally, Board members Ron Brooks and Lori Chesnut were present.

Excused: Committee members Megan Sanders and Autumn Beese.

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 Steve Klismet 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:

Chairperson Feldt advised that Director of Teaching and Learning Mark Flaten will start the meeting with an exercise reflecting on our conversations. Mr. Flaten added that this is an opportunity to continue to build trust and revisit core beliefs and roles and responsibilities. Those present were divided into four groups with each group receiving a sheet of paper containing a list of roles and responsibilities. It was then up to each group to determine under which category those items belonged – Authorizer, Governance Board, School Leadership, or District Administration. The groups were all correct in their selections. Mr. Flaten summarized the activity by adding that these are the roles and responsibilities of each group but there has to be some overlap too in order for the Charter School to be successful.

Chairperson Feldt reminded the Committee that it is all of us working together in this partnership to help the Charter School succeed, so if it doesn't it is a reflection on the entire District not just on the CECGC.

Section 3.5C:

Measurable #1: Mr. Flaten advised that they revised this paragraph (including the subparagraphs) to mirror what SDW teachers have been preparing for – grade level preparedness and proficiency. Thus, the measurable will include the final grades, the Wisconsin Forward Exam, and the i-Ready assessment. This is not above and beyond what is asked from each building. This is the appropriate level into the data that they should go at the Board level. It will indicate if our

students are ready for the next level and what we are doing to help those subgroups who are not doing as well as their peers.

Measurable #2: This measurable is regarding growth and Mr. Flaten advised they just made some vocabulary changes as this is a metric that the i-Ready assessment provides the information for.

The Committee felt it was important to keep these key measurables at a high level in the contract as it can always drill down if needed. In addition, the SDW Board and CECGC just need to see an overview of the growth whereas principals will have the details to see where improvements are needed. However, Committee member Sandy Robinson advised that the narrative piece will be very important from the GC's perspective and it will be created by CEC Administrator Carrie Naparalla together with the GC. A narrative will consist of the interpretation of the data and how they are going to use the data, including how they adapted to get the students back on track. The Committee agreed to add a sentence with regard to this, and Mr. Flaten suggested the term "explanation" be used rather than "narrative". The Committee agreed with all of these language changes, therefore the yellow highlighting was removed.

Mr. Flaten pointed out that instead of listing out the State report card subgroups in this paragraph, they included the web address to the definitions that are in the State report card. And because not everyone has access to a computer, Mrs. Robinson advised that when the final contract is posted, a note will be included on the CEC website that a hard copy of the contract (along with the referenced State report card definitions) are available.

Section 3.6a:

Following up on the previous discussion regarding who can be on the GC, Chairperson Feldt advised that the Administration suggested the language highlighted in yellow. He commented that in order for the Charter School to apply for federal funding, it cannot have a SDW employee on the GC (which includes a substitute or coach), and this restriction could apply to future federal grants. Mrs. Robinson responded that she thought this language was specific to the federal grant previously received and it was a federal (not a state) requirement. But she suggested that the contract could be modified to not include SDW employees if it became necessary. However, Mr. Feldt did not agree and preferred to keep it similar to the SDW Board requirement that a member cannot be an employee of the District.

Mr. Flaten pointed out that diverse opinions are important but having them being voting members is a different level of ownership. The parents who have students open enrolled at the Charter School have a direct ownership/commitment to the CEC. There is a difference between consulting versus making decisions relating to the students at the CEC.

Discussion continued regarding allowing substitute teachers to be on the GC. Mrs. Robinson and Committee member Betty Manion argued that a former employee of the District has an interest and that a substitute teacher would be a benefit. Perhaps we could specify that they cannot be subbing at the CEC. So Mr. Feldt advised he could accept the exception for retired teachers from the SDW only but not from other districts, and that they can be a substitute for the District but not at the CEC.

Mr. Flaten argued that it is not a good idea to have School Board/Governance Council members who have an additional role in addition to being a Board/GC member – there is a reason for checks and balances. However, Mrs. Robinson pointed out that if they run into issues they can remove a GC member at any time because they are not elected. She asked that the Committee and SDW Board of Education count on them to be judicious in inviting and selecting people to

be on the GC and the flexibility to correct the language if needed, emphasizing that no full-time employee of the SDW can serve on the GC but a substitute can.

Mr. Flaten suggested that similar to when a CEC staff member is hired and they go through the GC process with final approval by the SDW Board, perhaps we could possibly do the same for GC members. However, Mrs. Robinson strongly objected to the SDW Board review of GC member applicants, because it is the membership who can vote on that and it is the GC's responsibility.

The Committee agreed to delete the language highlighted in yellow and to keep the remainder of the language in that paragraph. However, then more discussion continued regarding substitutes being on the GC. Ms. Naparalla pointed out that it wasn't really relating to being a retired teacher but more about being a substitute. Although a substitute is not under contract, they do go through an approval process, so Committee member Steve Klismet does not want to limit a quality person from being on the GC.

Committee member Becky Lange preferred to keep the original language relating to community members from all over being able to serve on the GC. It was also suggested that as an option perhaps we could include language that only a certain percentage of people not living in the community can be on the GC.

However, Chairperson Feldt strongly emphasized that they have to live within the SDW boundaries or are parents of students open enrolled. However, the SDW Board would be agreeable with SDW employees serving on the GC, but reiterated his fear about federal grants that may come up and the CEC not being able to apply. Mrs. Robinson assured him that they won't jeopardize any federal funding and will revise the contract if necessary.

Mr. Flaten suggested that the Committee think more about this and do some wordsmithing on it for the next meeting.

Mrs. Robinson advised that the WRCCS annual (virtual) conference is coming up in August. The first day is for authorizers and governing boards. Mrs. Manion will forward the invitation to all the SDW Board members for their information.

Section 3.6b:

Chairperson Feldt advised that this is pretty straightforward and was taken from the WRCCS model contract.

Section 3.6c:

Mr. Feldt advised that this language was taken from the redline version of the contract (pages 11 and 12) and Sections 4.3 and 4.5 of the WRCCS model contract. The GC members disagreed with the change from school calendar to master schedule in item #2.

Ms. Naparalla advised that she wants some autonomy and flexibility over the school calendar. The master schedule includes courses and electives, however the school calendar lists professional learning days which would then be virtual learning days. The school calendar would be created ahead of time so parents were aware. Mrs. Robinson added that they are not looking at the SDW to support any additional costs if they change the school calendar. However, Mr. Flaten had several concerns such as child care issues, what are the parameters, and this could create inequities between SDW CEC staff vs. non-CEC staff. Mr. Feldt commented that a school calendar is days of school and a virtual day is a day of school. However, Mr. Flaten argued that if the advisors are at a conference, they are not available to assist students. However, the

teacher/student contact days/hours requirements are not the same for the Charter School as the other SDW schools.

Ms. Naparalla advised that all of the CEC's concerts are on the school calendar. This past year they ran into some rescheduling issues which then conflicted with Board meetings.

Next Meeting:

Chairperson Feldt advised the Committee that they will continue with where it left off today regarding the master schedule vs school calendar.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Steve Klismet and seconded by Betty Manion to adjourn the meeting at 5:17 p.m. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.