

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD

NOTICE is hereby given of a meeting of the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board to be held on Tuesday, January 22nd, 2019 beginning at 10:00amCST in the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board Offices located at 239 N. Lamar Street, Suite 207, Jackson, MS 39201. Participation at this meeting may be by teleconference at locations different from the above location pursuant to Miss. Code Ann. § 25-41-5(2013) with participation being available to the public at the location set forth above. The purpose of the meeting is to conduct the regular business of the Board.

This the 17th day of January 2019.

BY: Quentin Ransburg
Board Chair

Agenda
Regular Monthly Meeting
MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD
January 22nd, 2019

- I. Call to Order
- II. Adoption of the Agenda
- III. Approval of December 3rd Meeting Minutes
Approve January 2nd Special Called Meeting Minutes
- IV. Chair Report
- V. Committee Reports
 - a. Applications Committee
 - b. Performance and Accountability Committee
 - c. Grants Committee
- VI. New Business
 - a. 2019 Request for Proposals: Suggested Changes and Release
 - b. 2019 Request for Proposals: Independent Evaluation RFP
 - c. Executive Director Hiring Process
 - d. FY19 Budget Revision
 - e. Smilow Collegiate School Selected Indicators
 - f. Educational Materials Specialist
 - g. Approval of Invoices
- VII. Public Comment

LUNCH

- VIII. Closed Determination of Executive Session to Discuss Personnel Matters
- IX. Next Meeting
 - a. March 4th
- X. Adjourn

MINUTES OF THE
MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD
Regular Monthly Meeting
Monday, December 3, 2018

The Regular Monthly Meeting of the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board was held at 1:00 p.m. on Monday, December 3rd, 2018. In attendance were:

Ms. Krystal Cormack, Board Chair
Dr. Karen Elam
Mr. Quentin Ransburg

Dr. Jean Young and Mr. Chris Wilson participated via teleconference.

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.

ITEM I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Adoption of Agenda

The Agenda was previously circulated to all Board members for review.

Chair Cormack asked to strike items C. Grant Modification- Clarksdale Collegiate and H. ii. School Selected Indicators as it pertains to Joel E. Smilow Collegiate from New Business.

Chair requested a motion to approve the agenda, as amended.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Mr. Ransburg

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

ITEM II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A. Approval of Minutes of the October 15th, 2018 Board Meeting

The minutes of the October 15th, 2018 Board meeting were previously distributed to the Board members for review.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the minutes of the October 15th, 2018 Board meeting.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

ITEM III. CHAIR REPORT

Chair Cormack expressed her excitement for upcoming initiatives that will soon be moved forward by the Board.

ITEM V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Applications Committee

Dr. Elam noted that it was the recommendation of the committee to retain the same Request for Proposals (RFP) process as the previous year, changing only the dates for the deadlines in the process. She explained that significant changes to the RFP would be best considered after a new Executive Director is hired, who could provide more guidance on the matter. She mentioned that there are some major changes to the RFP the committee is considering for the future, and that the committee will conduct research concerning these potential changes between now and the next application cycle.

B. Performance and Accountability Committee

Mr. Wilson noted that at the last Performance and Accountability Committee meeting, Beth Tek from Bellwether Educational Partners presented a proposal for her organization's potential services regarding the annual report. He also noted that the committee discussed the accountability ratings assigned to each charter school, the proposed School Selected Indicators from Clarksdale Collegiate, and a proposal from School Works to conduct site visits.

C. Grants Committee

Mr. Ransburg reported that at the last meeting of the Grants Committee, the members discussed the Grants Coordinator hiring timeline and process and the need to gather more information concerning a grants budget modification process.

ITEM VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Executive Director Hiring Process

Chair Cormack remarked that the Board has the option of creating a formal Executive Director search committee comprising of two or three members, or use an ad hoc consisting of volunteers from the Board and any contracted staff that may need to be involved in the interview process. Chair Cormack presented a timeline for hiring that includes a December 31st, 2018 deadline for applications to be submitted.

Dr. Elam moved to allow the Executive Director hiring process to be conducted through an ad hoc committee.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Mr. Wilson

Dr. Elam asked if Chair Cormack was satisfied with the ad hoc committee consisting of herself and Mr. Cardin in the previous Executive Director hiring process, or if she would have preferred greater input from the Board. Chair Cormack responded that she was satisfied with the previous arrangement. Dr. Elam expressed concerns that expanding the arrangement to a formal committee would require more members to coordinate schedules in order to move the process forward, which may be difficult.

There being no further discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating,

the motion carried.

Chair Cormack noted that the proposed Executive Director hiring timeline allowed the process to begin that day, December 3rd, 2018. She explained that if the timeline is adopted, the first portion of January 22nd, 2019 would be used to interview Executive Director candidates, and the second portion of the day would be used to conduct the regular monthly board meeting, in order to maximize the already scheduled meeting date. She also explained that currently the Board is scheduled to have a Board Retreat on January 21st, 2019 but this can be eliminated if there is no need for a retreat. She added that on January 22nd, 2019, candidate interviews could be conducted in the afternoon, and the Board meeting in the morning if that is what would work best for the candidates.

Dr. Elam moved to approve the Executive Director hiring timeline, as presented.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Dr. Young

Mr. Ransburg asked about plans for advertising the vacancy. Chair Cormack recalled several advertising strategies that were used in the last Executive Director hiring process. She noted that in the last Executive Director hiring process, there were 38 candidates who applied, and Dr. Elam noted that these candidates applied during a longer application cycle than the cycle that is being proposed today. Dr. Young asked if there was any intention of reaching out to the previous 38 candidates who applied; Chair Cormack responded that she would contact these individuals and invite them to reapply. Mr. Ransburg asked if anyone had concerns about the hiring timeline existing during the holiday season. Chair Cormack remarked that she is hopeful that this won't be an issue due to the fact that the role being advertised is an education role, and many people working in education have extra time off work during the holiday season, which might allow them time to invest in an application that they might not have at any other point in the year. Chair Cormack noted that while she does have concerns that the application period for the role might be too short, the need to hire an Executive Director as soon as possible necessitates that the Board complete the hiring process expediently. She noted that if the Board is not satisfied with the progress of the hiring process on December 31st, 2018, the deadline could be extended.

There being no further discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

B. Grants Coordinator Hiring Process

Chair Cormack remarked that the Grants Committee is recommending adjusting the Grants Coordinator Hiring Timeline by changing the dates of candidate interviews from December 4th-18th to December 18th and 19th. She remarked that she would reach out to the United States Department of Education to gain clarity on hiring requirements for this role. She also expressed the importance of ensuring a salary offer is cleared with the State Personnel Board in terms of a hiring pin. Dr. Young asked if a bonus could be offered to the person the Board desires to fill this role; Chair Cormack responded that enticements cannot be offered to either Grants Coordinator or Executive Director candidates.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the Grants Coordinator Hiring timeline, as amended.

MOTION: Mr. Wilson

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

C. MS First Survey Update & Request for Support

Dr. Angela Bass, Deputy Director of MS First, presented an update on two projects her organization is working on: a public perceptions report and a landscape document of policies and procedures. Dr. Elam expressed concerns that the sample used for the public perceptions report cannot be considered a truly random sample because a portion of the sample is self-selected, as parents contacted for this survey can opt to or opt not to share their phone number for this purpose. Dr. Young expressed concerns that the report would not actually give an accurate representation of the public perception of charter schools in Mississippi, as the people who tend to respond to these surveys are unhappy with the situation at hand, and those who are happy with the situation at hand tend not to respond to surveys at all. Chair Cormack noted that the telephone numbers of parents are directory information under FERPA, so MS First is not actually asking parents to give away information that would have been otherwise private. In regards to the landscape document of policies and procedures, Dr. Bass mentioned that her organization has started drafting a school closure protocol for MCSAB. Mr. Wilson asked how much progress has been made on this protocol, and Dr. Bass responded that MS First had previously submitted a draft of this protocol to the Board. The Board discussed the sample being used to conduct the satisfaction survey, and it was clarified that charter school parents are only a subgroup of the sample of this survey.

Dr. Elam moved to table the decision to provide further support for MS First concerning the public perceptions report and policies and procedures landscape document.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion, the motion passed with four votes in favor and one against.

D. 2019 Request for Proposals: Release for Public Comment

Chair Cormack requested a motion to release the 2019 Request for Proposals for public comment.

MOTION: Mr. Ransburg

SECOND: Dr. Elam

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

E. RePublic High School and Revive Prep: Defer Opening Request

Jon Rybka, CEO of RePublic schools requested that the Board defer the opening up RePublic High School and Revive Prep from 2020 to 2021. Dr. Elam asked Mr. Rybka if he had concerns that the Jackson Public School District may improve to a C accountability grade before 2021, eliminating the possibility for these two schools to open at this time. Mr. Rybka expressed that while he would be delighted to see this improvement from Jackson Public Schools in this timeframe, he speculated its likelihood. Dr. Elam expressed her disappointment that students currently attending ReImagine Prep will have to return to a failing school district upon entering 9th grade. Mr. Rybka reported that ReImagine Prep has been working with Empower MS to help 8th graders at

Reimagine Prep choose a high school that is best suited for their needs.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the deferral of the opening RePublic High School and Revive Prep from 2019 to 2021.

MOTION: Mr. Ransburg

SECOND: Dr. Elam

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

F. Charter Contract Amendments

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve Clarksdale Collegiate's amended contract to reflect new enrollment numbers.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

G. School Selected Indicators

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the proposed School Selected Indicator for Clarksdale Collegiate.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

H. Contracts for Consideration

Chair Cormack noted the organization Virtual Chief of Staff has put forth a proposal to temporarily support the work of the board on a month-to-month basis, and their services can include managing hiring processes, prepare for meetings, complete meeting follow-up tasks, strategic planning, and meeting planning. She noted that a Virtual Chief of Staff could potentially manage the RFP process, as well as prepare Board meeting resources. Chair Cormack explained that Ms. Naomi Jozovich who is a potential candidate for this role has instructional and charter school start-up experience. She noted that the Board could choose from other candidates as well. Chair Cormack recognized that the proposal offers Tier One Support, which includes 20 hours of support a month, which can be increased as needed. As part of these 20 hours, Chair Cormack mentioned the Virtual Chief of Staff could potentially conduct round one interviews with Executive Director Candidates and synthesize notes for the Board's review. In response to a question from Dr. Elam, she also noted that while the Virtual Chief of Staff could manage Stage One and Stage Two of the RFP process and provide some support for Stage Three, additional support from NACSA would be needed to manage Stage Three unless the individual hired as the Executive Director has the capacity to manage Stage Three themselves. Dr. Elam asked Chair Cormack's opinion of Virtual Chief of Staff, and Chair Cormack replied that she was pleased the organization came highly recommended from other organizations she had worked with, and was especially pleased that the

organization allowed you to choose your own Chief.

Dr. Elam moved to authorize the Board Chair to contract with Virtual Chief of Staff pending the Board attorney's review of necessary contracts and to authorize the Board Chair to request either Tier One or Tier Two support from Virtual Chief of Staff at her discretion.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Mr. Wilson

Mr. Wilson asked what level of support from Virtual Chief of Staff would be needed to onboard a new Executive Director, to which Chair Cormack responded that she thought Tier One support would be sufficient. Dr. Elam questioned if 20 hours a month would be enough support, and Chair Cormack responded that her opinion is that it will be enough support for now, but the level of support can be increased at a later date if needed.

There being no further discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

Chair Cormack explained that Bellwether Educational Partners has made a proposal for gathering data, conducting analyses, and creating graphic designs for the annual report and accompanying narrative. She noted that the organization will create this report in consultation with the Performance and Accountability Committee, and it is proposed for \$30,650 which is a 10% discount over last year's proposal. Mr. Wilson made note that it is the recommendation of the Performance and Accountability Committee that the Board approve the proposal.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the Bellwether Educational Partners proposal.

MOTION: Mr. Wilson

SECOND: Mr. Ransburg

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

Chair Cormack reminded the board that typically MCSAB staff conducts site visits of schools. She reviewed the typical schedule for conducting site visits at schools that are in various stages of their charter contract. Chair Cormack explained the importance of quality site visits, as they will be especially helpful in making determinations of renewal for Midtown Public Charter School and Reimagine Prep. Chair Cormack presented the site visit proposal from School Works and noted that the proposal includes gathering documentation from the schools, managing the documentation, and conducting the actual site visits. She reported that for the spring semester, School Works will do half-day visits for schools in year one, two, and three, and will conduct two-day site visits for schools in year four, and School Works will provide an 8-10 page report for each school. She noted that School Works will use the Mississippi Performance and Accountability Framework to conduct evaluations. Chair Cormack remarked that School Works will additionally make recommendations to the Board to improve the MCSAB's site visit protocol for upcoming years; this proposal will cost \$49,700. Mr. Wilson remarked that approving this proposal is the recommendation of the Performance and Accountability Committee. Chair Cormack acknowledged that NACSA recommended the use of School Works for site visits.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the School Works proposal pending appropriate legal review.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Mr. Wilson

Dr. Elam asked if contracting School Works for site visits was a permanent fixture for MCSAB operations, or if this was a solution proposed only for this upcoming year. Chair Cormack remarked that MCSAB staff members had previously conducted site visits, but she questioned if staff members had the expertise to conduct full facility reviews, and mentioned that contracting this service as a temporary solution would be an improvement. Dr. Elam suggested it would be best to wait until a new Executive Director is hired to determine if staff or a contractor will conduct site visits in the future.

There being no further discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

Chair Cormack presented the contract for the services of Stewart McMillan, and detailed that the contract included pre-opening support, management of monthly subscriptions, managing correspondence with the Mississippi Department of Education, and onboarding the new Executive Director. She noted that the only change from Ms. McMillan's previous contract to the one being presented was an increase in the hourly rate.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the contract for Stewart McMillan.

MOTION: Mr. Wilson

SECOND: Dr. Elam

Mr. Ransburg asked if the Board will have the opportunity to ask for additional staff during the legislative session. Chair Cormack responded that the new Executive Director will have the authority to hire additional staff as they see fit as long as the Board moves the budget in such a way that makes this possible. Chair Cormack remarked that her long term vision is to staff the office with an Executive Director and either an Deputy Director or two Directors serving under the Executive Director in addition to a Grants Coordinator. She noted her opinion that with more staff members, many of the existing temporary contracts could be eliminated.

There being no further discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

Chair Cormack addressed the need to strike item I. i. 5. Contracts for Consideration as it pertains to Educational Materials Specialist.

Chair Cormack presented a letter requesting that the Board allocate an additional \$10,000 to the intern line item in the budget and extend Lauren Hulen's contract until May 31st, 2019.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the intern contract for Lauren Hulen.

MOTION: Mr. Ransburg

SECOND: Dr. Elam

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

I. Invoices for Consideration

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the payment of all invoices presented.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Mr. Ransburg

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

J. Budget Revisions

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve all budget revisions as presented.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Mr. Ransburg

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

K. Closed Determination of Executive Session

Chair Cormack noted that there was no need for a Closed Determination of Executive Session.

ITEM VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ITEM VII. NEXT MEETING

Chair Cormack noted that the next meeting will be Tuesday, January 22nd at the Authorizer Board's office, unless there needed to be a special called board meeting.

ITEM IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Cormack requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Mr. Ransburg

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a vote in favor by all members present and participating, the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned.

Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board
Regular Monthly Meeting
December 3rd, 2018
Page 9 of 9

Adopted this 22nd day of January 2019.

Quentin Ransburg, Chair

Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board
Regular Monthly Meeting
December 3, 2018

Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board - 2019 Request for Proposals Timeline

Milestone	Date (2019)
Pre-Application Stage: Letter of Intent and Eligibility Determination	
Launch of 2019 Request for Proposals	January 24
Prospective Applicant Informational Webinar This information session will provide those interested in applying for a charter in this cycle with an overview of the changes to the process; detailed demonstration of the online portal; high level walkthrough of the RFP; and a detailed walkthrough of the proposal timeline, requirements, and eligibility demonstration. The webinar will be recorded and posted to the online portal for on-demand viewing. Please email charterschools@mississippi.edu for instructions.	January 31
Deadline for mandatory Letter of Intent (LOI) and Eligibility Demonstration In order to be eligible to submit a full proposal, all interested parties must submit the mandatory LOI and accompanying eligibility documentation. Conversion schools must also submit their proof of support at this time. Eligibility packets must be prepared using the template documents provided and submitted via the online portal.	March 5 (5pm Central)
Eligibility Determinations The board will review the LOI packets for each applicant and issue a determination on eligibility via email. Applicants deemed ineligible will be disqualified from submitting a full proposal in this cycle.	March 15
Applicant Orientation Webinar All eligible applicants will receive an invitation to a webinar that provides a more detailed explanation of the evaluation process, a high-level walk through of the evaluation criteria; and time for applicants to ask questions. The webinar will be recorded and posted to the online portal for on-demand viewing.	March 26
Stage 1: Completeness Check	
Deadline for Complete Proposals All proposals must be submitted in complete and final form by this date via the online portal. Incomplete proposals, including those that are only partially uploaded, will be disqualified from this cycle.	May 10 (5pm Central)
Initial Completeness Findings Distributed The Board will review complete proposals for each applicant and issue a determination on completeness via email. If a proposal is incomplete and/or incorrectly formatted, the applicant will have 48 hours to rectify issues and resubmit the proposal.	May 22
Completeness Remedy / Resubmission Deadline Applicants who do not respond by this deadline will be disqualified from this cycle.	May 24 (5pm Central)
Final Completeness Findings Distributed Applicants failing to satisfactorily rectify identified issues within the allotted time will be disqualified from this cycle.	June 3

Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board - 2019 Request for Proposals Timeline

Milestone	Date (2019)
Stage 2: Threshold Quality Review	
Stage 2 Evaluation Independent evaluators will assess critical elements of each proposal against the published Stage 2 evaluation criteria in five to seven identified areas.	June 4 – June 25
Stage 2 Findings Distributed Applicants must receive a 'minimally adequate' rating in all areas of evaluation in order to be eligible to move forward to Stage 3 of the Request for Proposals process.	July 8
Stage 3: Independent Evaluation Team Review	
Stage 3 Independent Evaluation Team Proposal Review Independent evaluation teams will review each proposal against the published Stage 3 evaluation criteria.	July 9 – July 30
Capacity Interviews Independent evaluation teams will conduct an in-person capacity interview for each applicant team. Interviews will ONLY be held on these days; applicants are requested to keep all dates open on their calendars.	July 30 – August 2
Public Hearings MCSAB hosts public hearings in the communities where proposed public charter schools are to be located. MCSAB will work with applicant groups to schedule each hearing date. Transcripts of the public hearings will be provided to all MCSAB board members with all other application materials.	Mid-August TBD
Independent Evaluation Team Recommendation to Applicants MCSAB delivers the independent evaluation team's recommendation to all applicants for their review. Applicants have the opportunity to provide a written response to the independent evaluation team's recommendation and may choose to 1) provide additional information and/or 2) correct any factual inaccuracies.	August 15
Operator Response to Third Party Evaluation Due Applicants may provide a written response to the independent evaluation team's recommendation and may choose to 1) provide additional information and/or 2) correct any factual inaccuracies. The operator response is provided to all MCSAB board members with all other application materials.	August 22 (5pm Central)
MCSAB Proposal Decisions MCSAB votes on final approval or denial decisions at its September board meeting.	September 9

Suggested Changes to 2019 RFP

Changes made by Krystal:

1. On the introduction page, I change the spelling of prior to the correct spelling.
2. On page 3, I changed the abbreviation RFP to Request for Proposals
3. I added Mississippi Charter school to the words Performance Framework
4. In the paragraph on accountability, I changed semi-colons to commas
5. On page 4, I removed the final bullet point but kept the wording
6. I changed "Initial Stage" to "Pre-Application stage" because the initial stage and stage 1 was confusing to applicants
7. I changed the data of the prospective applicant webinar to January 31 and changed some of the language
8. I changed all due times to 5pm CST (to be more aligned to standard close of business)
9. I changed many of the other dates on the timeline to be aligned to the board calendar, to provide more time for review of the different stages for MCSAB staff members (in response to feedback)

Changes made by Lauren:

- ~~• Include a table of contents (very difficult to find individual sections of the document, maybe also include a header on each page?)~~
- Page 21, item 2 under Professional Development, change “responsive” to “responsible”? **(I made this change)**
- Page 38, item 2 under Professional Development, change “responsive” to “responsible”? **(I made this change)**
- Page 54, the first box under “A response is substantially inadequate if:” says “The contract is not in the form of a fee-for-service agreement, and/or any financial transactions, facility transactions, etc., are included in the contract.” Shouldn’t it be inadequate if the transactions, etc. *are not* included in the contract? **(I made this change)**
- Page 59, the first sentence under “Governing Board”, it talks about “Effective governance structure for network and school governance” in relation to New Operators. Shouldn’t “network” be taken out of this sentence since New Operators don’t have networks? **(I made this change)**
- Page 71, the last bullet under Organization-wide (capitalize the W? **I made this change)** Staffing is the exact same sentence as the first bullet under Professional Development on the same page. Should this sentence be removed from one of these locations to reduce redundancy? **(I made this change)**
- Page 72, the 2nd-7th bullets under Financial Plan are the exact same sentences as bullets 3-8 under Organization-Wide Business Plan on pages 72-72. Should we remove these sentences from one of these locations to reduce redundancy? **(I made this change)**
- Page 74, second bullet under ESP management plan, it says “detailed explanation the scope of services”; shouldn’t it say “detailed explanation *of* the scope of services”? **(I made this change)**
- Page 29, item 3, at the end it says “If the proposed leader has never run a school, describe any leadership training programs that (s)he has completed or is currently participating in, and provide analogous data for all classrooms the teacher has led.” Shouldn’t this be changed to “If the proposed leader has never run a school, describe any leadership training programs that (s)he has completed or is currently participating in, and provide analogous data for all *schools* the *leader* has led.” **(I made this change)**
- I understand that Existing Operators and New Operators will have different requirements in completing the application, as Existing Operators will have to demonstrate past success, and

Suggested Changes to 2019 RFP

New Operators will not. However, certain sections of the RFP have different requirements for New Operators and Existing Operators that are unrelated to past performance, so it doesn't make sense to have different requirements for each type. These differences are listed below:

- Existing Operators are required to “Explain how the school culture will take into account and serve students with special needs, including students receiving special education services, English language Learners, and students at risk of academic failure” (page 26, item 3 under School Culture), but New Operators are not required to do this (page 15). **(I listed this as a requirement for New Operators as well)**
- Existing Operators are required to do this: “If the proposed leader has never run a school, describe any leadership training programs that (s)he has completed or is currently participating in, and provide analogous data for all classrooms the teacher has led” (page 29), but New Operators are not required to do this (page 18). **(I listed this as a requirement for New Operators as well)**
- Existing Operators are required to “Explain the staff retention plan” (page 36, item 2 under Staffing Plans, Hiring, Management and Evaluation), but New Operators are not required to do this (page 20). **(I listed this as a requirement for New Operators as well)**
- Page 12, the subtitle says the Executive Summary Narrative has a limit of 2 pages, but page 9 (under Directions) says “The total narrative response may not exceed 50 pages (not including the requested attachments and addenda).” This might confuse an applicant and make them wonder if the Executive Summary Narrative can be 2 pages long or 50 pages long. My guess is that “total narrative response” means every part of the RFP not including addenda and attachments, and the Executive Summary Narrative is referring to that one individual section, but because the word “narrative” is used in both of these locations, I think it would be easy to get confused. **(I removed the word narrative from the phrase “total narrative response”).**

Hi all,

We have chosen to continue using the NWEA MAP as the measurement tool for all our schools, to include Smilow Collegiate. In previous years, we have included a rationale memo describing why we think this test is the most appropriate for our scholars.

For Smilow Collegiate, we'll be measuring ourselves in the following way, annually:

	Kindergarten	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
NWEA MAP	50% Typical Growth				

Please let me know what additional information I need to submit to the board.

Thank you!

Abigail

Abigail Rockey
Director of Network Operations
RePublic Schools
215.285.4622



TO: Marian Schutte and Stewart McMillan, MS Charter School Authorizer Board
FROM: Erika Berry, RePublic Schools
DATE: November 20, 2017
SUBJECT: Revised School Selected Indicator Rationale

2017-18 Proposed School Selected Indicators

Joel E. Smilow Prep: 75% of students meet their individual growth goal in reading, as set and measured by the NWEA MAP assessment.

Reimagine Prep: 75% of students meet their individual growth goal in reading, as set and measured by the NWEA MAP assessment.

Rationale for Proposed School Selected Indicators Revision

What is NWEA?

- The NWEA MAP is an adaptive, computer-based assessment that can be used in grades K-12 to measure both student performance and student growth.
- It provides information about a student's continuum of learning and growth trajectory, and helps identify strengths and opportunities and focus instruction on the areas of greatest need.

Why is NWEA a better measure than F&P/other assessments?

- **The NWEA MAP is the gold standard** in evaluating performance and growth that is comparable. It is used by leading organizations like Charter School Growth Fund and Building Excellent Schools as their default measure for comparable quality.
- The **NWEA MAP is nationally normed**, meaning that we can compare our student performance and student growth against 10.2 million other students across the country who have taken the same test. Being the best in our network and in Jackson is an admirable goal, but we aim to be the best in the nation.
- **The NWEA MAP allows you to see if students are growing** at an expected pace, regardless of where they started and allows us to make predictions about what kind of growth is typical and atypical.
- **The NWEA MAP can help our scholars K-12**, not just in elementary or middle school, because it has a platform that stores student results over time. Every question on a MAP assessment is calibrated to their RIT scale. Because this equal interval scale is continuous across grades, we can use it to track longitudinal growth over a student's entire career.
- **The NWEA MAP is predictive of the ACT** since they have indexed their scores by grade level and quarter to projected ACT scores to be on track for college readiness.

Why is 75% growth goal robust and rigorous?

- Of all BES schools in the 2016-2017 school year, only five different schools would have exceeded this goal of 75%.

- For fifth grade reading, Tulsa Honor Academy had 79% of their scholars meet or exceed their growth targets.
 - For sixth grade reading, Collegiate Hall, Libertas College Preparatory, California Collegiate and Resolute Academy had 84%, 80%, 76% and 76%, respectively, meet or exceed their growth targets.
 - For seventh grade reading, no schools had over 75% of scholars meet or exceed their growth targets.
 - For eighth grade reading, no schools had over 75% of scholars meet or exceed their growth targets.
- **75% growth goal is aligned to high performing networks.** After each student takes a baseline test, they are assigned a growth goal for the year that is normed against historic data from every other student that has taken the same test and started at the same level. This allows us to compare their growth with that of their academic peers. That means that our scholars will be in the TOP 25% in the country for growth as compared to over 10 million other students (in the current year), using decades of data. Entering this year, 34% of our incoming fifth graders were on or above grade level. Hypothetically, if 50% hit their growth targets annually, we would still have around 60% leave eighth grade on or above grade level. Many high-quality networks across the country set growth goals around 50%-80%.
 - **Setting a growth of 75% DOES NOT mean that we are not serving 100% of our students.** In fact, it is mathematically possible to hit 100% proficiency without growing students. This creates incentives to NOT grow your highest performing students. By focusing on growth, we are actually creating incentives to serve ALL students, not just our lowest performing students.
 - **Within the current framework, it is mathematically impossible to get an A if we set the goal at 100%.** We chose 75%, and not 100%, because we would never be able to get to the Exceeds Expectations level to earn an A with a goal of 100%, since there is no way to have more than 100% of scholars meet their growth goals. This way, having anywhere from 76% to 100% of students meet their growth goals would give us the opportunity to exceed expectations of our goal.

I. Academic Performance Framework – Academic Performance Rating: Grades K – 8				
Measure	Rating			
	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Fails to Meet Expectations
1. State Accountability Letter Grade – Proficiency and Growth	A	B - C	D	F
2. School-Specific Academic Goals*	School exceeds school-specific annual goals.	School meets school-specific annual goals.	School did not meet school-specific academic goals.	School fell far below school-specific academic goals.

Charter School Authorizer Board
Items Presented for Payment
January 22nd, 2019

Contractual:

Mississippi Education Accelerator January Invoice - **\$27,500**

Mississippi First December Invoice - **\$3,000**

Mississippi First January Invoice -

Stewart McMillan Hours Worked in December Invoice - **\$1,933.75**

Stewart McMillan Hours Worked January 1st through January 15th, 2019 Invoice - **\$892.50**

Stewart McMillan Subscriptions Invoice - **\$441.20**

Virtual Chief of Staff December and January Invoice- **\$8,505.00**

Cornerstone Consulting December Invoice - **\$1,721.25**

Cornerstone Consulting January Invoice -

Equipment:

Computers and software Purchase Order - **\$3,366.15**

Total: