

District of Columbia Public Charter School Board
Meeting Minutes: December 14, 2015
6:30 PM

Meeting Location:
Cesar Chavez Prep PCS
770 Kenyon Street NW
Washington, DC 20010

Public Hearing

Board Members in attendance: Don Soifer (Vice Chair), Ricarda Ganjam, Rick Cruz, Sara Mead, Scott Pearson (Executive Director, *Ex-Officio*), and Steve Baumbaugh;

Absent: Darren Woodruff (Chair).

Mr. Soifer called the public hearing to order at 6:42 PM.

I. Public Officials: No public officials addressed the board.

II. Charter Amendments:

**A. DC Preparatory Academy Public Charter School (“DC Prep PCS”),
Charter Amendment: Request for Enrollment Ceiling Increase:**

1. Representatives:

- a. DC Public Charter School Board (“DC PCSB”): Melodi Sampson, Strategy and Analysis Specialist.
- b. DC Prep PCS: Emily Lawson, Founder and Chief Executive Officer.

2. Discussion:

- Ms. Sampson testified that DC PCSB received a charter agreement amendment application from DC Prep PCS requesting an enrollment ceiling increase of 1,783 students beginning school year (“SY”) 2016-17, with a maximum enrollment of 2,056 students in SY 2019-20. Ms. Sampson stated this will increase the number of seats in grades pre-kindergarten 3 (“PK3”) through 6. Currently in its twelfth year of operation, DC Prep PCS educates 1,564 students in grades PK3 through 8 at five campuses. Ms. Sampson testified this proposal is the third of its kind in a 12-month period; DC Prep PCS requested and received enrollment ceiling increases in December 2014 and June 2015. Ms. Sampson testified DC Prep PCS is consistently among the highest-performing charter networks in DC and recently had very high Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers

(“PARCC”) scores. Ms. Sampson stated DC PCSB’s recommendation to the board is based on the DC PCSB Enrollment Ceiling Increase Policy, and DC Prep PCS met most of the criteria. Ms. Sampson testified there are concerns about (1) the school’s access to a facility if the board chooses to authorize the increase, and (2) the school’s accreditation status, which was accredited until 2014, is now an AdvancedED candidate, and should have its accreditation by 2016. Ms. Sampson testified that if DC Prep PCS does find a new facility it will have to revise its certificate of occupancy to increase the occupant load at their schools.

- Ms. Lawson testified that DC Prep PCS started to seek a revised certificate of occupancy and is in the accreditation process with AdvancedED. She stated the process was delayed for two reasons: (1) the school was searching for a program that would work with the whole network; and (2) so the school could work toward meeting the Office of the State Superintendent of Education’s (“OSSE”) gold level funding standards. Ms. Lawson stated DC Prep PCS has been looking for a permanent facility for its Anacostia elementary campus in South Ward 7, Anacostia, and North Ward 8.
- Ms. Mead asked whether the children who enter DC Prep PCS under the proposed enrollment ceiling increase will be able to remain through middle school since there is not an accompanying middle school enrollment ceiling request.
- Ms. Lawson stated the enrollment ceiling increase for the elementary school assumes there will not be space for these students in the middle school, since the school has not submitted an amendment, but the school fully intends on receiving board approval to increase the middle school’s enrollment ceiling.
- Ms. Mead asked whether it is the school’s intention for all of the children to continue to the middle school.
- Ms. Lawson responded yes.
- Ms. Mead asked what will happen if the school does not secure a middle school location.
- Ms. Lawson stated the immediate concern is a permanent elementary facility. She stated DC Prep PCS has four years to secure a permanent facility.
- Mr. Soifer asked when DC Prep PCS would seek approval to open the middle school.

- Ms. Lawson responded once DC Prep PCS finds a facility and determines the opening date, so there is a chance within the next few months but the latest would be before fall 2020.
- Mr. Baumbaugh asked Ms. Lawson to discuss DC Prep PCS's policy of not backfilling in grades seven and eight. He stated if every school had a similar policy then seventh and eighth graders would have difficulty finding a school.
- Ms. Lawson stated DC Prep PCS previously accepted students at every grade, however students were not prepared for high school since some of the new seventh and eighth graders came in below grade-level and the school did not have time to catch them up. Additionally, Ms. Lawson stated students who started in the seventh and eighth grade did not feel a strong connection to DC Prep PCS. Ms. Lawson stated these students did not take advantage of the alumni support program like those who spent more time at the school. Ms. Lawson explained that DC Prep PCS felt it had a limited ability to meet its mission with those students, but the conversation in DC has caused the school to think about its policy.
- Mr. Soifer stated DC Prep PCS has the high suspension rate in the city, and asked Ms. Lawson to speak about the school's approach to discipline and whether it thought about changing its approach with the increase in students.
- Ms. Lawson stated the students are engaged in their lessons and learning, as evidenced in the school's academic results. Ms. Lawson stated that in order to have a warm and orderly classroom environment the school has set up incentives, advisories, and a discipline policy. She explained the discipline policy has small consequences (like losing a fictional DC Prep dollar) and more severe consequences (like in-school suspension or out-of-school suspension). Ms. Lawson testified that not many students get out-of-school suspension and the average has been about one student per year out of 1,500 students. Ms. Lawson stated out-of-school suspension is a maximum of one day, so the instructional time lost is on par with average according to DC PCSB's data. Ms. Lawson stated the policy does not seem to have a negative effect on students. She stated the school is evaluating its policy and recently made some changes, which have brought its rates down. For example, verbal threats are now in-school suspension unless the threat is violent which is an out-of-school suspension. Ms. Lawson stated the school is trying to find ways to reduce suspension while maintaining the safe environment.

- Ms. Soifer asked whether the discipline policy is the same across all campuses. Mr. Soifer stated the suspension rates vary between campuses and grade levels, and asked Ms. Lawson to explain the differences.
- Ms. Lawson responded that it is, but the middle school and elementary school are slightly different because of the grade level difference. Ms. Lawson stated a lot of factors affect the suspension rates. For example, she stated an amazing teacher can engage students in the lesson which results in fewer discipline incidents. She stated the lack of engagement could lead to discipline incidents rather than the discipline policy itself.
- Mr. Soifer asked whether there is a link between the enrollment ceiling increase and the suspension policy.
- Ms. Lawson stated she does not believe so.

III. Policy Revisions:

A. Policy Revision: Data and Document Submission Policy (proposed), previously Attendance and Discipline Data Policy:

1. Representatives:

- a. DC PCSB: Rashida Young – Senior Manager, Equity and Fidelity Team

2. Discussion:

- Ms. Young testified that the proposal for revisions to the Attendance and Discipline Data Policy opened for public comment on November 16, 2015, and remained open until this meeting. The proposal will be voted on at the January meeting. Ms. Young stated the policy proposed to be revised is from 2012 and there are a few key changes. (1) The title is being changed to the Data and Document Submission policy because the process for sending all data and documents will be standardized under one policy. (2) The new policy gives expectations for timely submission in the three old categories (Attendance, Discipline, and Enrollment) and also includes Finance, Compliance documents collected in Epicenter, and all other requested data validation. (3) The consequences will be standardized but will remain the same. The consequences for lateness or non-submission are a Staff-to-Staff Early Warning Email; Staff issues an Out of Compliance Notice Email; and lastly, DC PCSB Board issues a Notice of Concern at a public meeting.
- Mr. Soifer asked whether any public comment was received, and when the comment period closed.

- Ms. Young responded no public comment was received, and it closed December 14, 2015.

The public hearing was adjourned at 7:08 PM.

Public Meeting

Board Members in attendance: Don Soifer (Vice Chair), Ricarda Ganjam, Rick Cruz, Sara Mead, Scott Pearson (Executive Director, *Ex-Officio*), and Steve Baumbaugh;

Absent: Darren Woodruff (Chair).

Mr. Soifer called the public meeting to order at 7:08 PM.

I. Approval of the Agenda:¹ Ms. Mead moved to approve the agenda, and Mr. Cruz seconded. The Board approved the motion 5-0.

II. Approval of Minutes – November 16, 2015. Mr. Cruz moved to approve the minutes from the DC PCSB Board meeting on November 16, 2015. Mr. Baumbaugh seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion 5-0.

III. Consent Calendar:²

A. Administrative Contracts over \$25,000; Washington Yu Ying Public Charter School (“Yu Ying PCS”) Charter Amendment: Modified Mission Statement; Inspired Teaching Demonstration Public Charter School (“Inspired Teaching PCS”) Charter Amendment: Revised Bylaws:

1. Vote:

- Ms. Mead moved to approve the consent calendar. Mr. Cruz seconded. The board approved the motion 5-0.

IV. Public Comment:

A. William Boston, Ward 5 Community Member; Deborah Lambert, Ward 5 Community Member and a Member of the Metropolitan Police

¹ Mr. Soifer stated the agenda was revised because Pathways in Education (“PIE”) withdrew their new charter school application, so the board would not be voting to approve or deny the application.

² Mr. Soifer stated the consent calendar is a new procedure the board is implementing for routine, unobjectionable matters that do not require discussion. Mr. Soifer stated the board members can remove an item from the consent calendar and it will then be moved to the regular agenda for discussion and vote. If a board member is recused for a particular matter it will automatically be moved to the regular agenda.

**Department (“MPD”); Norma Childs, Ward 5 Community Member;
Gary Stiles, Ward 5 Community Member**

1. Mr. Boston:

- Mr. Boston testified regarding the Inspired Teaching Demonstration Public Charter School’s (“Inspired Teaching PCS”) enrollment ceiling increase. Mr. Boston stated parking in the community is a long-standing issue made worse by the school. Mr. Boston stated Ms. Williams has been unwilling to meet with the community members about the issue and has not been a good community partner, but has been more responsive recently. Mr. Boston stated the school was not putting information out in the community and, only recently, started giving notice a couple of hours before the events. Mr. Boston stated \$16.5 million was recently given to the neighborhood Community Center for renovations. However, he stated, Inspired Teaching PCS uses the Community Center and the law prohibits others from entering the grounds when children are in school unless they are related to the child. Mr. Boston stated as a result no one can use the Community Center when the students are present. Mr. Boston stated the community does not know what the use agreement is between the Department of Parks and Recreation and Inspired Teaching PCS, which should be made public. Mr. Boston stated he was aware that the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) for 5E01 was present at the last meeting, but the community did not give consent to the ANC Commissioner or meet with her, as required.

2. Ms. Lambert:

- Ms. Lambert testified that she lives across the street from Inspired Teaching PCS and is a 26-year member of the MPD. Ms. Lambert stated there is a parking issue in the neighborhood. Ms. Lambert stated her car has been damaged, she has received tickets, and after-school events prevent parking until approximately 8:00 PM. Ms. Lambert stated she requested a survey of the area, and the Mayor and Department of Transportation agreed. She stated she does not think it is a good idea to bring more people to the neighborhood because it will increase the traffic. Ms. Lambert testified that the community was not aware of the board meeting on December 14, 2015, and that there is no communication between the community and the ANC Commissioner, so she does not speak for the community. Ms. Lambert stated she hopes the board will allow the survey of the area to be completed before agreeing to bring more people into the community.

3. Ms. Childs:

- Ms. Childs stated she agreed with Ms. Lambert’s statements about the parking problem in the community. Ms. Childs stated the community is not notified of things. Ms. Childs suggested the school take the grounds across the street to create a teacher and visitor parking lots. Ms. Childs concluded by asking the board to consider the parking issue to make a plan that is suitable for the community and the school.
4. Mr. Stiles:
 - Mr. Stiles stated he agreed with Ms. Lambert’s statements about the parking problem in the community. He stated he cannot find any parking in front of his home.
 5. Mr. Boston:
 - Mr. Boston concluded Ward 8’s community concerns by stating he hopes the board will take their comments into consideration. He stated the community would like to sit down with the school and school board president. Additionally, he stated the community would like compensation for the use of the recreation grounds. Mr. Boston stated the basketball court and tennis court cannot be used by the community until after 6:00 PM and the community would like to find a way to work through this issue.

B. Maxine Swann, Potomac Preparatory Public Charter School (“Potomac Prep PCS”), Director of Special Education Services; Vivian Swailes, Potomac Prep PCS, Parent and Board Member; Lloyd Royal, Jr., Potomac Prep PCS, Parent.

1. Ms. Swann:
 - Ms. Swann stated she is a retired compliance officer from Prince George’s County and the president elect of the DC Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children (“CEC”). Ms. Swann stated the school has improved and its students made significant progress. Ms. Swann stated she is concerned with the board’s criteria because the request for revocation is largely based on the scores of the special education students and how they are included in the general education population. She stated that this should not happen when looking at the ability levels of students. Ms. Swann testified that the students in the testing group had a variety of disabilities that were difficult to test, which should be taken into consideration in terms of criteria and expected progress. Ms. Swann stated if the students had the same expectations then they would not have needed special education support. She stated the students are reading two to three grade levels below their peers and that should be taken into account when looking at the total scores for the school.

2. Ms. Swailes:

- Ms. Swailes testified that Potomac Prep PCS's staff has been awesome in terms of the special Individualized Education Program ("IEP"). She stated her son is in the 8th grade and has a special IEP, but while he is still below basic Ms. Swann has helped bring him one credit shy of honor roll. She stated if the board relocates the students under Ms. Swann's IEP, whose self-esteem has grown, they will be devastated.

3. Mr. Royal:

- Mr. Royal testified that his daughter attends Potomac Prep PCS's middle school. Mr. Royal asked the board whether they have voted on revoking the school's charter.
- The board responded no.
- Mr. Royal stated that the decision was already made according to Mr. Pearson. Mr. Royal stated the justification was that the school made an agreement and the school did not live up to the agreement. Mr. Royal stated the school agreed to DC PCSB's terms because it was partial freedom. He stated the scores are slightly under par, but the school lived up to the letter of the agreement. Mr. Royal stated the board should not make a decision until all of the facts are known and not on metrics alone, which can be manipulated. Mr. Royal stated one year was not enough time and the board knew that, so instead two or three years should have been given. Mr. Royal stated the school needs an honest vote and should not follow the chairman's vote.

IV. Public Officials: No public officials addressed the board.

V. Approve/Deny New Charter School Amendments:

A. Inspired Teaching Demonstration Public Charter School ("Inspired Teaching PCS") vote: Enrollment Ceiling Increase:

1. Representatives:

- a. DC PCSB: Melodi Sampson, Strategy and Analysis Specialist.
- b. Inspired Teaching PCS: Deborah Williams, Head of School; Kate Keplinger, Chief Operating Officer.

2. Discussion:

- Ms. Samson testified that Inspired Teaching PCS's proposal for an enrollment ceiling increase was open for public comment from September 28, 2015 to November 16, 2015, and a public hearing occurred November 16, 2015. At the public hearing the board heard from ANC representatives who, while supportive of the school, were concerned with disorderly traffic flows and at times illegal parking

during drop-off and pickup. The school committed to seek solutions to these issues. Ms. Sampson testified that DC PCSB staff recommends that the Board conditionally approve the charter agreement amendment request of Inspired Teaching PCS provided that the Board is satisfied that the school is effectively addressing neighborhood traffic concerns, and subject to the following condition: If the school is accredited, the enrollment ceiling shall be 418 students for SY 2016-17, and a maximum of 520 students for SY 2020-21. Until the school is accredited, at no time shall its enrollment ceiling exceed 448 students. Ms. Sampson stated DC PCSB used the DC PCSB Enrollment Ceiling Increase Policy to make its recommendation, and the school meets most of the criteria. Ms. Sampson testified that the school did not meet the accreditation criteria but has begun the accreditation process as evidenced by a letter received on December 8, 2015, which states the school has met two of the ten steps. Ms. Sampson stated it will take a year or more before the school is accredited. Additionally, the school partially met the Performance Management Framework (“PMF”). Generally, a school is automatically recommended if its score is 68% on the PMF but Inspired Teaching had a 53.9%. Ms. Sampson stated that whenever a school has a PMF score between 50-64% the recommendation is based on the totality of the circumstances. Ms. Sampson stated DC PCSB staff also looked at the school’s five-year charter review (the school met all of its goals and academic expectations), the school’s attendance rate (which is 94% and higher than the city average), and the school’s suspension rate (which is 3% and considerably lower than the city average). Ms. Sampson stated DC PCSB staff also conducted a Quality Site Review this past October, where staff found 76% of the observations were distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment Domain and 74% of the observations were distinguished or proficient in the Instruction Domain. Lastly, DC PCSB staff looked at how likely it is that the school will meet the enrollment increase and how reasonable it is to increase the enrollment ceiling. Ms. Sampson stated the school will likely meet the increase and it is reasonable.

- Mr. Soifer asked whether Ms. Sampson stated all of the recommended conditions.
- Ms. Sampson stated the conditions are based on the accreditation, so the school cannot exceed more than 448 students until it is accredited. Additionally, Ms. Sampson stated a plan was not created regarding the

traffic concerns and she would leave it to the board's discretion regarding how it would like to move forward.

- Ms. Williams testified that Inspired Teaching PCS has been working with the community and scheduled a meeting at the school for January 20, 2016. Ms. Williams stated the school met with Sally Hobaugh, the ANC representative who presented at the November meeting, and outlined steps the school has taken and plans to take. Ms. Williams stated the school: (1) contacted the police department directly to request the presence for morning arrival and afternoon dismissal; (2) requested a crossing guard (the school is on the waiting list); (3) has staff facilitating the morning drop-off process (so all families do not have to park); (4) created a designated drop-off spot; (5) reminds parents to obey parking laws; (6) reminds teachers not to park on Douglas Street and to obey parking laws. Recently, Ms. Williams stated the fire department was at the school and she took the opportunity to ask them to support the school by ticketing those who violate the law. Additionally, Ms. Williams stated the parents' association created orange tickets that are given out in the morning and afternoon to remind people to obey the law. Ms. Williams stated the school is working to include the community, the police department, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority ("WAMATA"), DC PCSB, District Department of Transportation ("DDOT"), the Mayor's office, and Councilman McDuffie's office at the January meeting. Ms. Williams stated Ms. Hobaugh is posting this on the listserv for the community and the school is disseminating the notice to the neighborhood. Ms. Williams stated the school created an email address community@inspiredteachingschool.org to provide a vehicle for the community to be in touch with the school. Lastly, Ms. Williams stated the school has reached out to institutions nearby who have available parking (e.g. Trinity University) to help with event parking. She stated with the enrollment increase more families will be in the neighborhood but the school is hoping to have the support of the DC government to help their initiatives.
- Ms. Mead asked whether the DC PCSB staff or board can help the school with its interactions with the DC government and the community.
- Ms. Williams replied that the MPD stated it could not provide a daily presence but will come as is feasible. Ms. Williams stated she called MPD before the winter concert to ask for assistance with traffic and remind people of the parking laws. Ms. Williams stated MPD did

come and ticket cars. Ms. Williams stated she also brought a letter from a community member which attests to the work the school has done with that individual.

- Mr. Soifer asked whether the school is satisfied with its interactions with the DC government.
- Ms. Williams responded no.
- Mr. Soifer asked whether the board could help ease any concerns.
- Ms. Keplinger stated she thinks the January meeting will be helpful to have everyone in one place to discuss creating solutions, and a concerted effort.
- Ms. Williams stated the school also contacted WMATA to have a bus route from the Rhode Island Metro Station and Brookland Metro Station to lessen the need for parking. Ms. Williams stated the request was denied because the school does not have the sufficient population for that service. Ms. Williams stated that the school's requests have not been granted because of a lack of resources or for failure to qualify.
- Mr. Soifer asked where the school is in the accreditation process and what impact Ms. Williams expects that to have on the condition in the enrollment increase request.
- Ms. Williams stated the school has completed two out of the ten steps. Ms. Williams stated the school has submitted the entire application and supporting documents, completed the financial transactions, and is working to set the time line with the organization for the remaining processes.
- Ms. Mead asked whether DC PCSB staff will determine whether the school gained accreditation without another board meeting.
- Ms. Sampson stated that is correct and the enrollment schedule shows the maximum depending on whether the school is accredited or not.
- Ms. Ganjam asked how the Inspired Teaching PCS is communicating directly with the neighbors.
- Ms. Williams stated the school has an email list and prints out flyers that staff delivers to the block directly across the street from the school, on the side of the school, and one block over in each direction.
- Mr. Soifer asked whether there is anything else the school can do to improve communication.
- Ms. Williams stated the open meeting will help.
- Mr. Cruz asked whether there was a reason why the board needed to vote on the enrollment increase at this meeting.

- Ms. Sampson stated no because the current authorization for SY 2016-17 is for 424 students, which is more than the enrollment ceiling increase which limits enrollment to 418.
- Mr. Soifer asked whether the vote would impact the SY 2016-17.
- Ms. Williams stated it would not.
- Mr. Pearson clarified that the vote would not affect the ceiling at the meeting or in January, but based on the number of students who are being admitted in lower grades it would influence how many students are taken next year. Therefore, the decision would need to be made by April. Mr. Pearson stated he would leave it to the school to clarify whether there would be an impact if the vote was delayed.
- Ms. Keplinger stated there was some confusion about what was in the original charter and what was included in the first 5 years. She stated the amendment is to clarify and state what was in the school's original plan. Ms. Keplinger stated there are impacts on the school's current seventh graders if the vote is delayed.
- Mr. Baumbaugh asked whether the vote was necessary for seventh graders to know they have seats in the eighth grade next year.
- Mr. Pearson responded that he did not think so because the enrollment ceiling would not be materially different and is actually six students lower than the current enrollment ceiling.
- Mr. Soifer asked whether the motion the board is being asked to consider has no material affect on it if the board votes at the next meeting.
- Ms. DeVeaux stated a vote needs to occur today to allow the board chair to sign an amended enrollment ceiling with the right Schedule I. Currently, the charter agreement has the incorrect Schedule I, so the board needs to vote to amend that with the right version, but the board does not have to do a ceiling increase.
- Ms. Mead asked whether the entire vote could wait until January because she did not feel comfortable voting on the issue now and in pieces.
- Mr. Pearson stated it could all wait until January.
- Mr. Soifer asked how the school felt about tabling the whole issue until the January meeting after the community meeting occurred.
- Ms. Williams asked whether additional information would be required from the school.
- Mr. Cruz stated he would like to hear a more detailed resolution and roadmap of solutions regarding the community's concerns.

3. Vote:

- Ms. Mead moved to postpone the vote until the January meeting. Ms. Ganjam seconded. The board approved the motion 5-0.

VI. Approve/Deny Charter Continuance:

A. St. Coletta Special Education Public Charter School (“St. Coletta PCS”)

vote: Ten-Year Charter Review:

1. Representatives:

- a. DC PCSB: Rashida Tyler, Senior Manager, School Quality and Accountability.
- b. St. Coletta PCS: Dr. Peggy O’Brien, Board Chair; Janice Corazza, Principal; David Knight, IEP & Assessment Coordinator; Donald Denton, Treasurer.

2. Discussion:

- Ms. Tyler testified that DC PCSB staff completed the ten-year review of St. Coletta PCS. She stated the school fully met all of its goals and student academic achievement expectations and has neither materially violated the law nor its charter. The School Reform Act (“SRA”) provides that DC PCSB “shall review a school’s charter at least once every [five] years. As part of this review, DC PCSB must determine whether: (1) The school committed a material violation of applicable laws or a material violation of the conditions, terms, standards, or procedures set forth in its charter; and/or (2) The school failed to meet the goals and student academic achievement expectations set forth in its charter. If DC PCSB determines that a school has committed a material violation of applicable law, or has not met its goals and expectations, as described above, it may, at its discretion, grant the school a conditional continuance, or revoke the school’s charter. Additionally, there is a fiscal component to the charter review. DC PCSB is required by the SRA to revoke a school’s charter if DC PCSB determines in its review that the school (a) has engaged in a pattern of non-adherence to generally accepted accounting principles; (b) has engaged in a pattern of fiscal mismanagement; and/or (c) is no longer economically viable. St. Coletta PCS began operation as a public charter school in 2006 under authorization from the District of Columbia Board of Education (“DC BOE”) to serve students aged 3-22 with intellectual disabilities. The school was founded by St. Coletta Greater Washington (“SCGW”), a non-profit organization that opened a private school for students with disabilities in 1959. SCGW continues to operate a private school, which serves Maryland and Virginia students, along with adult students. The private school

operates alongside the DC charter school, which serves eligible DC residents only. The school's mission is to serve children and adults with intellectual disabilities, and to support their families. St. Coletta PCS is the only DC public charter school whose mission is to serve solely students with disabilities, and nearly all of St. Coletta PCS's students are classified as having Level 4 disabilities. SCGW manages St. Coletta PCS's operations according to a management agreement executed by SCGW and the school. Per this management agreement, St. Coletta PCS transfers all revenues to SCGW, which then pays all of the school's vendors and personnel and keeps any excess funds as a management fee. DC PCSB staff completed a Qualitative Site Review of St. Coletta PCS from September 14–29, 2015. The team observed overwhelming evidence of the school fulfilling its mission and the school scored exceptionally high on the Framework for Teaching rubric. Observers during the unannounced visit scored 97% of the observations as distinguished or proficient using the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching and Learning in the Classroom Environment Domain and another 93% as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction Domain. The evidence was overwhelmingly positive, reflecting an exceptional learning environment for their target population. A review of St. Coletta PCS's board minutes indicates that the school's board is active and engaged, and discusses academic, compliance, and fiscal issues related to the school's operation. The SRA requires charter schools to be responsible for the school's operation, including preparation of a budget and personnel matters, and that the board of trustees "shall set overall policy for the school." However, while the school's board may discuss those matters, the management agreement places significant managerial authority of St. Coletta PCS with SCGW, which may conflict with the statutory requirement that a school's board have ultimate control of a DC charter school. Another concern is with the level of transparency of the school's financial statements as reported to DC PCSB. Per the management agreement, all revenues received by the school are immediately transferred to the management organization, which then pays all of the school's vendors and personnel. Any excess funds are considered a management fee and retained by the management organization. This payment structure creates a lack of transparency regarding the school's use of public funds. SCGW has been responsive to DC PCSB's requests for financial information about the management company, however DC PCSB is unable to fully monitor

the school's fiscal performance because its financial transactions are not reported separately from those of the management company in audited financial statements. Given these reporting practices, and in light of the pending legislation aimed at increasing the transparency of contracts between public charter schools and management organizations that is currently being considered by the DC Council, DC PCSB staff recommends the school's continuance be conditioned on the school fulfilling the commitments it made at the October 26, 2015 meeting, including: (1) segregation of the school's financial statements; (2) compliance with procurement contract submission policy; and (3) transparent reporting of the management fee. These changes to the school's financial reporting are necessary for St. Coletta PCS to achieve a level of transparency consistent with the rest of the sector. DC PCSB staff appreciates St. Coletta PCS and SCGW's collaboration in developing these new practices to create sufficient transparency without creating undue burden on the school. Finally, DC PCSB staff recommends further analysis to ensure that the school's governance structure complies with the SRA's requirement that control of the school remain with the school's board, and that St. Coletta PCS amend its governing documents if necessary to ensure full compliance.

- Dr. O'Brien stated the school had a meeting on October 26 with DC PCSB staff and the school agreed to address these three issues. Dr. O'Brien stated the school has been keeping separate books, but has not been as transparent as DC PCSB would like. Dr. O'Brien stated the school understands the concerns and has begun to take steps to create reports and provide DC PCSB with more information.

3. Vote:

- Ms. Mead moved to approve the charter continuance with the conditions stated by DC PCSB staff. Ms. Ganjam seconded. Mr. Soifer stated Dr. Woodruff voted by proxy. The board approved the motion 6-0.

B. Richard Wright Public Charter School for Journalism and Media Arts (“Richard Wright PCS”) vote: Five-Year Charter Review:

1. Representatives:

- a. DC PCSB: Taunya Nesen, Senior School Quality and Accountability Specialist.
- b. Richard Wright PCS: Marco Clark, Executive Director; Michelle Santos, Director of Journalism and Media Arts; Jamila Alarcun, Data

and Assessment Coordinator; Alicia Roberts, Director of Business Operations.

2. Discussion:

- Dr. Nesin testified that DC PCSB staff conducted a charter review of Richard Wright PCS according to the standard required by the SRA (as read by Ms. Tyler in the previous review). Richard Wright PCS began operation in 2011 under authorization from DC PCSB and serves approximately 322 students in grades eight through twelve in SY 2015-16. Over 99% of the school's population is African American and Economically Disadvantaged. Its mission is as follows: The mission of Richard Wright PCS is to transform students in grades eight through twelve into well-versed media contributors by providing a student-centered environment that connects them to the classics and modern languages and a curriculum focused on strong writing skills and vocabulary. In Richard Wright PCS's annual report, the school highlights its focus on a curriculum that has an interdisciplinary approach and infuses Latin, journalism, and media arts throughout all of the content areas. DC PCSB staff recommends that the Board exercise its discretion to find that the school has met its goals under the Improvement Provision for the following reasons: (1) The school has demonstrated consistent, annual, significant improvement in its PMF score since its inception. It's PMF score of 48 for 2013-14 is more than 20 points higher than the score it earned in its first year. (2) Qualitative assessments of the strength of instruction have been relatively strong, with more than half of the observations made in the school's Qualitative Site Review rated distinguished or proficient. (3) The school's English Language Arts results have been relatively strong, with above average student growth and tenth grade proficiency rates for African American and Economically Disadvantaged students exceeding the District Average. (4) This is a growing school, which graduated its first class of seniors in SY 2014-15. Therefore, DC PCSB only has one year of data for any measures involving high school seniors. While these findings are sufficient to invoke the Improvement Provision, other of the school's performance indicators are cause for concern. These include below state and sector average performance in multiple measures including: Mathematics – both measured by student growth and proficiency rates (overall and by subgroup); PSAT; SAT/ACT scores; Advanced Placement/Dual Enrollment passage rates; College acceptance rates; Four-year graduation rates. DC PCSB staff also recommends that the Board vote

to continue the school's charter with the following conditions: (1) Complete the process of becoming an independent local education agency ("LEA") for special education by: (a) Conducting a Qualitative Assurance Review ("QAR") of its special education programming in spring 2016 and developing an action plan based on identified areas of concern, and achieving 100% on all applicable indicators on the QAR after one year of QAR Action Plan implementation; and (b) developing and implementing a plan with deliverables and dates to ensure a smooth transition for SY 2016-17 to operating as an independent LEA for special education compliance by February 1, 2016. (2) Submit the outstanding Determination and Findings forms for procurement contracts and implement a reporting system moving forward to ensure it remains in compliance with this requirement by February 1, 2016. (3) Staff recommends that the Board expect improved academic performance in accordance with the school's charter agreement. As such, and consistent with the Elect the PMF as Goals policy, should the school earn a PMF score below 45 in any two years (whether consecutive or non-consecutive) between 2015-16 and 2020-21, it will be subject to charter revocation. The Board is not bound to exercise its discretion pursuant to the Improvement Provision within the school's charter agreement at the next high-stakes review. Failure to comply with these conditions or attain the academic performance expectations may result in staff recommending revocation of the school's charter.

- Dr. Clark testified that Richard Wright PCS has a team to meet its goals and to continue the upward trajectory the school has achieved with reading. Dr. Clark stated math has been the nemesis and the school needs to include math in every class like literacy. Dr. Clark stated the school has put things in place to overcome this, including requiring Saturday school and implementing morning math moments. Dr. Clark stated the school will continue working with the Achievement Network to identify the challenges and deficiencies of the school, as well as utilizing the benchmarks and resources it provides. Dr. Clark stated the school now has a Data Coordinator, who consistently looks at data and works with the students and staff to understand the data, which helps students see their growth. Dr. Clark stated the school has identified students in a tier measure. Tier 1 students are progressing at or above grade level; Tier 2 students are progressing in the middle; and Tier 3 students are those who need intensive support from staff. Dr. Clark stated the school recognized

that accepting students in the middle of the program has affected the school data as well, so the school now only accepts new eighth and ninth graders into its program. Dr. Clark stated this year the school created a partnership with Howard University's math department. Dr. Clark stated the board has allotted more money to invest in new math teachers and online programs for students.

- Mr. Soifer asked when the school put these changes into place.
- Dr. Clark responded that these changes have been put into place in July and August.
- Mr. Soifer asked about the school's low re-enrollment rate between the last two years.
- Dr. Clark stated the students move around because of homelessness, adjudication, and foster care. Dr. Clark stated some incarcerated students could not come back this year, and some students left because they were in foster care or moved out of state. Dr. Clark stated the school should have uploaded the data information previously for DC PCSB to explain its low re-enrollment rate.
- Mr. Soifer asked about the student performance, specifically the low median growth percentile in math.
- Dr. Clark stated the school spent a lot of time working on the literacy and reading of its students, since they were three to five grades behind in reading. Dr. Clark stated the school has not spent enough energy with math, so the new services implemented will increase the math scores since the students are three to four grade levels behind in math, like they were in reading, which improved after putting the same amount of energy into that area.
- Mr. Soifer stated he was appreciative of the school's responsiveness regarding literacy. He asked about the school's specific academic instructional adjustments.
- Dr. Clark stated the Saturday school is mandatory, which focuses on math. Dr. Clark stated he met with his team to discuss infusing math into all subject areas. Dr. Clark said the school is working to help students realize they can do math and understand its importance with reading. Dr. Clark stated the school has a math morning moment, where the students begin their day with math; disciplinary math problems; study hall in the afternoon concentrated on math; and the other subjects are infused with math problems. Dr. Clark stated the teachers are collaborating with the math department to develop the math problems and to have a unified approach. Dr. Clark stated the online math program will give students access to test themselves at

any time. He stated the school has a similar program for reading which was used by the students and helped increase their reading abilities.

- Ms. Alarcun stated the school has also ensured math is taught the same way in all subject areas, so that it is the same language across the building. Additionally, Ms. Alarcun stated the school made a math progression so all teachers know what students must know before progressing to the next grade.
 - Ms. Santos stated math is integrated into the media arts and gave examples of how math is infused into the curriculum.
 - Ms. Mead asked how the school is reviewing the math curriculum to see where the curriculum supports attainment of the standards. Ms. Mead asked who is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the strategies to ensure they all relate and connect to get students to where they need to be to meet the standards.
 - Dr. Clark stated the school has a team that reviews data. He stated there is a collaborative meeting with the curriculum instruction coach, data analyst, teachers, and administrators to unfold the data and evaluate the students individually to understand what instruction needs to be implemented.
 - Ms. Mead asked who is responsible for making decisions about the math curriculum.
 - Dr. Clark stated the curriculum and instruction person and the data assessment person.
 - Ms. Ganjam stated she noticed the school had its first graduating class last year, and asked for some examples of what the students did when they left the school.
 - Dr. Clark stated most students went to a four-year college and two students signed up for military service in the spring.
3. Vote:
- Mr. Cruz moved to approve the charter continuance for Richard Wright PCS under the Improvement Clause Provision with the conditions proposed by DC PCSB staff. Mr. Baumbaugh seconded. Mr. Soifer stated Dr. Woodruff voted by proxy in support of the conditional continuance as well. The board approved the motion 6-0.

VII. Approve/Deny Proposal to Initiate Charter Revocation:

A. Potomac Preparatory Public Charter School (“Potomac Prep PCS”), Charter Revocation:

1. Representatives:

- a. DC PCSB: Naomi Rubin DeVeaux, Deputy Director.

- b. Potomac Prep PCS: Dr. Marian White-Hood, Head of School; Maxine Swann; Michelle Smith, Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics (“STEAM”) Program Coordinator, Grade 6.

2. Discussion:

- Ms. DeVeaux testified that after reviewing the Turnaround Plan that the DC PCSB and Potomac Prep PCS executed in December 2014 and incorporated as a charter amendment, DC PCSB staff has determined that Potomac Prep PCS has not met the specified targets, which the school agreed to, for SY 2014-15. Based on the above determination and pursuant to the terms in the Agreement, DC PCSB staff recommends that its board initiate charter revocation proceedings against Potomac Prep PCS and the school close at the end of SY 2015-16. This action is taken under DC Code section 38-1802.13(a)(2), which allows DC PCSB to revoke a school’s charter if the school “has failed to meet the goals and student academic achievement expectations set forth in the charter.” In 2014, Potomac Prep PCS underwent a 10-year review, during which DC PCSB found that the school had not met 17 of its 20 goals and academic achievement expectations. Accordingly, on November 17, 2014, DC PCSB voted to initiate charter revocation proceedings against Potomac Prep PCS. However, the school maintained that a significant turn-around was underway and, on December 15, 2014, DC PCSB voted not to revoke the charter and to approve the charter continuance, conditioned on the school meeting certain targets for SY 2014-15 and beyond. Potomac Prep PCS amended their Charter with DC PCSB in December 2014, agreeing to meet those targets or relinquish its charter. Ms. DeVeaux testified that the agreement was negotiated together. Specifically regarding SY 2014-15, the amendment required Potomac Prep PCS to meet all of the specified targets or relinquish its charter by the end of SY 2015-16. The targets were as follows: (1) The school will be within at least one percentage point of or exceed the in-seat attendance rate for the charter sector for each of the three grade-level bands for 2014-15. The school did not meet this target for their pre-kindergarten (“pre-K”) students but did meet it for the elementary and middle. (2) The school’s average proficiency rate on PARCC in reading and math will be at least within one standard deviation of the 50th percentile of all DC charter elementary and middle schools for 2014-15. The school did not meet this target, and is the lowest performing charter school in reading on the PARCC of all open charter schools. Ms. DeVeaux testified that a condition was also in the agreement that the school

could have use Northwest Evaluation Association (“NWEA”)- Measures of Academic Progress (“MAP”) assessment if they did not want to use PARCC, but the school did not meet the target for MAP, which was set at 70%, for reading or math. (3) At least 75% of pre-kindergarten 3 (“PK3”) and pre-kindergarten 4 (“PK4”) students will meet or exceed their average growth goals on the Every Child Ready assessment or Potomac Prep PCS will score within 0.1 point of the 2014-15 DC charter average in each of the three CLASS domains. The school did meet this goal. (4) Lastly, 50% of kindergarten through second grade students will meet or exceed typical growth in reading and math on the NWEA-MAP assessment. The school did not meet this target. Because Potomac Prep PCS did not meet all of its targets for SY 2014-15, pursuant to its Charter amendment, the Potomac Prep PCS board must relinquish its charter, by the end of SY 2015-16. Although the deadline for Potomac Prep PCS to relinquish its charter has not occurred, DC PCSB submitted a letter to Potomac Prep PCS requesting that the school submit a letter of relinquishment by December 9, 2015, prior to the DC EdFest, which occurred on December 12, 2015. Ms. DeVeaux stated the school did not relinquish its charter, and is asking the board not to proceed with revocation despite the fact that DC PCSB staff feels that is what needs to occur to honor the agreement.

- Dr. White-Hood stated she wanted to correct the record about the attendance goal, which the school did meet for pre-K but did not meet for third through eighth grade by about 1.5 percent. Dr. White-Hood testified that the school sent a letter to Mr. Pearson on December 9, 2015, which stated the school was not going to relinquish its charter. She testified that the school is a rising school according to OSSE, fully accredited, and was just a few points shy of meeting its other targets.
- Ms. Swann stated using only the non-special education student data Potomac Prep PCS scored above 70% on the NWEA on math and reading, which meets the performance goal. She stated the school performance outcomes in general and special education students in particular are penalized if the Individualized Education Program (“IEP”) for students with disabilities is disregarded and the performance bar is set at the same level for both special education and non-special education. Ms. Swann stated in fairness to the school and students, Potomac Prep PCS asks DC PCSB to revise that threshold and for students with disabilities to be evaluated with standards that are aligned with the progress goals and the students’ IEP.

- Ms. Smith stated the school has a Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics (“STEAM”) program and uses the Project Lead the Way Curriculum. She stated students have been learning introduction to computer science, the changing Earth, using the engineering and design process to solve real world problems.
 - Dr. White-Hood stated that the school has a challenging demographic and has students from all over the city. Dr. White-Hood stated the letter was untimely, as it arrived just before Thanksgiving, and is dealing with it just before Christmas, (which is untimely) so the school should not have to interrupt its operations this year. She stated 80% of the students are at-risk and the school receives Title I funds. She stated the Turnaround Plan has been implemented with extreme fidelity and the school has gained national attention for its efforts. Dr. White-Hood stated Potomac Prep PCS has obtained Ms. Swann of the DC President Elect for the Council of Exceptional Children to maximize the outcomes for the school’s most challenging students. Dr. White-Hood asked for another year to continue or longer and stated turn around is not one year, it is two or three years.
3. Vote:
- Ms. Mead moved to approve the proposal to initiate charter revocation proceedings. Mr. Cruz seconded. Mr. Soifer stated Dr. Woodruff voted by proxy. The board approved the motion 6-0.³

VIII. Approve/Deny Reopening DC PCSB’s 2015-16 Performance Management Framework Policy & Technical Guide (“PMF Guide”) for Public Comment:

A. Vote to Reopen DC PCSB’s 2015-16 PMF Guide for Public Comment:

1. Representatives:
 - a. DC PCSB: Erin Kupferberg, School Quality and Accountability Manager.
2. Discussion:
 - Ms. Kupferberg testified that a vote on the 2015-16 PMF Guide was originally scheduled for November. However, after receiving the official 2014-15 PARCC data and reviewing public comments about the business rules for the targets for the state assessment measures and the changes to the Adult Education framework, DC PCSB chose to delay the vote to address comments in a revised Guide. DC PCSB

³ Mr. Pearson stated Potomac Prep PCS will receive a letter stating the board voted to initiate charter revocation and the school will have fifteen days to request a public hearing. Only then would DC PCSB schedule the public hearing to take place thirty days after that, so likely some time in early January. After the public hearing, the board would leave the record open for four or five days and then a final vote would take place.

convened Task Force members and based on further discussion made additional revisions that are significant enough to warrant reopening the policy for comment. DC PCSB staff recommends that the Board vote to re-open the 2015-16 PMF Guide for public comment from December 14, 2015 through January 25, 2016, and hold a public hearing on January 25, 2016. Barring any substantive comments during the public hearing that require reconsideration of the policy, will vote on the policy on the same day at its public hearing.

3. Vote:

- Mr. Cruz moved to reopen for public comment the 2015-16 PMF Guide from December 14, 2015 through January 25, 2016. Mr. Baumbaugh seconded. Mr. Soifer stated Dr. Woodruff voted by proxy. The board approved the motion 6-0.

IX. Approve/Deny Amendments to the 2014-15 Performance Management Framework Technical Guide (“PMF Guide”):

A. Vote to Amend the 2014-15 PMF Guide with an updated Hold Harmless Provision:

1. Representatives:

- a. DC PCSB: Erin Kupferberg, School Quality and Accountability Manager.

2. Discussion:

- Ms. Kupferberg testified that the DC PCSB staff recommends that the board vote to approve an amendment to the 2014-15 PMF Guide to neither tier nor score the 2014-15 Early Childhood/Elementary School/Middle School (“EC/ES/MS”) or High School (“HS”) PMF. The following statement will be added to the 2014-15 PMF Tech Guide: PCSB will not score or tier the EC/ES/MS or HS PMF for SY 2014-15. The school’s performance on each measure will be displayed separately without percentages of total points, providing total transparency in school performance on each aspect of the PMF without the ability aggregate into a total score or tier.

3. Vote:

- Ms. Mead moved to neither tier nor score the 2014-15 EC/ES/MS or HS PMF as proposed by DC PCSB staff. Mr. Baumbaugh seconded. Mr. Soifer stated Dr. Woodruff voted by proxy. The board approved the motion 6-0.

X. Public Comment: No members of the public addressed the board.

XI. Adjourn.

1. Vote:

- Mr. Cruz moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Mead seconded. The board approved the motion 5-0.

The public meeting was adjourned at 9:01 PM.