

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION**

Thursday, January 30, 2014 – 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
TAF: Bethaday Community Learning Center

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Trish Millines Dziko, Larry Wright, Kevin Jacka, Chris Martin, Dr. Margit McGuire, Dave Quall, Steve Sundquist, and Cindi Williams

Excused: Dr. Doreen Cato

Staff: Joshua Halsey, Executive Director; Aileen Miller, ATG; and Colin Pippin-Timco, Executive Assistant

OPENING AND WELCOME

Chair Sundquist called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. and took attendance. All commission members except Commissioner Cato were present.

It was determined that a quorum was present to proceed with the meeting.

Minutes from the December 5 meeting were reviewed and approved – Commissioner Dziko moved and Commissioner McGuire seconded the approval.

PUBLIC HEARING

Gary Johnson, board member of Sunnyside Charter Academy, thanked the commission for examining the organization's application, and encouraged the commission move for a conditional approval resolution of the academy.

Brittany Weaver, board president of Sunnyside Charter Academy, presented the financial expertise within her organization. Mrs. Weaver emphasized that conditional approval now would better help the organization's fundraising efforts.

Thelma Jackson, chair of board of SOAR Academy, called to the commission's attention a number of concerns regarding the evaluation team's recommendation report of SOAR. Mrs. Jackson noted that there was a lack of accuracy and consistency across evaluation teams. Mrs. Jackson reported that the start date of 2015 for her organization's charter school was recorded incorrectly as 2014 on recommendation report documents. Mrs. Jackson reported that the evaluation team cited concern for SOAR's use of levy fund in its third year budget, even though charter schools have equal access to levy funds in Washington State. Mrs. Jackson reported that a number of other organizations slated for approval by the Commission's evaluation teams did not have their director of the school living in the school's location as of current, a detail which was cited as a concern in her organization's evaluation team recommendation report. Finally, Mrs. Jackson reported that the evaluation team was incorrect in assuming a lack of fundraising experience on SOAR's team, and expanded on the resumes of two team professionals. Mrs. Jackson closed, calling for the commission to approve SOAR so the team could move forward with its fundraising.

Amy Barnes, board member of SOAR Academy, expressed concerns regarding the evaluation team's recommendation report of SOAR. Mrs. Barnes presented her resume as a successful fundraiser, and pointed out further that SOAR's leadership was prepared for authorization.

George Meng, board member of SOAR Academy, expressed concerns regarding the evaluation team's recommendation report of SOAR. Mr. Meng asserted that charter schools had access to levy funding in Washington State. Mr. Meng pointed out that SOAR academy's budget was conservative in comparison with other organizations slated for approval by the Commission's evaluation teams. Finally, Mr. Meng stressed that the school director's residency had been a non-issue for other organizations that received recommendations for approval by the Commission's evaluation teams. Mr. Meng asked for the Commission for a motion to reconsider the SOAR application.

Christina Bellamy-McClain, proposed school director of SOAR Academy, as well called to the commission's attention concerns regarding the evaluation team's recommendation report of SOAR. Mrs. Bellamy McClain stated that she has contacts in the Tacoma area, and that she has an established school site for SOAR. She asked that commissioners reassess Soars application.

William Lay, school director of Evergreen Leadership Academy (ELA), remarked that anecdotal evidence did not satisfy the evaluation team's recommendation report. Mr. Lay noted that that ELA's Charter Management Organization (CMO) had been in existence for 20 years, and had proven itself as a successful model in Oregon. Mr. Lay ended by stating that reference material used in the due-diligence report was incorrect.

Catherine Lay, operations and staff manager of ELA, remarked that the evaluation team's recommendation report of ELA contained errors. Mrs. Lay questioned how the school's CMO could be viewed as unsuccessful after 20 years of existence.

Jeff Petty read a letter written by Hannah Williams, school director of Out of the Box Learning Studio. Mrs. Williams' letter said that the organization had reviewed the evaluation team's recommendation report, and thanked the Commission. Further, Mrs. Williams' letter pointed out that since the application submission, the organization had made significant funding inroads, which they would reveal at a launch scheduled for later in the evening. Finally, Mrs. Williams' letter asserted that the percentage regarding the number of at risk students the school would serve was incorrectly captured in the evaluation team's recommendation report

Marta Reyes Newberry, interim director of Washington Charter Association, put forward concern and hopes for due-diligence on the commission's part in reviewing the evaluation team's recommendation reports. Mrs. Reyes Newberry emphasized that the commission is the authorizing body. Mrs. Reyes Newberry gave her support for future charter schools. Finally, Mrs. Reyes Newberry noted that the commission had until February 24 to make final decisions on school authorization.

Mitch Price, outreach and education coordinator of Washington Charter Association, thanked the Commission for the forum process. Further, Mr. Price appreciated the environment created by the commission. Finally, Mr. Price clarified that levy funding is available to charter schools after school start-up.

John Donaghy, Washington Educators Association, pointed out various threats to charter schools operational capacity. As well, Mr. Donaghy noted that the schools recommended for approval by the evaluation teams all appeared to utilize blended learning. Mr. Donaghy said the commission would have its hands full after authorization. Mr. Donaghy ended by making a perceived connection between one of the applicants, CORAL Academy of Sciences, and a philosophical organization, Gülen.

Melissa Westbrook, writer at saveSeattleSchools.org, expressed her appreciation of the quality of the evaluation teams. Mrs. Westbrook moved on to express concern about Gates Foundation funding of one of the charter applicants, Summit Public Schools, and the Washington Charter Association. As well, Mrs. Westbrook reiterated Mr. Donaghy's concern with an apparent tie between CORAL and Gülen. Finally, Mrs. Westbrook suggested some solutions for the length of the charter school applicants' paper applications.

RESOLUTION PROCESS OVERVIEW

Chair Sundquist presented known conflicts of interest between commission members and charter school applicants: Commissioner Cato had recused herself from voting and participating in the discussion concerning First Place Scholars' resolutions; Commissioner Martin had recused himself from voting and participating in the discussion concerning Pioneer School's resolutions; and Commissioner Dziko had recused herself from voting and participating in the discussion concerning Summit Public Schools' resolutions.

Commissioner Wright explained that he had recently been hired by the College Success Foundation, which receives Gates Foundation Funding. Chair Sundquist suggested that Commissioner Wright recuse himself from voting on Green Dot Washington's resolutions. Commissioner Wright recused himself from voting on Green DOT's resolutions.

William Haft, Vice President of authorizer development for National Association of Charter School Authorizers, reviewed the evaluation process, and presented the various stages of the application process. Mr. Haft gave a summary of the various applicants, noting that 5 national CMOs had applied, as well as 14 local organizations. Mr. Haft pointed out that there was a clerical error in SOAR's evaluation team's recommendation report, but that the evaluation team did in fact evaluate the applicant's capacity for a 2015 opening.

Chair Sundquist presented the resolution process. Chair Sundquist reminded commissioners that Washington State law requires terms for approval or denial, and the 8 charter school per year limit imposed by Washington charter school law. Chair Sundquist explained that each application has been assigned a lead commissioner. After Executive Director Halsey has presented the evaluation team's recommendation report as well as his personal recommendation based off those findings, the lead commissioner would present their opinion recommendation for the applicant's resolution, after which the meeting will be open for discussion and questions from commissioners. The lead commissioner will move for a vote after the open discussion. Amendments will be displayed for the public to see. Chair Sundquist pointed out that resolutions will not carry in the event of a tie, and that the failure of an approval resolution does not connote a denial resolution; the commission must vote on a denial resolution in the event of an approval resolution failure.

Commissioner McGuire stated that all of the applications lack an active mission to prepare students as citizens of a democracy.

CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICANT RESOLUTIONS

CAL Elementary

At 9:45 a.m., Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on CAL Elementary. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial

because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny CAL's application.

Lead Commissioner Williams agreed with the evaluation team's findings, noting that the financial plan was concerning. Commissioner Martin noted the lack of community outreach and groundwork that was presented in the application. Commissioner Wright agreed with the evaluation team's findings. Finally, Chair Sundquist agreed with the evaluation team's findings.

Lead Commissioner Williams moved to adopt resolution 14-01D to deny CAL Elementary's proposal because it did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion that carried unanimously.

Cedar River Academy

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Cedar River Academy (CRA). Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny CRA's application.

Lead Commissioner Quall supported the recommendation for denial, though he was impressed with the school's successful operation as a private school for 11 years, as well as public comments of support for the school. Commissioner Wright noted that CRA's enrollment plan was not well articulated in its application. Chair Sundquist agreed with the recommendation for denial, and did not believe CRA's pre-Kindergarten plan expressed in its application was in accordance with state law. Commissioner Martin noted that CRA's proposal for a 10th month of operation in which students would pay tuition created an inequality between those who could and those who could not afford the tuition.

Lead Commissioner Quall moved to adopt resolution 14-02D to deny CRA's a charter because it did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Commissioner Martin seconded. Lead Commissioner Quall's motion carried unanimously.

Coral Academy of Science

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on CORAL Academy of Science. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and financial plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny CORAL's application.

Lead Commissioner Williams agreed with the evaluation team's findings, noting that the amount of work put into the application was impressive, but only 2 pieces of data on the proposed education design were presented, and this did not provide enough evidence as to its success. Lead Commissioner Williams also commented that the lack of Title 1 funding in the proposed budget represented a clear lack of knowledge in education finance. Chair Sundquist agreed with Commissioner Williams and cited a large public outpouring at the applicant's public forum as positive, but indicated that the application did not yet pass the threshold for approval.

Lead Commissioner Williams moved to adopt resolution 14-03D to deny CORAL a charter. Commissioner McGuire seconded. Lead Commissioner Williams' motion carried unanimously. CORAL was denied a charter because the proposed model rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and financial plan and capacity were not met.

Evergreen Leadership Academy

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Evergreen Leadership Academy (ELA). Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny ELA's application.

In Commissioner Cato's absence, Chair Sundquist took the lead on ELA's application. Chair Sundquist agreed with the recommendation for denial, and noted that the commission must think deeply about how to evaluate success factors to an ELA-like proposal in the future. Commissioner Wright noted that Grays Harbor County (GHC) could use a program like this, and that there were minor issues in the application that led to the recommendation for denial. Commissioner Dziko agreed that a school was needed for GHC, but did not concur with the reintroduction plan for ELA in GHC.

Chair Sundquist moved to adopt resolution 14-04D to deny ELA's charter. Commissioner Martin seconded. Chair Sundquist's motion carried unanimously. ELA was denied a charter because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity.

Excel Public Charter School

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Excel Public Charter School. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for approval because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. ED Halsey recommended approval of EXCEL with the following condition: no later than February 14, 2014 Excel shall provide a statement of assurances that the loan referenced in its application is not secured by public funds, and that the school will not now, or in the future, pledge assign, or encumber public funds received to secure debt; if the loan contemplated was to be secured using public funds, within 30 days the applicant should provide proof that it has an alternative source for the funds; certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Lead Commissioner McGuire agreed with the recommendation, but questioned the educational plan and capacity because of the lack of civics curriculum, and the 9 hour school day proposed by Excel. Further, she described the discipline plan as a 'deficit model'. Finally, Excel's teacher merit pay model was problematic, as it did not account for mid-year enrollment of students. Commissioner Wright commented that Lead Commissioner McGuire's comments were well stated, but too specific. Chair Sundquist was supportive of the application, and noted Excel's fundraising model was well designed; the proposed \$500K loan was supported by fundraising. Chair Sundquist suggested that conditions beyond Executive Director Halsey's conditions were not needed. Commissioner Dziko agreed that extra conditions need not be imposed, but commented that the discipline and merit pay in Excel's application were worrisome. Lead Commissioner McGuire commented that the criterion for discipline was not culturally responsive. Commissioner Williams asked for guidance from Carly Bolger, NACSA, on Excel's

special education plan. Mrs. Bolger responded that there was nothing insufficient in Excel's application. Commissioner Jacka commented that Excel, if approved, will prove successful for certain students, and less for others.

Chair Sundquist moved to adopt resolution 14-05A to approve Excel's charter. Commissioner Williams seconded the approved motion with a 6 aye to 2 nay vote. Commissioner Jacka and Commissioner McGuire opposed. Excel was approved for a charter because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: no later than February 14, 2014 Excel shall provide a statement of assurances that the loan referenced in its application is not secured by public funds, and that the school will not now, or in the future, pledge assign, or encumber public funds received to secure debt; if the loan contemplated was to be secured using public funds, within 30 days the applicant should provide proof that it has an alternative source for the funds; certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

First Place Scholars

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on First Place Scholars. Mr. Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for approval because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. ED Halsey recommended conditional approval of First Place given: certification by the State Board of Education; agreement to comply with the McKinney-Vento Act; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Lead Commissioner Wright commented that he was impressed by First Place's public forum presentation. In addition, the school already had an impressive track record as a private school. Finally, First Place's finances have been impressively balanced for the last 20 years. Commissioner Wright questioned Executive Director Halsey if the condition regarding the McKinney-Vento act was necessary. Executive Director Halsey responded that the condition added assurance. Aileen Miller, ATG, related that OSPI had a concern that First Place could be in noncompliance with McKinney-Vento if it was to enroll too many homeless students; the condition was a proactive measure. Commissioner Williams commented that First Place is an example of an innovative school. Lead Commissioner Wright continued that he believed the McKinney-Vento condition was unnecessary.

Lead Commissioner Wright moved to adopt resolution 14-06A, with conditions regarding the McKinney-Vento Act removed. Commissioner Martin seconded. Chair Sundquist offered an amendment to reinstate the stated condition. Commissioner McGuire seconded. The amendment failed 4-4, with Commissioners Dziko, McGuire, Quall, and Sundquist in support, and Commissioners Jacka, Martin, Williams, and Wright opposed. The commission then voted on resolution 14-06A that was unanimously approved. First Place was approved for a charter because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Green Dot Public Schools-Washington State

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Green Dot Public School – Washington State. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for approval because the proposed model exceeded the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and met the rubric standard for financial plan and capacity, organizational

plan and capacity, and existing operator. Mr. Halsey recommended conditional approval of Green Dot given: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Chair Sundquist reminded the commission that Commissioner Wright had recused himself from Green Dot's proposal. Chair Sundquist led the commission, stating the applicant's organizational and educational plans were strong. Chair Sundquist continued that it appeared Green Dot was moving away from turnaround projects. Commissioner McGuire stated her hope that, though the program was being run from California, that the proposed school would be independently overseen in Washington. William Haft, NACSA, expanded on Commissioner McGuire's sentiments stating that Green Dots' intent was to have a local governing board and infrastructure.

Chair Sundquist moved to adopt resolution 14-07A to approve Green Dot's charter. Commissioner Williams seconded. Chair Sundquist's motion carried with 7 votes and 1 abstention (Commissioner Wright). Green DOT was approved for a charter because the proposed model exceeded the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and met the rubric standard in financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

King County Academy

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on King County Academy (KCA). Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny KCA's application.

Chair Sundquist led the commission, noting that the community represented in the application attended the public hearing in large numbers, and was very desirous of such a school, but that he was in agreement with the evaluation team's recommendation. Commissioner Dziko agreed that the community support was impressive, and suggested that KCA's leaders obtain assistance from the Washington Charter Association. Commissioner Williams commented that she was impressed with the community involvement at KCA's public forum.

Chair Sundquist moved to adopt resolution 14-08D. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion that carried unanimously. KCA was denied a charter because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity.

Out of the Box Learning Studio

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Out of the Box Learning Studio (OBLs). Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model partially met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity, and did not meet the rubric standard in financial plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny OBLs' application.

Lead Commissioner Martin concurred with the evaluation team's report, stating that Fall, 2014 was too early a start date for OBLs. Commissioner McGuire encouraged the school to develop a more complete curriculum.

Lead Commissioner Martin moved to adopt resolution 14-09D to deny OBLs' charter. Chair Sundquist seconded the motion that carried unanimously. OBLs was denied a charter because the proposed model partially met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity, and did not meet the rubric standard in financial plan and capacity.

Pioneer School

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Pioneer School. Mr. Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, organizational plan and capacity, and the application was not in compliance with the law: RCW 28A.710.050. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny Pioneer's application.

Chair Sundquist reminded the commission that Commissioner Martin would be recusing himself from Pioneer's application. Lead Commissioner Jacka noted that the school had seen 33 years of success as a private school, but there was a lack of understanding in the application between private and charter school law. Commissioner Wright noted that the school has well-spoken students, but that the application did not meet the standards.

Lead Commissioner Jacka moved to adopt resolution 14-10D to deny Pioneer's charter. Commissioner McGuire seconded motion that carried with 7 aye votes and 1 abstention (Commissioner Martin). Pioneer was denied a charter because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, organizational plan and capacity, and the application was not in compliance with the law: RCW 28A.710.050.

Rainier Prep

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Rainier Prep. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for approval because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Halsey Recommended conditional approval of Rainier Prep given: no later than February 14, 2014 Excel shall provide a statement of assurances that the loan referenced in its application is not secured by public funds, and that the school will not now, or in the future, pledge, assign, or encumber public funds received to secure debt; if the loan contemplated was to be secured using public funds, within 30 days the applicant should provide proof that it has an alternative source for the funds; certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Chair Sundquist asked that William Haft, NACSA, expand on a potential conflict of interest between the evaluation team and the school's board of directors. Mr. Haft stated that, during the capacity interview, Carly Bolger, NACSA, observed that one of Rainier's board members was an employee with the Gates Foundation, one of NACSA's underwriters. Mr. Haft notified Commissioner Sundquist and Executive Director Halsey of the potential conflict, as well as leadership at the Gates Foundation. The individual of concern has since stepped down from Rainier's board. Mr. Haft assured the commission that the evaluation team's evaluation report was made without knowledge of the board member's ties to the Gates Foundation. As well, Executive Director Halsey stated that he had communicated with 3 out of the 4 evaluation team members himself, and was confident that NACSA had not influenced their decisions.

Chair Sundquist agreed that he was confident in the lack of a conflict. Commissioner McGuire agreed, and highlighted the anti-racist curriculum. Commissioner Williams commended Rainier on the groundwork done with the school district already in place.

Chair Sundquist moved to adopt resolution 14-11A to approve Rainier's charter. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion that carried unanimously. Excel was approved for a charter because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: no later than February 14, 2014 Rainier shall provide a statement of assurances that the loan referenced in its application is not secured by public funds, and that the school will not now, or in the future, pledge assign, or encumber public funds received to secure debt; if the loan contemplated was to be secured using public funds, within 30 days the applicant should provide proof that it has an alternative source for the funds; certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

SOAR Academy

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on SOAR Academy. Mr. Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, yet only partially met the financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny SOAR's application.

Lead Commissioner Dziko expressed concern about the evaluation team's recommendation. Commissioner Dziko cited a lack of a rubric standard for school leader residence, an element for which the evaluation team showed concern in SOAR's application. Commissioner Dziko continued, stating that levy funding is available to charter schools, another element for which the evaluation team showed concern in SOAR's application. As well, the evaluation team showed concern for the arts education budget in SOAR's application, a concern Commissioner Dziko did not feel was validated as not every volunteer contract can be codified in writing. Commissioner Dziko's only concern revolved around the proposed charter's executive salaries, as well as the number of deans (3).

Commissioner Dziko moved to adopt resolution 14-12A to approve SOAR's charter. Commissioner Williams seconded.

Chair Sundquist asked William Haft, NACSA, to clarify Commissioners Dziko's concern with the evaluation team's report. Mr. Haft stated that there was a clerical error for the start date of the school in the report, but he had contacted the evaluators and was assured that they had evaluated SOAR as opening in 2015, not 2014. Mr. Haft expressed that the report's conclusions represented a judgment about the readiness of the organization.

Commissioner Dziko moved to amend resolution 14-12A to contain amendment 1.17.1: school must revise its organization plan to reduce the number of deans from 3 to 1 and submit an amended budget before February 13, 2014. Commissioner Williams Seconded. Commissioner Jacka aired concerns that 3 deans might serve as a strength for SOAR. Chair Sundquist moved to strike language concerning deans in amendment 1.17.1 to read: school must revise its organizational plan and budget to address concerns of the Commission and resubmit them for Commission approval before the February 13, 2014 Commission meeting. Commissioner Martin seconded, with the commission voting 7-1 to approve, with Commissioner Dziko opposed. The commission returned to Commissioner Dziko's original motion. The motion passed unanimously. SOAR was approved for a charter because the proposed model met the

rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: no later than February 14, 2014 SOAR shall provide a statement of assurances that the loan referenced in its application is not secured by public funds, and that the school will not now, or in the future, pledge assign, or encumber public funds received to secure debt; if the loan contemplated was to be secured using public funds, within 30 days the applicant should provide proof that it has an alternative source for the funds; school must revise its organizational plan and budget to address concerns of the Commission and resubmit them for Commission approval before the February 13, 2014 Commission meeting; certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Sports in Schools Team Charter

The Commission reconvened after a break at 2:12 p.m. Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Sports in Schools Team Charter. Mr. Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model partially met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and did not meet the rubric standard in financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny Sports in Schools application.

Lead Commissioner Williams applauded the applicant for its efforts, but agreed that it was lacking in many areas.

Lead Commissioner Williams moved to adopt resolution 14-13D to deny Sports in Schools a Charter. Commissioner Dziko seconded, with the commission unanimously voting to approve. Sports in Schools was denied a charter because the proposed model partially met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and did not meet the rubric standard in financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity.

Summit Public Schools: Olympus

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Summit Public School: Olympus. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for approval because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Halsey Recommended conditional approval of Summit: Olympus given: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval

Lead Commissioner McGuire stated she was impressed by the proposal, highlighting the applicant's efforts at competency based learning.

Lead Commissioner McGuire moved to adopt resolution 12-14A. Commissioner Martin seconded with the commission voting to approve with 7 aye votes and one abstention (Commissioner Dziko). Summit: Olympus was approved for a charter because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Summit Public Schools: Sierra

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Summit Public School: Olympus. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for

approval because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Halsey recommended conditional approval of Summit: Olympus given: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval

Lead Commissioner McGuire stated that the application was identical to the previous application other than the location of the school.

Lead Commissioner McGuire moved to adopt resolution 12-15A. Commissioner Williams seconded with the commission voting to approve with 7 aye votes and one abstention (Commissioner Dziko). Summit: Sierra was approved for a charter because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity with the conditions that: certification by the State Board of Education; and execution of a contract with 90 days of approval.

Sunnyside Charter Academy

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Sunnyside Charter Academy. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model met the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity, yet only partially met the financial plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny Sunnyside's application.

Lead Commissioner Quall stated that he was impressed with the proposal, but continued that the major error the applicant made was in changing its opening date from 2015 to 2014 in its capacity interview. As well, Commissioner Quall believed that the applicant was in need of a broader and deeper cultural outreach program. Commissioner Quall agreed with the evaluation team's findings.

Lead Commissioner Quall moved to adopt resolution 14-16D, to deny Sunnyside a charter. Commissioner McGuire seconded, with the commission voting to approve with 6 ayes and 2 nays. Commissioners Martin and Wright opposed.

The Village Academy

The Commission reconvened after a short break at 3:02. Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on The Village Academy. Mr. Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny The Village Academy's application.

Lead Commissioner Dziko commented that she had been hoping for a stronger application, and agrees with the denial, citing an undeveloped educational design. Commissioner Wright agreed that he was disappointed in the specificity of the application, and that a school serving the proposed community was exactly what the commission was hoping for from applicants.

Lead Commissioner Dziko moved to adopt 14-17D, denying The Village Academy a charter. Commissioner Martin seconded, with the commission voting to approve unanimously. The Village Academy was denied a charter because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in

educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity.

Washington STEM

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Washington STEM. Mr. Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny Washington STEM's application. Executive Director Halsey also stated that the applicant did not attend their public forum, and was therefore not in compliance with the law: RCW 28A.710.140 and WAC 108-20-050.

Lead Commissioner Jacka expressed his approval of Executive Director Halsey's recommendation. Commissioner Dziko commented that she was disappointed in the applicant for wasting the commission's time.

Lead Commissioner Jacka moved to adopt resolution 14-18D, denying Washington STEM a charter. Commissioner Williams seconded, with the commission voting to approve unanimously. Washington STEM was denied a charter because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, organizational plan and capacity, and was not in compliance with the law: RCW 28A.710.140 and WAC 108-20-050.

Yakima Academy

Executive Director Halsey briefed the commission on the evaluation team's findings on Yakima Academy. Executive Director Halsey noted that the application had been recommended for denial because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity. Executive Director Halsey recommended the commission deny Yakima Academy's application.

Lead Commissioner Martin stated that the group was lacking public testimony at its public forum. Commissioner Martin, as well, noted that there seemed to be a disconnect in the group's initial proposal, as their focus as a CMO had been high school students, and they were proposing a K-12 school.

Lead Commissioner Martin moved to adopt resolution 14-19D, denying Yakima Academy a charter. Commissioner Wright seconded, with the commission voting to approve unanimously. Yakima Academy was denied a charter because the proposed model did not meet the rubric standard in educational program design and capacity, financial plan and capacity, and organizational plan and capacity.

NEXT STEPS

Chair Sundquist identified the following next steps for the commission: reviewing SOAR's response to the approval conditions; proposed rule-making; and to begin preparations for the next round of applicants. Chair Sundquist also commented that it was the last commission meeting on the west side of the state for Commissioner Martin.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m.