

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**UTAH STATE CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD MEETING**

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

Utah State Board of Education—Board Rooms

**DRAFT**

**Members Present:**

Chair Kristin Elinkowski (refrains from voting, unless otherwise noted).  
Vice Chair DeLaina Tonks  
Member Cynthia Phillips  
Member Jim Moss (via telephone)  
Member Krystle Bassett  
Member Michelle Smith  
Member Bryan Bowles

**Staff Present:**

Jennifer Lambert  
Rabecca Cisneros  
Michael Clark  
James Madsen  
Amber Hellstrom  
Brett Campbell  
Assistant Attorney General David Jones  
Stewart Okobia

**Others Present:**

Scott Jones (USBE), Angela Stallings (USBE), Joylin Lincoln (UAPCS), Preston Allen (UAPCS), Gina James (UAPCS), Emily Morris (Mountain Sunrise Academy—MSA), Rebecca Stone (MSA), David Fawson (MSA), Krystelle Rose (MSA), Alyssa Sorenson (MSA), Emily Ashby (MSA), Karren Pyfer (Utah Mountain School—UMS), Tim Owen (UMS), Chris Wright (UMS), Mike Johnson (UMS), Betty Sawyer (UMS), John Stein (UMS), Howard Stephenson (Bridge), Matt Morrison (Bridge), Debbie Nelson (Bridge), Kim Duponce (Bridge), Lani Rounds (Bridge), Kim Coleman (Monticello), Gianni Assinks (Bridge), Joel Coleman (Monticello), Dane Roberts (Monticello), Montell Withers (Monticello), Steve Carroll (Utah Military Academy—UMA), Matt Throckmorton (UMA), Kelly Mack (UMA), Hanifi Oguz (Beehive Science and Technology Academy), Sudha Karghi (Beehive), Calvin Zullie (Beehive), Chris McCandless (Beehive),

## **Call to Order**

Chair Elinkowski called the meeting to order at 9:11 AM, and informed the room that Member Moss would be joining the meeting via telephone.

## **Public Comment**

No public comment was made.

## **New School Application and Satellite Report**

Ms. Rabecca Cisneros discussed the process the application readers use.

Ms. Angela Fanjul, acting as the representative for the readers, delivered the readers' feed back for the new school applications. The ability to meet state requirements, achieving positive student outcomes, pros and cons of models, proposed learning environments, market analyses for each school was discussed.

Ms. Cisneros presented: data, state averages, schools compared to closest neighbor, student engagement, transfer and retention, finances, and enrollment for Satellite and Replication applicants.

## **New School Application Capacity Interviews**

### *Mountain Sunrise Academy*

Mountain Sunrise, a proposed Waldorf model seeking an enrollment of 392 students for SY21 and growing to 504 by SY23 in the Saratoga Springs/West Lehi area, introduced themselves and delivered an elevator pitch for their proposed school.

Teaching methods, rigorous math lessons, differences from other Waldorf and Waldorf inspired schools in Utah, capturing imagination of students; blending of artistic, cognitive, and physical words; target market and population growth in the area were presented by representatives of Mountain Sunrise Academy.

Mountain Sunrise Academy was questioned on future employment of board members with the school, roles of each board member, typical day for sixth grade students, teaching with fidelity, curriculum and Utah Common Core, testing results, financial oversight and ability, things the reader may have missed, what they would do if they could not break ground by the January 1 Board Rule, self-contained environments and potentially having more students with disabilities than expected, budget for special education services onsite, growth projections and alignment with district, attracting teachers and starting salaries, business consultants and board's capacity to manage finances, construction and land values, teacher evaluation and implementation of the vision, teacher shortage and its effect on the fulfillment of the model, license grade-bands for Utah teachers, and if they have considered authorization from Alpine District.

## **New School Application Capacity Interviews**

### *Utah Mountain School*

Utah Mountain School, a proposed project-based outdoor learning model seeking enrollment of 400 for K-8 in SY 21, and growing to 450 students serving K-9 in SY22, in Ogden, UT, introduced themselves and delivered an elevator pitch, discussing: standards-based instruction, rigorous assessment, and emotional and academic growth.

Representatives were questioned on collaboration and how it will fill a need in the community; how they will help the SCSB achieve its vision, research based methods; role of board vs authorizer, and the relationship between the two groups; student schedule and teacher-student ratio; location, building construction and outdoor space; geodesic domes; transportation; changing the trajectory of at-risk students; aerobic exercise; analysis of curriculum programs that fit with mission and vision of school; special education competence; reactions to reader feedback; commitment from local junior high population to reach enrollment numbers; researching where students come from and where they plan to go; participation in the school lunch program; dealing with transient populations; helping at-risk students succeed; what they would do if committed enrollment at the start of the school year was lower than budgeted enrollment; how the model prepares students for high school/district school; examples of cultural competence; marketing plans for target population; starting salary for teachers; meeting core standards; how the governing board will know if students are meeting the school's learning goals; and if feeder schools have been identified.

## **New School Application Capacity Interviews**

### *Bridge Elementary*

Bridge Elementary, a proposed personalized learning model seeking an enrollment of 535 students in K-6 for SY21 and growing to 558 by SY22 in the Roy/West Haven area, introduced themselves and delivered an elevator pitch for their proposed school.

Power of students writing their goals and taking ownership of their learning, listening to SCSB feedback, board experience and competency, not having any board members employed by the school, and not having entered in to any contracts was presented by representatives of Bridge Elementary.

Representatives of Bridge Elementary were questioned on: how they would help the SCSB achieve its mission and vision, the role of Bridge Elementary's board vs. the role of the authorizer, the typical day for a sixth grader, why new people joined their board in this application process, how the application has changed from last year, what classrooms will look like, where the student body is expected to come from, reaction to readers' feedback, how they would respond if their director was not implementing the vision and mission of the charter, how they would respond if part-time positions needed to be made full-time, how often the board will meet annually, term limits for board members, how the school will make the personalized learning model work, community outreach and how they know the school is wanted, what they

will do if their enrollment does not meet their budgeted enrollment, how the governing board and principal will know if students are meeting the goals of the model, how standards will be met with a part-time specialist, difficult decisions, curriculum and alignment, and student agency.

### **Replication Application Interviews**

#### *Monticello Academy*

Monticello Academy, seeking Replication in West Point, Utah with enrollment of 680 students in K-8.

Representatives of Monticello Academy were introduced and offered their elevator pitch, discussing: track record as a thirteen-year old charter that is high ethnicity and economically disadvantaged,

Representatives of Monticello Academy were questioned on: mission and vision, how they help the SCSB achieve its vision, meeting goals and key elements of their charter, late application submittal, not submitting application to the local superintendent, concerns with special education complaints, decisions and difficulty with operating two geographically distant schools, pros and cons of replicating, organizational and business structure, West Point mayor's public comment, how they have identified successes to replicate, how they know the community wants their school; an expedited opening, what kind of teachers are needed to implement the program and how they will be attained, and how current students are meeting goals.

### **Replication Application Interviews**

#### *Utah Military Academy*

Utah Military Academy, seeking replication in grades 6-12 in multiple locations, was introduced, then delivered their elevator pitch.

Representatives of Utah Military Academy were questioned, discussing: their mission and vision and how it fills a need in the community, how the school is meeting its charter goals, the number of students that enlist in the military, what market analysis has been done, why they want to open two Replication schools, which ROTC programs they are planning to affiliate with, preference of location, what makes them successful enough to replicate, revising goals, assessments, how and how often their director is evaluated, policy decisions with operating four geographically distant schools, evidence of community support in new areas, growth, and education.

### **Satellite Application Interviews**

#### *Beehive Science and Technology Academy*

Beehive Science and Technology Academy, seeking a K-12 Satellite of 800 students in SY21 and growing to 1167 students by SY23, were introduced, then delivered their elevator pitch, discussing: academic growth, need for more STEM in Utah with currently over 5,000 computer

jobs available that can't be filled due to inadequate education, boundaries and location of student population.

Vice Chair Tonks declared a conflict of interest, because the developer of her school, Mountain Height's Academy, is the same as that of Beehive Science and Technology Academy.

Representatives of Beehive were questioned on on: anticipated challenges and excitement that initiated a Satellite request, closing achievement gaps, handling changes in facility costs, expected policy decisions necessary with operating a K-12, specifics of what is making the school successful, size of classroom, teacher-student ratio, preserving elements that made the initial Beehive campus successful, how to maintain culture and consider the unique needs of each student and teacher, identified challenges with serving more grades, facility costs, special education violations, and evidence that current families support a new school,

### **Adjourn**

Vice Chair Tonks moved to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.