

Charter/Choice Programming Committee

Minutes – March 8, 2016

“The charge of this committee is to provide guidance and recommendations to the School Board, relating to its role as authorizer of current and future ECASD Charter/Choice Schools. This will encourage innovation that could increase our ability to provide diverse programming and methodologies. Through this investigation and advisement the committee can support the increase in student readiness for and success in ECASD programming and post-secondary options.”

Meeting Recorder: Sandy LaValley

Committee Norms: Honest and open dialogue

Committee Members Present & Position/Employee Group

Derick Black, Secondary Teacher

Melissa Greer, Elementary Teacher

Gail Halmstad, Ad Hoc Member

Todd Johnson, CVM Principal/Co-Chair

Tim Leibham, Administration

Instruction/Co-Chair

Doug Diermeier, McKinley

Chris Hambuch-Boyle, BOE & Chair

Jeremy Harrison, CV Montessori Teacher

Mike Kohls, McKinley Charter

Pete Riley, McKinley Head of

Rich Spindler, BOE

Absent: Tracy Bush

Committee Chair, Chris Hambuch-Boyle, reported the name of this committee was discussed at a recent Policy & Governance Committee meeting, noting the public might be confused on the "choice" piece. The group may consider a future committee name change. Committee members reported feedback they have heard after the Innovation Zone proposal information appeared in the staff District Update.

1. Proposal Reviews

Tim Leibham shared four steps of the Innovation Zone (IZ) proposal process:

- Step 1 is the initial narrative that provides an overview of the IZ proposal.
- Step 2 is the interactive proposal used to talk through the IZ concept with a small group of committee members and receive feedback.
- Step 3 is the educational program detail to explain all of the components of the IZ concept sharing framework of Who? Why? How? What?
- Step 4 is the IZ Performance Agreement which provides the Board of Education an itemized list of autonomies being requested by the proposers.

The committee reviewed four proposals:

A. ARCTIC ZONE PROPOSAL - NORTHSTAR MIDDLE SCHOOL

This proposal, Authentic, Real-World Curriculum & Technology-Infused Classroom (ARTIC) has been submitted by two Northstar teachers. It is a collaboration of several departments as well as combining grade levels. Tim Leibham will meet with the staff on Wednesday, March 9, 2016, to share the committee's questions and outcome.

Questions/comments from committee members:

- Is it feasible to start with a single section/smaller scale?
- How will it meet with our standards?
- Have they looked at business partnerships?
- They would teach 5 middle school requirements. How will they bring in all of those skills with two teachers? How many teachers?
- Demonstrate more what their alignment is with the state standard and more specifically, how will they do that? What about supporting curriculum? Assessment piece?
- Technology: iPad apps; would they be willing to negotiate their technology? (We've been told it won't be iPads at DeLong.)
- Solving Real World Problems on 3 year program cycling kids through: What will students solve and will the problem end at the end of the school year or carry over?
- Aggressive timeline: smaller scale or wait another year?
- Fiscally responsible? This is not a small undertaking in the building re: FTE.
- More details about the student learning? Flex-time? Seminar time?

Outcome: Approved to move to Step 2

B. IMAGINATION PROPOSAL – SAM DAVEY

This proposal is targeted to 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students with focus on planning and integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) concepts.

Questions/comments from committee members:

- Asking for flexibility of time to integrate STEM?
- Curriculum/instruction: incorporating all curriculum materials provided by ECASD. How would they get through all of this? Need more details on this section.
- Scheduling? How would this work within their building?
- If developing curriculum, they may lose or drop a content/standard, so suggestion is to make sure they map out to the standards. The earlier the better to align with standards.

Outcome: Approved to move to Step 2

C. MYSCHOOL PROPOSAL – NON-ECASD STAFF

This proposal would serve children/teenagers with a primary or secondary Social Anxiety Disorder with the expectation that the candidates would experience a non-or less threatening school environment. The committee discussed the possibility of this falling under the McKinley Charter School umbrella and budget.

Questions/comments from committee members:

- Could this be something flexible under the McKinley Charter umbrella?

Outcome: Need to examine McKinley contract and follow-up with more information.

D. YEAR ROUND CALENDAR – LONGFELLOW

This proposal offers an alternative calendar to meet students' academic and social/emotional development with flexible pacing as determined by student needs.

Questions/comments from committee members:

- How will bussing work?
- Teacher Contracts?
- Buildings/grounds?

Outcome: Need more clarity and timeline information.

2. Charter Choice Budget Development

The committee members discussed proposing a budget for 2016-17 school year that would include professional development, staffing, contracted services, equipment/materials and supplies. More information will be shared at the April meeting.

3. Other/Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 12, 2016, at 4:00 pm in Room 123B at the Administration Building, 500 Main Street, Eau Claire.