

## Agenda

Board of Directors Emergency Meeting (online)

April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020

4:15 pm CST

Board Meeting Topics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Call meeting to order (1 minute)</li> <li>2. Approval of Agenda for 3/31/2020 (1 minute)</li> </ol> <p>Discussion Items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ACNW hearing response written submission</li> <li>2. ACNW hearing structure (Planned presenters and items to be discussed)</li> </ol>
Purpose of the Meeting	To discuss necessary school business in order to ensure the proper and smooth running of NSA.
NSA Mission and vision Statement	<p>Academic achievement through the study and exploration of the natural world.</p> <p>Vision: Through its nature immersion, Natural Science Academy will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide and exemplary elementary science program</li> <li>• Cultivate and grow each student’s connection to the natural world</li> <li>• Foster creative and critical thinking</li> <li>• Create and sustain a safe, supportive, nurturing community in which to learn, explore and grow.</li> </ul>
Location	Natural Science Academy 920 Holley Ave. STE #3 St. Paul Park, MN 55071
Chairperson	Zach Fjelstad,
Secretary	Katrina Nichols,
Treasurer	Harry Adler
Board Members	Jill Schaeppi, PRESENT Tasha Steinmetz, PRESENT Kristi Ruport, PRESENT
Ex-Officio Members	Kendra Hunding (Lead Teacher), PRESENT Traci LaFerriere (Business Manager), PRESENT

	Kate Maki (Special Projects Coordinator), PRESENT
Attendees and Visitors	

## Minutes

1. Call meeting to order (1 minute)

2. Approval of Agenda

Ruport moves, Steinmetz seconds

Discussion: none

Adler: Yay

Steinmetz: yay

Schaeppi: yay

Ruport: yay

Nichols: yay

Fjelstad: yay

Motion carries unanimously.

3. ACNW hearing response written submission

Steinmetz moves to discuss, Ruport seconds.

Fjelstad moves to use the powerpoint Harry Adler created to guide our discussion. Nichols seconds.

Fjelstad moves to change approval methods throughout the discussion of powerpoint to a 1-5 scale and to include Ex-Officio members. Adler seconds.

Discussion: Fjelstad underscores the importance of having a united front with this response. 1-5 is a consensus gauging tool the NSA staff uses to make decisions. In this context, we'll pause on each page to address concerns of folks who vote less than 5.

Vote on 1-5 voting method.

Adler: Yay

Schaeppi: yay

Ruport: yay

Steinmetz: yay

Nichols: yay

Fjelstad: yay

Motion passes unanimously

#### Page 1: NSA Wants to Continue Operating

Hunding asks if members understand that getting another authorizer is a mutual decision by necessity. Steinmetz emphasizes the statute says that we can't find another authorizer if they choose to non-renew us. Clarify that the goal is to get a one-year probationary contract during which we could find another authorizer, should ACNW agree.

Concern about the wording on the first page making authorizer defensive/coming off as combative.

Board considers going through the whole slide show before finalizing wording changes re: mood of this page.

All members vote 5 on moving on to page 2

#### Page 2

Question about whether culture belongs on this slide. Unanimously 5 on this page.

#### Page 3

Mission and vision. Board makes wording changes, votes 5 on this page.

#### Page 4

Generates list of accomplishments, including MACS Innovation Award, MDE Clean Special Education Audit Award, MDE Finance Awards. Asks whether these should be recognitions or examples of how we've lived out our mission, like storm drain stenciling, or positive student outcomes.

Totals of off-campus trips, organizations we've connected kids with. Can give someone the authority to fill these in later. Group votes 5 on that idea.

Group votes 5 to move onto page 5

#### Page 5

Parent members ask if there are programs the school is looking at implementing. Strike some points that address plans for the future, as this slide is history of improvements. Group votes 5 to advance to next slide

#### Page 6 – enrollment trend

Group votes 5 to move on

#### Page 7 – Fund Balance

#### Page 8 – MCA History

These graphs highlight the statistical unreliability of our sample sizes. There's fluctuation because the sample size is so small, and even so, the numbers are ok. We're not underperforming other ACNW schools.

Question—they used to compare us with other small schools, but not anymore. What was that change about?

Question—our scores are higher than several ACNW schools? Adler and Maki provide more information.

Group votes 5 to move on to next page.

Page 9 – School Performance

Showing the trend toward improvement as measured by NWEA MAP scores.

Got the average growth from NWEA normative data and compared it to our growth. Asks about visually representing the comparison between our growth and NWEA's normative growth.

Vote to add a graph after this slide and empower Kendra to do that. Group unanimously votes 5.

Vote to move on from this slide: group unanimously votes 5.

Page 10 – Academic Performance

Question—what are we trying to do with this slide?

Display that NSA is responsive. Discussion about title to clearly communicate this purpose

Line about test taking needed clarification. Not teaching to the test, but rather helping students manage their emotional responses to test-taking.

Discussion about Illustrative Mathematics Curriculum and implementation date. Clarification: we've been implementing it to the point that we can before publication, using the materials that they HAVE released.

Anything more to add? Math para added this year and another next year.

Made a new slide.

Vote to move on: 5

Page 11 – Teacher Retention

Discussion about title – changing it to highlight that we're talking about the systemic supports in place for teaching team.

Clarification on what is meant by team building—the investment in scheduling regular events for the team to socialize and do things together, like axe-throwing, bowling, karaoke.

Discussion about interview process. Point made that the interview process isn't necessarily the problem; we'd interviewed a bunch of promising candidates for the K-1 positions, and offered the

position, but were turned down because our package wasn't competitive enough. Group decides to leave that point off. Vote to move on: group votes 5

Professional Development and Governance slides reversed

Governance changed to Board Development. Formatting changes and clarifications made. Split into two slides.

Refocuses on developing board toward providing oversight. Group votes 5 to move on.

Org chart and statement that we moved to Team Leader structure, responding to ACNW's concern about the leadership structure. Vote to move on: group votes 5

Rigorous Evaluation of School Leader:

Idea here is to show commitment to board oversight of the leader and the leadership model. Group works to clarify points that are unclear. Discussion clarifies the evaluation system – the continuous review cycle. Deadlines weren't made, but the process was completed all the way through, or mostly. Hunding advocates for completing the evaluation all the through. Ruport expresses concern that the authorizer has concerns over it being a continuous improvement cycle. Discussion of concern over how much power ACNW should have in dictating HOW we evaluate the goals. Concern over the evaluation not being tied to contractual goals. Didn't happen in board meetings in the past, so ACNW doesn't have the evidence it needs.

Discussion of what 1-year means. Is it July- July or September – June? It's August-June, depending on the year. Extra hours built into the summer. Goal in asking the question is figuring out when we'll know if we're going to continue with this leadership model or switch the model. We need to show we have a solid plan in place. Let's set the date as February. Evaluation completed by January 30, 2021.

Discussion circles back to what ACNW's issue is with the evaluation. Board concludes it's that we don't have clear evidence from board meeting minutes that it's been happening. Group votes 5 to move on.

Board Training – is this redundant? This is the detailed action plan version. Does this go in a different document? But are we reviewing that document in this meeting? So maybe it does need to stay. Make a new slide for the board development measures and add it to the end of the board development slides earlier in the slideshow.

Board discusses the purposes of the slideshow and other documents. Action plan, refutation, slideshow. Refutation and action plan are like a big legal brief, the most complete response. The slideshow is the guide for making the case in the hearing. Good to discuss the measures now so that we're on the same page about them, whether or not they're included in the slideshow.

Board development measures – dates added.

Professional Development measures:

Increased student outcomes—which ones? Measured how? Question whether this will address the concerns or not. Title change to Instructional Leadership.

Question about consultant—helping us improve for FY21 or beyond that? Since we're only asking for a one-year extension

Board clarifies purpose of this slide and sets dates for the measures. Group votes 5 on this.

Staff Culture

Can we do exit interviews for staff that leave to generate data for number of staff that leave for other reasons? Discussion about whether resignation letters serve that purpose.

Last slide: proposal for next year.

Question: refutations in the presentation, or submitted separately. Are they allowed to make their decisions based only on the presentation?

Hunding advocates for adding visuals about teacher retention, and academic improvement.

Fjelstad calls for motion to approve presentation pending addition of two graphs. Adler moves, Steinmetz seconds.

Discussion: none

Vote:

Steinmetz: Yay

Ruport: Yay

Nichols: Yay

Adler: Yay

Fjelstad: Yay

#### 4. ACNW hearing structure (Planned presenters and items to be discussed)

Adler moves to discuss hearing layout, Steinmetz seconds:

Discussion:

One person speaking at a time? One primary speaker. Typically, one main presenter but others support presenting points. Fjelstad is the main presenter as board chair. What if there are questions? Fjelstad will call on Adler for the MCA data, Nichols for the MAP data explanation, Ruport to read letters of support. If questions regarding MAP data or academic progress come up, Nichols can provide support. MCA data: Adler provides support. Can also chat or raise Zoom hand to volunteer to answer the question.

Who is taking on the task of making the refutation and action plan documents concise? Hunding with support from Steinmetz. Nichols and other board members will proofread.

Do those need to be two separate documents? Ruport says yes.

Submitting: action plan, refutations, support letters, HR letter, presentation to follow at the hearing. Powerpoint Presentaton? Board discusses, decides not to.

Fjelstas and Adler work on introductory letter, sent in by Thursday morning prior to noon.

5. Meeting Adjournment

Nichols moves to adjourn, Adler seconds.

Vote:

Nichols: Yay

Adler: Yay

Steinmetz: Yay

Ruport: Yay

Fjelstad: Yay

Meeting adjourned at 9:09.