

The CSAB disposition for each of the twenty-eight (28) complete 2016 applications is as follows:

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
1. Discovery Charter School (Durham County)	Approve (10-0; TS absent)	January 11, 2016
	SW noted this is an experienced board. Additionally the ES outlined the board is dedicated. HP outlined more diversity on the board is important. SR recommended that we forward to ready to open. TH seconded. Motion passed unanimously.	
2. Johnston Charter Academy (Johnston County) ¹	Approve (9-0; HP recused; ES absent)	February 9, 2016
	HP recused herself from any discussion of this application. SW outlined there is a need for another charter in Johnston County in the Clayton area. Additionally SW outlined the EVAAS growth at PreEminent the last school year. JM was impressed with the board and their familiarity with the application. JM made a motion to move the applicant to the RTO process and SR seconded. The motion passed unanimously.	
3. Montcross Charter Academy (Gaston County) ²	Approve (11-0)	December 8, 2015
	Langtree (1150), Cabarrus (1150), and Cardinal (908) enrollment and performance grades for each of these schools were questioned by JM & TH. JM also questioned the wait list for the existing schools. JM made a motion to move the school forward to the ready to open process. SR seconded the motion. ES is pleased that CSUSA is seeking to diversify their portfolio. HP feels it will be a school of high quality. The motion passed unanimously	
4. Movement School (Mecklenburg County)	Approve (10-0; CT recused)	
	SW TH second to move forward to ready to open. AQ communicated this is the way it should be done and it is exciting. AH outlined it was a smart move of the board to seed the school with administrators from Sugar Creek and it is guaranteed success. JM hopes this becomes a community service model for needy communities. The motion passed unanimously.	
5. Rolesville Charter Academy (Wake County) ¹	Approve 10-0; JM absent)	March 7, 2016

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>SW outlined the positives of the application and the interview especially with the transportation plan. He additionally outlined the need for the school given the expanding population in the area. ES outlined he was appreciative of the board chair being present although unable to speak due to illness. Additionally the demographics of some subgroups in some NHA schools is concerning especially if there is no true intent to market to particular groups. PG made a motion to move applicant forward to ready to open. SR seconded. The motion passed unanimously</p>	
<p>6. UpROAR Leadership Academy (Mecklenburg County)</p>	<p>Approve (10-0; ES absent)</p>	<p>April 12, 2016</p>
	<p>HP outlined she is impressed with the innovation of this group. JM outlined the budget will be difficult. TS outlined the enrollment will be difficult to meet especially with the magnet school in the Char-Meck area. CT outlined the school will probably start with more 6th than 5th graders. SR outlined the first year will be tough but once they get a group of students in the movement may take on and this will be a difficult undertaking initially. SR outlined the passion and premise of the school is promising and hopes the board maintains this passion. AQ outlined he will support the school but there may be budgetary hurdles for the school. Additionally the school may need to look at the group of students they will be starting with and establishing culture will be important to success. AQ encourages the school to visit other schools that have done this successfully. TH encouraged the board to be smart and to listen to the Accelerator folks. He also stated to be smart about the money. TH made a motion to move the group forward. SR second. CT outlined her prior experience in active duty and how that translates into the life of the students. AH outlined that the school must differentiate how it is different from the current offerings available in Char-Meck. Additionally, enrollment will be important. The motion passed unanimously.</p>	
<p>7. Francis Classical School (Mecklenburg County)</p>	<p>Do Not Approve (10-0 ; JM absent)</p>	<p>March 7, 2016</p>
<p>8. Paul L. Dunbar Charter School (Rowan County)³</p>	<p>Do Not Approve (10-0; TS absent)</p>	<p>January 12, 2016</p>
<p>9. Robert J. Brown Leadership Academy (Guilford County)</p>	<p>Do Not Approve (10-0; ES absent)</p>	<p>February 9, 2016</p>
<p>10. Union Leadership Academy (Union County)⁵</p>	<p>Do Not Approve (10-0; ES absent)</p>	<p>April 12, 2016</p>

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
11. Addie C. Morris Children's School (Forsyth County)	Approve (8-3; AQ, TS, ES dissenting)	December 7, 2015
	The CSAB discussed the applicant group is persistent and has a lot of heart. AH suggests the CSAB give them an opportunity and moved to recommend the group to the SBE for preliminary planning year. SR seconded. JM stated the group needs to hold themselves to the goals they have outlined in the proposed application. BT outlined there are many flaws in the budget and charters often fail due to financial reasons. BT outlined budget needs someone to provide additional support. ES outlined the application lacks depth and contains numerous buzz words especially with the application being a fourth version.	
12. Bonnie Cone Classical Academy (Mecklenburg County)	Approve (6-3; CT recused; AQ, ES, HP dissenting; TS absent)	January 11, 2016

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>The CSAB reported the proposed board does not have a firm understanding of classical education and what the program entails. CSAB members reported the proposed board's response is that they must get approved before accurate responses can be given. The CSAB reported there is a lot of information "up in the air." The CSAB reported concern as not all board members were not able to articulate classical education. SW reported enrollment may not be a problem due to the growing area. JM outlined the education part of the application is written well. JM also stated the board may need additional training as not all board members can articulate the purpose and hopes they will stay true to the classical model. AQ outlined the responses outlined were not sufficient and not thought out although there were good written responses provided. AQ - the board changed their responses multiple times during the interview and there was not a lot of depth. ES outlined the appendices were all cut and paste and the board could not provide generalizations and it took a CSAB member prompting to include one of the basic concepts of classical education the Socratic method. The responses left a lot to be desired and depth was lacking from beginning to the end of the interview. HP outlined technology is important in the 21st Century. PG rebutted and commended the school on not offering computers to the early grades. ES stated there was not a level of depth that should be expected at this time. JM made a motion to recommend the school to ready to open status. AH thinks there is a strong board and through training and due diligence they will get it because the demand is high. AQ pointed that the survey referenced was from a prior application and the demand may not be in the area. TH provided the applicant with a way to make the budget piece look more appealing for the applicant group. ES questioned CSAB members on what is influencing this decision outside of classical being in the name. JM outlined this is a model he believes in and may be beneficial to the community. JM outlined the board may not have responded appropriately but classical education is important. SR outlined while reading the application responses were appropriate, but the interview left much to be desired as there was a lack of depth to the responses given. Motion passed 6-3 with 3 dissenting HP, ES, AQ.</p>	
13. Emereau: Bladen (Bladen County)	Approve (7-3; TS, SR, HP dissenting; ES absent)	February 8, 2016

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>AQ outlined there is a need but he is not convinced. CT was concerned about the submission of 5 applications at once. SR had concerns about the transportation plan. CT think the idea is different and thinks it is innovative. AH made a motion to recommend 2 Emereau schools one in Bladen and Halifax based on the strength of Kate Alice and the pressing need in the counties. AH is uncomfortable with approving 5 at once. PG seconded. JM wants to think outside the box when it comes to approving these schools based on the success of their planning year for the remainder schools - staggered opening to prevent going through another application cycle. SW outlined the interview helped him make a decision. Multiple members discussed the need for the schools in Halifax and Bladen. AH reminded the CSAB of the Leandro case, SW outlined the enrollment numbers are concerning to the financial component of the school. AQ outlined the ed plan in the application received an overall fail and multiple schools out of the box is concerning. CT outlined reading the ed plan was not written clearly but Kate Alice explained it well during interview. SR outlined all the applications were based on one application need Bladen and each of the areas proposed were very different. Each application should have been applicable to that particular area per SR. MM outlined the board members were aware of the need in Bladen but maybe not in other areas proposed. TH outlined the board was impressive but relied on the future ED to answer the questions posed. TS questioned the distance between Halifax and Bladen. JM outlined it would be a good test with the schools being 100 miles apart. The motion passed 6 - 4 AQ, TS, SR, & HP dissented. The CSAB then took individual votes on each school.</p>	
14. Emereau: Halifax (Halifax County)	Approve (6-4; AQ, TS, SR, HP dissenting; ES absent)	

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>AQ outlined there is a need but he is not convinced. CT was concerned about the submission of 5 applications at once. SR had concerns about the transportation plan. CT think the idea is different and thinks it is innovative. AH made a motion to recommend 2 Emereau schools one in Bladen and Halifax based on the strength of Kate Alice and the pressing need in the counties. AH is uncomfortable with approving 5 at once. PG seconded. JM wants to think outside the box when it comes to approving these schools based on the success of their planning year for the remainder schools - staggered opening to prevent going through another application cycle. SW outlined the interview helped him make a decision. Multiple members discussed the need for the schools in Halifax and Bladen. AH reminded the CSAB of the Leandro case, SW outlined the enrollment numbers are concerning to the financial component of the school. AQ outlined the ed plan in the application received an overall fail and multiple schools out of the box is concerning. CT outlined reading the ed plan was not written clearly but Kate Alice explained it well during interview. SR outlined all the applications were based on one application need Bladen and each of the areas proposed were very different. Each application should have been applicable to that particular area per SR. MM outlined the board members were aware of the need in Bladen but maybe not in other areas proposed. TH outlined the board was impressive but relied on the future ED to answer the questions posed. TS questioned the distance between Halifax and Bladen. JM outlined it would be a good test with the schools being 100 miles apart. The motion passed 6 - 4 AQ, TS, SR, & HP dissented. The CSAB then took individual votes on each school.</p>	
15. Kaleidoscope Charter High School (Wake County)	Approve (7-3; AQ, TS, CT dissenting; ES absent)	April 12, 2016

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>JM outlined there were typos in the application and the external evaluators did not give it high marks. With that being said the board seems to be strong and maybe the CSAB should give them a chance. SW outlined he was unsure and recruitment of high school students may be difficult for the school. Additionally he is not clear on how the education plan will work at the school. AQ outlined he is not clear on how this plan will be operationalized and the applicant did not clearly articulate this during the interview or with the materials presented and there are still a lot of questions. SW outlined he is concerned that the teacher pay outlined in the application based on its proposed location may prove difficult to the recruiting the caliber of teacher needed to implement the proposed program. JM outlined the surrounding high schools may be helpful to recruiting because the large enrollment numbers and a parent's desire of a small educational setting. PG outlined teachers and students will want to attend because there will be smaller numbers the school is proposing. SR outlined the applicant failed to articulate what the student day would entail. MM outlined the board failed to answer questions regarding AIG and this is the population they tend to focus on. TS outlined there were a lot of questions that were not answered by the board and questions about the curriculum remain unanswered. Additionally, the targeted population may be able to meet the targets set but what about students who are not at that level yet? CT articulated that it is hard to visualize how this will work based on the presentation of the board. AQ outlined that because of the area the enrollment numbers may be easily met and his reservations are around operationalizing the plan. SW outlined he is willing to give a chance and the board may be able to figure it out. TH outlined he will go for recommending this school. AH outlined he is comfortable with the ambiguity and is impressed with the need/demand. AH made a motion to recommend this school. TH second. The motion 7 - 3 with AQ, TS, and CT dissenting.</p>	
16. Ridgeview Charter School (Gaston County)	Approve (7-2; ES, SW dissenting; TS, AQ absent)	January 12, 2016

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>SW outlined there is a disconnect between the mission and what is outlined in the application. Additionally there are teachers who are willing to work for less in charters; however, these proposed salaries in the application may make recruiting teachers difficult in the proposed location area. SW outlined you must have good teachers and salaries are important to that piece. SW also outlined confusion with the education plan. ES also outlined confusion about the education plan outlined even after questioning the applicant as it lacked specificity and suggested a reactionary way of delivering education. CT states the applicant outlined their mission and their budget doesn't reflect the priorities of the mission outlined. MM liked the facility the applicant is proposing and that there will be transportation/lunch offered. MM also outlined the teacher salaries proposed are problematic. SR outlined that the budget needs adjusting which may allow the teacher salaries to be increased specifically the principal salary. SR also outlined other tweaks that may be appropriate to help with adjusting teacher salaries. TH also expressed concerns about the teacher salaries outlined in the application and the ability to recruit quality teachers. ES outlined that it is concerning that the education plan is the life of the application and the applicant does not have that figured out where there may be room for adjustments in other parts of the application. CT outlined she is on the fence with this applicant group and has some of the same concerns that ES expressed. PG made motion to recommend. SR seconded. PG, JM, SR outlined they will have time to work things out during the planning year. The motion passed 7 - 2 with ES and SW dissenting.</p>	
<p>17. Twin City High School (Forsyth County)⁴</p>	<p>Approve (8-2; TS, SR dissenting; ES absent)</p>	
	<p>BT outlined that this type of school needs to exist and questions the validity of the ALS model. Additionally she outlined we are at a learning process with this model and the SBE has a desire to possibly study the model more for the potential impact. JM outlined we are struggling with the impact and may need to consider the growth of these schools until we know how effective they are. AH outlined maybe we shouldn't penalize this applicant group. SW offered that maybe this one is approved and then we would have a broad overview in different locations. CT outlined that possibly having the multiple urban areas for a pilot may be beneficial. The CSAB outlined that more proportional funding needs to be explored much like the EC model currently in place. SW made a motion to recommend the school to ready to open status. HP second. AQ outlined that the funding should be explored in collaboration with the district. Additionally, the true performance of students needs to be captured and there is much more to study. The motion carried 8 - 2 with TS and SR dissenting.</p>	<p>April 12, 2016</p>

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
18. Acorn to Oak (Wake County)	Do Not Approve (10 – 1; AH dissenting)	December 7, 2015
19. Aurora Prep (Beaufort County)	Do Not Approve (6-5; (AH, PG, JM, SW, TH dissenting)	December 8, 2016
20. Emereau: Johnston (Johnston County)	Do Not Approve (8-2; PG, AH dissenting; ES absent)	February 8, 2016
21. Emereau: Nash (Nash County)	Do Not Approve (8-2; PG, AH dissenting; ES absent)	
22. Emereau: Wake (Wake County)	Do Not Approve (8-2; PG, AH dissenting; ES absent)	
23. Forsyth Preparatory Academy (Forsyth County)	Do Not Approve (9-1; AH dissenting; JM absent)	March 7, 2016
24. Russell Lee Jones Charter High School (Mecklenburg County)	Do Not Approve (8-2; AH, PG dissenting; ES absent)	February 9, 2016
25. Next Generation Academy (Guilford County)	No Recommendation (5-5; ES, AQ, SR, HP, CT dissenting; TS absent)	January 12, 2016
	<p>AH outlined that Guilford County has 42 failing schools. Additionally he is impressed with the board and should be given an opportunity to operate in Guilford County. SW echoed the sentiments of AH and asked could it get any worse and there is a lot of community support behind the school. SW outlined it was not a perfect presentation by any means but the facility may be attractive for people to come to and there is a need and the proposed board has in artfully outlined that the other subject areas were mute. SW is more than willing to give the school an opportunity. PG outlines the school already has a location and supports the school. ES outlines the board skills are impressive but the application has a lot of concerns relating to depth, typos, appendices were lacked depth and possibly needed attribution. Additionally the clarity on what would take place in the classroom lacked clarity. ES outlines he does not think they are ready at this point based on the information provided. AQ outlined a lot of clarity was not given although the question was asked multiple times. AQ outlined the applicant needs more time to develop the true vision of the applicant. JM wished the application and the responses were clear. JM outlined the yearlong training may give the board the time they need and am willing based on need to take the risk to have the school to open. AQ pressed the CSAB to maintain a high level of quality with reviewing the applications and just giving a chance cannot be a bar. SR understands the plight of the community but the educational plan presented was not cohesive in interview or during the application. SR outlined the clarity needed was not provided and while the area needs a school we would be doing the students in the</p>	

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)	CSAB Meeting Date
	<p>area a great disservice. CT stated we need to know that these school are going to be successful and we never rec'd a solid answer to the questions. Because the need is so great we should not just say we will see if it will work and is distressed that the CSAB would agree that the app is not everything it should be and hope it works out. AQ outlined this is not at the level that our students deserve. ES outlined this application would not have gotten to the interview process in the past and there was not one argument made today that this was quality. ES implored the CSAB to outline how this application meets the mission of quality. SW provided he liked the idea of whole group and small group instruction. TH outlined what he was searching for the school to articulate but an excellent point was the board and that the community is trying to do something with the students. Additionally the goals in the application were lacking and this one is tough one for him to decide. MM outlined that you must have confidence in the applicants and he has concerns about the quality of the application as a whole. ES made a motion that the school not be moved to ready to open status. CT seconded. Motion failed 5 to 5. A second vote occurred to move the school to ready to open status and also ended in a tie vote.</p>	
26. Lake Academy (Iredell County) (Banyan)	N/A – Withdrew 12/1/2015	
27. Town Center Charter High School (Gaston County) ⁴	N/A - Withdrew 4/8/2016	
28. Young Inspiration Charter School (Mecklenburg County)	N/A - Withdrew 4/11/2016	

Notes: