



**Regular Meeting of the  
Board of Directors of Citizens of the World Kansas City**

**Location:** CWC Kansas City Primary Grades Campus  
3435 Broadway Blvd  
Kansas City, MO 64111

**Date:** Wednesday, June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017, 5:30pm

**Proposed Minutes**

1. [4:30pm] Call to Order

Mr. Norris called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m.

2. Board Diversity Committee Working Session – Focus Group with Prospective Member Slate

Board Members in attendance: Mr. Luke Norris, Dr. Joy Vann-Hamilton, Mr. Miguel Meneses

Non-Members in attendance: Dr. Kristin Droege, Mr. Anthony Sealey, Mr. Jim MacDonald, Mr. Ryan Brennan (for minutes).

Mr. Sealey introduced himself by sharing that his connection to CWCKC is through Shomari Benton, attorney for CWCKC. He just became a new dad and recently moved to Kansas City within the past 3 years. He is planting roots and passionate about improving local schools. Mr. Sealey works for SunLife and specializes in health insurance benefits and education/communication.

Mr. MacDonald introduced himself and shared that he is the parent of a CWCKC student. He is thrilled to be considered for the Board. He calls himself a passive, but very interested, observer of the KC school system and school options. While a 25-year midtown resident, when he became a dad, he immediately began to fret and plan about his child's education. He was thrilled to find a great option for his family as well as the opportunity to be more involved. His day job is with United Way – specifically, with their community initiatives (anti-poverty, community grants, etc.).

Mr. Norris stated the goal of this smaller working session is to orient the potential members around the processes of the Board and its meetings, operating norms, and expectations.

a. Sunshine Law

Mr. Norris stated that Missouri has a "Sunshine Law" that we abide by and support. The key takeaway of this is that everything is transparent (i.e. "done out in the clear sunshine of day."). Each board member will have a CWC email and Mr. Norris strongly encouraged everyone to exclusively use the CWC email regarding Board business. He said that emails are used to share

information and never to dialogue about information. That is because if a "discussion" happens online, it becomes a "meeting" and should then be subject to posting and open records notices. Further, any documents – including emails – are subject to Open Records Requests and communication should always be treated as public.

b. Board meeting overview

Mr. Norris continued by saying meetings are always open to the public and each meeting will have an opportunity for the public to address the Board. Once the agenda has been agreed upon (through a vote), the meeting generally become the Board's and the agenda is followed. Meetings also have the option to go into "closed/executive session" in which the public is not invited to. Meetings can go into closed session for specific reasons (personnel, facilities, etc.) and CWCKC generally uses closed session as an information sharing/discussion time, and not for voting. However, upon coming out of closed session, a recap is given as well as a statement given on whether any items were voted upon and if so, what those items were.

Dr. Droege reiterated that public session is a time for the public to share thoughts. Generally, the Board will not engage in specific conversations (because the Board can't go into conversations that are not on the agenda), but the Board may specifically say "a board member will follow up" or place an item on a subsequent agenda.

Mr. Norris gave an overview of the Board's responsibilities. The Board has the ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the school. Therefore, one of the duties of the Board each month is to approve the check register as well as review the monthly financial reports.

Continuing through a typical agenda, Mr. Norris moved through each "action point," including the Executive Director's report. Dr. Droege gives a report each month centering around the "diversity/connection/understanding" theme and often a staff member(s) will assist her in that in order.

Mr. Norris shared that among the Board, there are three Executive roles: Chair, Vice-Chair, and Treasurer. These 3 occasionally meet as an Executive Team, but no official Board items are discussed/decided. The Board does have a technical Secretary for state compliance and reporting purposes, but the minute-taking duties have been delegated to Mr. Brennan.

Dr. Droege underscored that she sets the monthly agenda, but encouraged new board members to communicate with her so she can designate appropriate time for Board discussion around specific points.

c. Connection to our National team – Citizens of the World Schools (CWCS)

Mr. Norris gave an overview of CWCKC's connection and partnership to CWCS (our national organization, based in LA).

CWCKC is our own, independent 501 (c)3 organization. In going through MO DESE's charter approval process, our governance structure resulted in a unique oversight setup. CWCKC has a licensing and affiliation agreement with CWCS – we use the CWC brand, we collaborate best practices across all schools, and we share a common academic model.

CWCS has a 1-person separate Missouri-based organization (CWC Executive Services, or CWCES). CWCES is contracted by the CWCKC Board to supervise the CWCKC Executive Director. This is a check-and-balance system that satisfies both DESE (to ensure 100% local control of the school) as well as CWCS that CWCKC will stay “on model.”

CWCS has a separate LA-based Board and agreements with schools in NY and LA. Again, we collaborate and share best practices, not specifically supervise.

Mr. MacDonald asked if any of those subsidiaries are for-profit; Mr. Norris affirmed that all associated parties are non-profit. Mr. MacDonald asked about the number of schools in our other locations; Dr. Droege gave a quick overview of the 3 schools in Los Angeles and 2 in New York.

d. Charter School Sponsor

Mr. Norris shared that typically charter schools are sponsored by Universities or school districts. CWCKC's original plan was to be sponsored by the University of Missouri. Through the initial workings with MU, they suggested and introduced us to MCPSA. MCPSA was started in 2013 and began work in 2014 and the sole purpose is to oversee and sponsor charter schools. We are their initial – and so far only – charter.

3. [5:30] Re-Call to Order

Mr. Norris re-called the meeting to order at 5:28 p.m.

4. Roll Call by Board Chair

Mr. Norris proceeded with roll call.

Present:

Jacob Littrell  
Miguel Meneses  
Luke Norris  
Joy Vann-Hamilton

Absent:

Tonya Brown  
Dr. Kaye Otten

Mr. Norris determined that with 4 of 6 Board Members present, a quorum is established for purposes of holding the meeting and voting.

5. Review & Consideration of Proposed Agenda

Mr. Norris moved to approve the agenda as proposed and Dr. Vann-Hamilton provided a second to the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

## 6. Public Comments

Mr. Norris invited public comment. No public comment was made.

## 7. Review & Consideration of minutes from the May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017 regular meeting of the Board

The Board did not have any comments regarding the proposed minutes from the regular May 24, 2017 meeting of the Board. Mr. Meneses moved to approve the minutes as proposed and Mr. Littrell provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

## 8. Finance Committee Report (Mr. Paul Greenwood)

### a. Review & Consideration of Monthly Financials, including Check Register

Mr. Greenwood gave an overview on the May financial statements. On the revenue side, state revenue was received as expected, our federal revenue is slightly lower than expected, but CSP was fully funded and received. We are still awaiting food service reimbursement and, overall, approximately \$100k needed to hit our revenue target. That food service receipt should bring revenue up to par.

On the expense side, monthly spending was \$222k – largely due to planned CSP spending. While we still have \$102k to spend to hit expense targets, each invoice this month will be reviewed for budget adherence and cash availability.

While we are currently operating at a \$65k loss for the month and a forecast \$155k loss for the year. This still gives us padding to hit the 3% cash threshold. All in all, finances are looking positive relative to meeting 3% threshold, if not 4%.

The Board did not have any questions on the state of May finances for Mr. Greenwood.

Mr. Norris reminded the Board that the state requires us to have a minimum of 3% cash in reserve at the end of each year. CWCKC has a separate and more-stringent goal of growing that every year throughout our initial 5 years.

Mr. Sealey asked for clarification on what the two main financial challenges were – he understood them to be enrollment and unknown facility operation costs. Dr. Droege affirmed those two are the challenges. On enrollment, we did not see it as a challenge throughout the school year, but it was a challenge during start-up and planning. We responded with reducing staffing/salaries and cuts to supplies as much as possible while maintaining a full program offering and the Board raised ~175k to meet that gap.

The Board did not have any questions regarding the check register. Mr. Littrell moved to approve the register as proposed and Mr. Meneses provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

b. Review & Consideration of 2017-2018 Budget Modification to 11 Classrooms

Mr. Norris reminded the Board that last month, the Board approved a 2017-2018 budget based around a 12-classroom model. After a month of continued enrollment, the finance committee met and proposed a modification to that budget based around an 11-classroom model.

Mr. Greenwood illustrated that when we reduce enrollment from 12 classrooms to 11 classrooms, we lose \$173k in revenue. In order to make that up, needed local fundraising has increased from \$125k to \$175k (which was raised last year), we did not hire the 2 associated classroom positions for that final classroom (which reduced salary and benefits), reduced insurance, and we reduced various discretionary spending.

The major risk in the budget is that it is still dependent upon full enrollment. Mr. Greenwood believes he and the finance committee have done everything they can to remove expenses – there is very little room for strain and circumstance.

Dr. Droege clarified that the enrollment projection on the budget handout should be “264 students,” not “162 students.” Currently, we are slightly overfilled on second grade, within 10 on K (after reducing a classroom), and within 12 on 1<sup>st</sup> grade. Another mailer will hit the first week of July. The first mailer this year resulted in 30 applications; last year’s summer mailer resulted in an even stronger result. Dr. Droege also shared that she and Mr. Norris have begun work on a 3-track fund-raising model (grant proposals, philanthropic, and parent fundraising). She has already submitted one grant and is working on another philanthropic opportunity.

Mr. Norris entertained the Financial Committee’s motion to modify budget. Dr. Vann-Hamilton officially motioned to approve the modified 11-classroom budget and Mr. Littrell provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

9. Executive Director’s Report (Dr. Kristin Droege)

a. Review of Dashboard

Dr. Droege quickly presented her dashboard overview: diversity (usually an overview of enrollment and/or staffing), understanding (usually Mr. Smith shares an academic perspective), and connection (usually Ms. Quance shares partnerships across the broader academic landscape).

i. Diversity

1. Student Enrollment Update

Dr. Droege gave an overview of the student enrollment pipeline, and verbally discussed how the now-reduced classroom model would impact remaining open seats.

Mr. Sealey asked where we are seeing growth. Dr. Droege shared siblings and word-of-mouth and Mr. Norris answered that our partner referrals are also growing.

Mr. Norris also affirmed that we are monitoring sub-populations to ensure we meet our broader diversity goals.

In a broad overview of student diversity (race and gender), we are seeing stable growth and Dr. Droege believes our position is strong.

## 2. Staff Hiring Update

Dr. Droege introduced Jose Rivera, a fellow working with CWCKC over the next 6-7 weeks. He'll be assisting with handbooks and policy/procedure updates.

Dr. Droege gave overview of expected staff for this next year, featuring a major increase in male staffing as well as bringing the custodial role on staff.

## ii. Understanding

Dr. Droege reviewed the Trimester 3 assessment data. It is school-level data and we use it to see whether or not we are meeting the mission of the school and if not, how we can 1) adjust professional development and supervision of teachers and 2) seeing where we need to supplement the curriculum.

She reminded the Board that NWEA is a nationally normed, standardized test where students are given different questions depending on their individual answers. It is taken 3 times per year and covers Language Arts in 4 areas and Math in 10 areas. It also includes Foutas & Pinnell reading assessment which rates reading comprehension and fluency. SELWeb – Social/emotional learning – is our third assessment tool and used only in primary grades and measures students' emotional competencies and level of acceptance by peers.

**NWEA** – Dr. Droege verified we are not seeing the levels of achievement we hoped to see and we are not yet meeting our 3-5 year goals. Around 45% of students are achieving expected growth - with a huge range of variability in that data set (from almost double the expected amount of growth in some students, to those who appear to have lost knowledge).

She stated there are a couple ways to look at data, one from Mr. Smith in that "we made a decision to focus a huge amount of energy and teaching time this year on norms, behavior knowledge, and culture development. That cost us time...but we will get that back in spades." Of the 100% of expected growth, by midyear we were at 60% of expected growth, by end of year we were close to 80% of expected growth. It sets us up for a year that we (faculty/students) know what we are doing. We also are seeing K scores coming in dramatically lower across the network. Therefore, we are beginning to conclude that it takes time in our program for students to reflect their learning in our program into assessments.

**F&P** – The F&P evaluations are administered 1-on-1 between a reading specialist and a student. The reading specialist sits down, listens to a student reading a book, asks questions about comprehension, and assesses the overall reading skill level. It takes

about 1 hour per administration. The data show 53% of Kindergartners and 73% of 1<sup>st</sup> are at/above grade level at reading. This is not our overall goal, but Dr. Droege is thrilled at the results from a first-year school. There are a lot of variables among "at/above grade level" and "achieving expected growth" (i.e. a student 1.5 grade levels above may only grow "3 levels" which is not "expected growth" – and this is similar for a student starting significantly below grade level).

We have to recognize our instructional model is also about assessment; we have to be giving them assessment methods that allow each student to demonstrate their learning in the same way they are learning it.

At the school-level, we have invested in a Fountas & Pinnell intervention kit targeted toward readers at the very first reading levels that are having difficulty. We have also invested in a program called "DIBS" – which will create a check-out system for classroom reading libraries. Students in the program take books home every day and practice reading with their family (at an instructional level); this engages the family in instructional growth. Lastly, Dr. Droege plans to work with Mr. Smith and Reading Specialists on observation/feedbacks within the reading groups.

Focusing on math, Dr. Droege shared that will be more directive in clarifying how instructors are building on the specific math concepts. It is a spiral curriculum (introducing 5 concepts at a basic level, circle back to an intermediary level, circle back to a mastery level) instead of a linear method. There will be focused training on Everyday Math from a specialist that the publisher is sending to us. Mr. Smith will also be working with Jonathan (CWCS) with "Illuminate" to be able to more fluidly look at our assessment data.

Lastly, supplementing our ACE program and enhance our math program, Dr. Droege is creating a "professional development certificate" program for our kindergarten teaching associates. This will provide additional training in both social emotional development and math. She is working on a strategy that defines a spectrum of co-teaching relationships. This will enable two opportunities: 1) they will also partner with 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> grade math instruction for an hour/day and 2) their contract day will extend a bit later so all K students staying late will stay in their classroom with their known Teaching Associate.

### iii. Connection

Dr. Droege shared an overview that, over the past year, CWCS has reviewed how they (CWCS) can add value in the supporting/networking relationship to each school. CWCS developed a new review process: the Graduate Dispositions Review.

There are three different areas of student outcomes (self, together, and the world) that, together with academic achievement, students need to be able to demonstrate at graduation to go out into the world successfully.

During the review, teams from CWCS follow a specific class throughout their day to observe them and provide feedback on how the day and activities in it meet/support (or not) graduate dispositions.

## 10. Board of Directors Membership Update (Mr. Luke Norris)

Mr. Norris reminded the Board we had a goal of adding two members (increasing from seven to nine), and filling another seat from an earlier resignation – so filling three seats total, to be done with an eye toward increased diversity and a broader skill set.

Mr. Meneses shared that he and Dr. Vann-Hamilton spent a great deal of time with both of the following candidates. Both feel strongly about their mission-alignment, community involvement, and that they each can add value to the school and the Board. Mr. Meneses thus moved forward with a recommendation that the Board vote to extend membership to both Anthony and Jim.

Mr. Norris affirmed that both of these seats would be effective today and for a term of three years. The remaining ninth seat (still to be filled) would fill out the remainder of Ms. Ellis Johnson's term.

- a. Review & Consideration of Jim MacDonald for appointment to the Board of Directors of CWC Kansas City

Mr. Meneses moved to approve the nomination and vote on adding Mr. Jim MacDonald as a Director of CWCKC. Mr. Littrell seconded the motion. The board unanimously approved the motion with none abstaining, and Mr. MacDonald was welcomed to the Board.

- b. Review & Consideration of Anthony Sealey for appointment to the Board of Directors of CWC Kansas City

Mr. Meneses moved to approve the nomination and vote on adding Mr. Anthony Sealey as a Director of CWCKC. Mr. Norris seconded the motion. The board unanimously approved the motion with none abstaining, and Mr. Sealey was welcomed to the Board.

## 11. Adjourn

Mr. Norris advised the Board that the July monthly meeting was not a typical, regular Board meeting, but rather a lengthier working retreat. Additionally, there may be a possibility of calling a special board meeting to approve a recommendation to fill the last remaining board seat.

Dr. Vann-Hamilton gave a motion to adjourn and Mr. Meneses provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining. The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 pm.

[/rb]