



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

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7268455026>
Passcode: 225236

Join by Phone:
(301) 715-8592 | Meeting ID: 726 845 5026
Passcode: 225236

Date: Thursday, October 15th, 2020, 5:30pm

Proposed Minutes

1. Call to Order

Mr. Norris called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

Mr. Norris welcomed the members of the public in attendance and gave an overview of the meeting order.

2. Roll Call by Board Chair

Mr. Norris proceeded with roll call.

Present:

Ms. Tonia Gilbert
Mr. Jacob Littrell
Mr. Jim MacDonald
Mr. Miguel Meneses
Mr. Derrick Nelson (7:15 pm)
Mr. Luke Norris
Mr. Jeff Phillips
Ms. Maria Salcedo
Mrs. Johna Sutton

Absent:

Mr. Norris determined that with 8 of 9 (later 9 of 9) Board Members present, a quorum is established for purposes of holding the meeting and voting.

3. Review & Consideration of Proposed Agenda

Mr. Norris proposed to recognize Mrs. Furlong (CWC Schools) and add a discussion agenda item with her, following the Monthly Finance Report (#7).

Mr. Phillips moved to approve the agenda as modified and Mr. Littrell provided a second to the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

4. Public Comments

Mr. Norris introduced himself, thanked the public on the call, and provided an overview of the public comment process and guidelines. Mr. Norris then invited public comment.

Mr. Tovar (CWC Staff) provided feedback on his perspective as a faculty member and encouraged the Board to lean on the data regarding a gating criteria decision.

Ms. Lindemann (parent of CWC student) seconded Mr. Tovar's comments and encouraged the Board to ensure a science-based approach regarding a gating criteria decision.

Ms. Byrd (parent of CWC student) agreed with both prior comments, and also provided feedback that the remote environment requires a high level of parent interaction and encouraged the school to seek additional ways to teach "live" and interact socially with peers.

Ms. Gronquist-Blodgett (parent of CWC student) echoed the prior comments, and also provided feedback that a hybrid model places a high demand on faculty and does not deliver the "same" in-person quality of education. Providing a choice for some parents discards faculty and may hurt those families who are not able to come.

5. Review & Consideration of minutes from the September 17th, 2020 regular meeting of the Board

The Board did not have any comments regarding the proposed minutes from the September 17th, 2020 Regular Meeting of the Board.

Mr. Phillips moved to approve the minutes as proposed and Ms. Gilbert provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

6. Review & Consideration of minutes from the October 9th, 2020 special meeting of the Board

The Board did not have any comments regarding the proposed minutes from the October 9th, 2020 Regular Meeting of the Board.

Mr. Meneses moved to approve the minutes as proposed and Mrs. Sutton provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

7. Monthly Finance Report (Mr. Jeff Phillips)

a. Finance Committee Report

Mr. Phillips began his presentation by pointing out the school's current cash position is lower than at the beginning of the year, which is expected and usual. Looking at year-to-date revenues and expenses, revenues are totaling \$1.2m compared to a \$1.3m budget. Revenues are ahead on the

local portion and behind on the state funding. The school's year-to-date net income is (-\$240k), compared to a (-\$390k) budgeted amount. Annual revenue is now forecasted at \$6.5m, off from the original forecast of \$6.9m, with the difference attributable to the current state funding gap. Expenses are forecasted close to budget. Overall, the current annual forecast is for an operating loss of (-\$88k), plus repayment of the \$250k CWCS loan, resulting in an ending (-\$338k) cash position.

Mr. Phillips further highlighted that:

- The school has experienced costs that were not budgeted due to the pandemic. Some of these costs have been specifically matched by additional revenue; some have not. School leadership continues to seek further funding.
- State funding continues to be biggest variable for ongoing budget work. It is difficult to do any forecasting. For example, while the school originally budgeted for a 6% state funding cut, every month since August has been dramatically less and rolled forward to next month, resulting in only receiving 83% of expected state revenue year to date.
- ADA is still a significant variable as the school considers what learning environment best fits our community needs, and that in turn dictates the state funding model.
- The school is in a unique environment amongst charters as Citizens does not have the "prior year ADA" safety net due to the school's student population growth.

Mr. Phillips underscored that the Board needs to discuss which variables are currently in play and how the Board can manage expenses should those variables play out.

Mr. Littrell asked for clarification on what budget shortfalls are directly tied to covid. Mr. Hile responded that first, additional expenses are being realized (additional technology and ongoing costs, additional materials and supplies to support remote learning) and moreover, on the revenue side; if the school sees an attendance decrease in-person, it will have significant impact on decreased revenue.

Mr. Meneses asked if, excluding covid, the school would be on target? Mr. Hile affirmed that the school would be in a different position without the covid impact and would be well-positioned.

b. Review & Consideration of Monthly Financials (September 2020), including Check Register

Mr. Phillips presented the September check register; the Board had no comments.

Mrs. Sutton moved to approve the check register as proposed and Ms. Gilbert provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

8. Discussion with CWC Schools (Mrs. Furlong, CWC Schools)

Mrs. Furlong introduced Mr. Hodgson (CWC Schools) in the meeting as well. Mrs. Furlong reminded the Board that in July 2019, the Board indicated to CWCS some potential changes to the upcoming licensing/affiliation agreement and CWCS received those in March 2020. She reflected that a shared understanding allowed all parties to approach the agreement through the lens of what is best for students, from an equity lens;, and in alignment with the Citizens' learning model. She shared that CWCS was committed to being open to feedback and making adjustments together and is supportive of the path laid out in the school's charter renewal application.

Mr. Littrell asked, in light of the Board considering both the school's charter renewal application and the revised licensing/affiliation renewal tonight, for clarity on how CWCS has made investments in growing CWCS' staff to support CWCKC, CWCLA, and the new CWC Cincinnati? Mrs. Furlong replied that CWC Cincinnati's Executive Director is on board and already leading, which is a change from prior regional openings which frees up other staff capacity and CWCS has brought on additional support onto their program team.

Mr. Meneses asked if CWCS has the capacity to stay within the goals of support outlined in the agreement? Mrs. Furlong affirmed that yes, CWCS has the capacity to support as well as be flexible and adaptable to the support needed.

Mr. Phillips asked if Mrs. Furlong could give insight on CWCS' revenue streams – fees versus grants? What financial support does CWCS have that can ensure CWCS can deliver on these promises? Mrs. Furlong replied that Ms. Rodriguez (CWC Schools) can provide the specifics, but CWCS has been intentional on shifting their financial focus away from the ebb and flow of philanthropic donations.

Mr. Littrell asked who at CWCS has the accountability to ensure a successful partnership? Mrs. Furlong replied that the entire team does. Her role is built into the agreement as a "liaison," but there is a need for every CWCS staff member available and leaning in to support each region.

Mrs. Sutton asked if CWCS has a plan on how to strategically support CWCKC's equity priorities? Mrs. Furlong replied that should be in the strategic plan. There is not just one support lever – it encompasses Professional Development, an evidence approach to learning, a strong teacher observation/feedback cycle, clear curriculum assessment, a codified academic mission. Mrs. Sutton followed up and asked how specifically, does CWCS see themselves as support in each of those areas? Mrs. Furlong replied that the CWCS team pushes in on each of those. Mrs. Sutton asked what "support" means to CWCS? Mrs. Furlong answered that CWCS outlines supports in nine areas (detailed in the licensing agreement) on what is CWCS' value add, especially given regional autonomy. In essence, CWCS provides the learning model and regional leadership is responsible for designing the implementation model.

Ms. Salcedo asked if CWCS was planning to be present next week with MCPSC? Mrs. Furlong affirmed she would be, along with Ms. Rodriguez and Ms. Kerr (CWC Schools).

Mr. Norris asked for clarification on CWCS providing a model, but not an academic framework – especially in light of subgroup performance (BAA) in CWCLA is also lower than our goal. How can the Board be confident in CWCS' interventions? Mrs. Furlong replied that subgroup performance is a challenge no one has figured out across the country. CWCS' model is to develop a framework and provide assessment assistance.

Mr. Norris also stated that, in the past, CWCS provided a curriculum and asked what changed? Is CWCS not leaning in on creating curriculum or are regions responsible for creating, developing, and refining curricula? Mrs. Furlong replied that CWCS does not provide curriculum; Citizens schools are project-based with a constructivist model and CWCS provides a list of recommended curricula that fits within that. Additionally, CWCS suggests instructional practices such as differentiated approaches and a gradual release of responsibility.

Mr. Hile asked if CWCS has capacity and knowledge to support a curriculum audit? Mrs. Furlong replied that CWCS is happy to support, but cannot drive an audit.

Mr. Norris asked since Mr. Hodgson is the only remaining CWCS staff from 5 years ago, what is CWCS doing to focus on employee retention/attrition and what assurances does the Board have that commitments made today will be followed through on? Mrs. Furlong replied that CWCS has an internal focus on professional development and growth and that has been exemplified through internal promotions.

9. Executive Director's Report (Mr. Jon Hile)

Mr. Hile thanked both Mrs. Furlong and Mr. Hodgson for their support and work in reviewing the renewal document and preparing the team.

a. School Dashboard Review

Mr. Hile presented the school dashboard.

The Enrollment/Demographics section shows enrollment holding steady just above 530, which is a growth in enrollment from Day 1. He also highlighted the school's FRL population is trending above the 50% goal.

The Student Engagement/Achievement/Growth section reflects the virtual learning engagement (3-2-1) goals. Mr. Hile applauded Mrs. Gripp's Middle School staff in building a system that works for students and parents. He presented baseline IXL data, which is tracking the percentage of students at/above grade level as well as tracking the percentage of students completing the diagnostic. Mr. Norris also requested IXL data be presented by sub-group as well.

Mr. Hile presented Student Mobility & Fund-Raising year-to-date data.

Mr. Littrell asked if the school has specific goals on student engagement? Mr. Hile replied that the "reach goal" is each engagement percentage at 90% and the standard goal at 80%. He underscored that, in a virtual learning environment, DESE will allot funding based on "course completion."

Mr. Littrell asked how the IXL interface looks so that school staff can track growth and achievement? Dr. Droege replied that there are two components: a diagnostic and a practice/mastery. The strong benefit is that staff can track week-to-week growth, not just a few datapoints throughout the year, which allows faculty to be very reactive. Her goals are 60% of students on/above grade level by May diagnostic and 60% of students demonstrate a full year of growth by May diagnostic. She also discussed the faculty data team that reviews this data weekly and specifically provides support to grade-level teams.

Mr. Nelson joined at 7:15 p.m.

b. Review of covid Gating Criteria

Mr. Hile reminded the Board that during the September meeting, the Board directed Mr. Hile to revisit and examine the gating criteria and financial impacts.

He also reminded the Board of the current approved gating criteria:

- Full Remote: positive test rate in KCMO is greater than 5% and new cases in the community are not declining.

- Remote Plus: positive test rate in KCMO is less than 5% and new cases in the community have declined for 14 days
- Hybrid Reopen: positive test rate in KCMO is less than 4.5% and new cases in the community have declined for 21 days.
- Limited Reopen: positive test rate in KCMO is less than 3.5% and new cases in the community have declined for 28 days

And the cadence of data analysis for decision making:

- Decision on October 29 for November 16 – December 31
- Decision on December 10 for January 1 – February 5
- Decision on January 21 for February 8 – March 26
- Decision on March 11 for April 5 – May 25

Mr. Hile shared that he has begun using the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) dashboard, who has given leadership in the tracking and school gating criteria over the past month. He recapped that each data point has increased over the past month (from September 14 to 21 to 28 to October 5):

- Positive Test Rate: 7.96 – 9.03 – 9.40 – 9.60
- Average Cases/14 Days: 1070 – 1280 – 1417 – 1450
- Average Cases/100k People: 218 – 260 – 288 – 295

Mr. Hile also confirmed that he has worked in collaboration with other charter school leaders with the Health Department. He shared that KCHD has yet to make any edits to their recommendations formally but has shared that they are comfortable with the Jackson County HD and MARC standards. MARC has been working to develop standardized gating criteria and has shared recommendations on their website.

Mr. Hile also asked them to confirm their reasoning behind moving away from 5% positivity as a key threshold. KCHD stated that they have neither the tests nor capacity to test enough asymptomatic individuals, which means they are testing more symptomatic individuals, which artificially increases the positivity rate. Therefore, given this environment, a 10% positivity rate threshold is in line with their original intent.

Additionally, looking at zip code data within the CWCKC catchment area, KCHD is reporting that all 19 zip codes are over 5%, 7 zip codes are over 10%, and 5 zip codes are over 15%.

Mr. Hile reported that KCHD (through MARC) is recommending the following thresholds as school gating criteria for reopening in Red-Yellow-Green status:

- Average Cases/100k People/14 days: >200 – 51-200 – <50
- Trend in Cases/100K People/28 days: Increasing – Steady – Decreasing
- Positive Test Rate: >10% - 5-10% - <5%
- Additional best practices in mitigation in place

Mr. Hile also reported on results from an internal staff survey (51 responses received; almost all)

- High percentage of staff (76%) believes it is best to follow the existing, established gating criteria.
- If the school reopens in January, 48% are ready to come back, 33% would request/prefer an accommodation, and 18% would not return.

Mr. Hile also reminded the Board of the finance impact scenarios (cut/paste last month).

- Scenario 1: Moving enrollment from 533 (budgeted) to 520 (actual): (-\$92k)
- Scenario 2: Enrollment = 520, Attrition = 3.5%, Attendance = 85% = (-\$373k)
- Scenario 3: Enrollment = 520, Attrition = 3.5%, Attendance = 80% = (-\$574k)
- Scenario 4: Enrollment = 520, Attrition = 6.5%, Attendance = 92% = (-\$207k)
- Scenario 5: Enrollment = 520, Attrition = 6.5%, Attendance = 85% = (-\$479k)
- Scenario 6: Enrollment = 520, Attrition = 6.5%, Attendance = 80% = (-\$674k)

Due to funding fluctuations and uncertainty in different learning environments, EdOps strongly encouraged the school to exercise caution about returning to in-person before semester end. Mr. Hile and EdOps are still working with DESE to obtain clarity if the learning environment method can be split throughout the year, meaning if the school is able to “book” the first semester, those financial impacts would be mitigated.

Mr. Hile then reported on results from a current family survey (367 respondents):

- 50% of families are “(not) able to manage the stress of facilitating my child(ren)’s learning at home.”
- 39% would like to immediately send children back to school.
- 13% would like to send children back to school after Winter Break.
- 48% would like to wait until there is lower virus spread and/or a vaccine.

- For K-2 grades: 41% are ready to return now; 57% return at semester or later
- For 3-5 grades: 42% are ready to return now; 50% return at semester or later
- For 6-7 grades: 17% are ready to return now; 83% return at semester or later

- For children of color: 38% are ready to return now; 62% return at semester or later
- For children who are white: 42% are ready to return now; 58% return at semester or later

- For FRL eligible students: 44% are ready to return now; 56% return at semester or later
- For non-FRL eligible students : 37% are ready to return now; 63% return at semester or later

Mr. Hile then submitted a recommendation to adopt the following revised gating criteria, focused on 3 variables:

- Remote: >200 cases/100K // >10% Positivity Rate // Increasing 14 average of new cases
- Remote Plus: 51-200 cases/100K // 8-10% Positivity Rate // Increasing or Steady 14 average of new cases
- Hybrid: 51-200 cases/100K // <8% Positivity Rate // Steady or Decreasing 14 average of new cases

- Additionally report to the Board at the November meeting with a return-to-school plan
- Continue monitoring health data and, if allowable, engage remote plus as soon as conditions allow.

Mr. Hile confirmed that the school would still currently fall squarely in the "Remote" phase, even with the revised criteria. Therefore, the school would stay in Remote learning and try to move forward with Remote Plus as soon as it is possible. School staff will come to the November meeting with a January reopen plan.

Mr. Norris thanked Mr. Hile for his research, presentation, and recommendation. He opened the floor for Board discussion, with the request that each Board member in turn will have the opportunity to make up to three minutes of remarks or ask 1-2 questions.

Ms. Salcedo asked Mr. Hile to clarify his recommendation. Mr. Hile restated his recommendation that the Board adopt new criteria that is more closely aligned with Jackson County Health Department, stay in Remote status while working toward Remote Plus and planning for Hybrid.

Mr. Norris asked how the phase be determined, on 2/3 of those variables? Mr. Hile agreed.

Ms. Salcedo asked Mr. Hile to clarify timing. Mr. Hile responded to move to Remote Plus as soon as conditions allow and Hybrid in January, if conditions allow, and otherwise follow the original cadence for decision making.

Mr. Nelson stated that, based on information Mr. Hile shared and the timing of upcoming holidays, he agrees with the recommendation to hold off on hybrid until at least January.

Mr. Phillips stated that he agrees with the recommended change to the gating criteria. He asked if, in the charter school meeting space, have other schools shared parent survey results? Mr. Hile responded that very few other schools have completed a parent survey, but sentiment is many schools are in alignment with targeting remaining remote at least through the first semester.

Mr. Meneses stated that the school does not have resources that other organizations do; how comfortable does Mr. Hile feel if the school opened in January to be prepared building-wise? Mr. Hile replied that he feels good from a building and supply standpoint, but his primary worry is what happens when a teacher gets sick; substitutes are at a premium, so the major focus is on a staff plan. Operations is good; Human Capital is the major challenge and specific focus.

Ms. Gilbert thanked Mr. Hile and the leadership team. She encouraged Mr. Hile to look to the health department for mask donations and encouraged school staff to look to state-level CARES funding for childcare.

Mr. MacDonald shared that he supports the recommendation and expressed appreciation for how well-reasoned it was and the thought that went into it.

Mr. Littrell acknowledged that it was a big ask to pull this data together in the midst of charter renewal, but it was exactly what the Board was looking for and needing. He asked where MARC is pulling their data from? Mr. Hile replied that MARC is a collaboration of local jurisdictions; they are pulling data from the "Core 4" (Jackson, Platte, Wyandotte, Johnson) counties as well as non-KC Jackson County and the KC Health Dept. Mr. Littrell asked if MARC ties their red/yellow/green zones to specific reopening recommendations? Mr. Hile affirmed they do, in a very similar way to the school's with the exception that MARC's "yellow zone" specifically equates to reopening for younger students.

Mr. Littrell stated that he would like to consider revising "Remote Plus" to include bringing younger grade levels back. Mr. Hile replied that he is wanting to avoid a scenario where the school is pulling kids in and out of in-person; there has been variability in the positivity rate and below 8% would provide stability. Remote Plus would focus on Special Education students first, but also focus on providing informal groups for social interaction. Mr. Littrell encouraged continued pursuit of that. Mr. Littrell also asked for confirmation that Hybrid will still support an option for parents to continue in a virtual-only model. Mr. Hile affirmed that it would, with the clear need that the leadership team will need to develop plans for how to staff and support that.

Mr. Littrell asked to revisit the financial impact, specifically asking what is important about completing the whole semester? Mr. Hile replied that he has asked DESE to fund the first semester in a "virtual-only" funding and lock it in. The concern is a hybrid model (2 days/week, which results in approximately 40 in-person days/semester) has the potential to count one student absence 4x as severe, which would mean a lower funding allocation. Mr. Littrell further shared his thoughts as a struggling Board member and reiterated his belief in in-person learning.

Mrs. Sutton clarified that this decision is specifically about approving the criteria; these are data points in order to make a decision. She encouraged more definition of what each phase encompasses and encouraged pointed thought on what supports will be given to faculty in hybrid.

Mr. Norris asked Mr. Littrell if his recommendation is to modify gating criteria or to disregard the criteria and move forward with opening? Mr. Littrell responded that he would like to revise the criteria to more closely align with younger students in-person. Mr. Norris asked him the timing of that revision; Mr. Littrell replied that, due to the financial challenges, supportive of remote through the semester, but would like to evaluate in-person in January.

Mr. Norris asked Mr. Hile his response to Mr. Littrell's thoughts. Mr. Hile replied that his recommendation is any return to hybrid wait until January due to a needed ramp-up period and considering the financial risk. Additionally, 8% up to 10% opens the school up to the risk of moving students in and out of in-person learning more frequently.

Mr. Norris summarized that two or more of the criteria would cause the school to act in the conservative and consideration should be given to the financial risk and mitigated to the 2nd semester.

Mr. Littrell moved to approve the revised gating criteria as proposed, to prioritize the decision in the conservative if 2 or more of the criteria are present, to remain in Remote learning at least through December, receive an update on an in-person plan at the November meeting, and make a decision for January in-person learning at the December meeting; Mr. Nelson provided a second. Mr. Norris called for a roll-call vote, as follows:

Ms. Salcedo	Aye
Mr. Nelson	Aye
Mr. Phillips	Aye
Ms. Gilbert	Aye
Mrs. Sutton	Aye
Mr. Littrell	Aye
Mr. MacDonald	Aye
Mr. Meneses	Aye
Mr. Norris	Aye

The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

Mr. Norris asked that, in order to respecting time for Counsel on the call, that the Board move Closed Session forward to the next agenda item.

10. Closed Session

Pursuant to § 610.021(12) and (13) RSMo, the Board of Directors of CWC Kansas City will enter into closed session to discuss matters related to contracts and personnel records.

Mr. Norris expressed gratitude to the Board, school staff, and members of the public remaining in the meeting. Mr. Norris Invited Mr. Hile into Closed Session.

Mr. Nelson moved to go into Closed Session and Mr. Phillips provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

11. Return from Closed Session; report on any action taken as required.

Mr. Norris welcomed members of the public back into Open Session and reported that discussion related to contracts. No actions were taken that require reporting.

12. Board Action Items

a. Charter Renewal Submission

Mr. Norris expressed gratitude to Mr. Hile, Dr. Droege, and the entire academic leadership team for their work in preparing the renewal documents. He also expressed gratefulness to the Board for their continued service and their assistance throughout the renewal process. Mr. Norris asked Mr. Hile for his recommendation to accept. Mr. Hile confirmed that he recommends that the Board accept this renewal document and move forward with submission.

Mrs. Salcedo moved to approve the Charter Renewal Submission; Mr. MacDonald provided a second. Mr. Norris called for a roll-call vote, as follows:

<i>Ms. Salcedo</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Nelson</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Phillips</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Littrell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Meneses</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Ms. Gilbert</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. MacDonald</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mrs. Sutton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Mr. Norris</i>	<i>Aye</i>

The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

b. CWCS Licensing & Affiliation Contract Approval

Mr. Norris summarized that the Licensing & Affiliation renewal re-confirms a 5-year partnership with CWC Schools, with notable changes being a change that the Board manages the Executive Director and a change in the dues structure (license, trademarks, services). He also noted that the Board did receive legal counsel through the process.

Mr. MacDonald moved to approve the Licensing & Affiliation renewal; Mrs. Sutton provided a second. Mr. Norris called for a roll-call vote, as follows:

Ms. Salcedo	Nay (noted strong)
Mr. Nelson	Aye
Mr. Phillips	Aye
Mr. Littrell	Aye
Mr. Meneses	Aye
Mr. MacDonald	Aye
Mrs. Sutton	Aye
Ms. Gilbert	Aye
Mr. Norris	Aye

The motion was approved 8-1 with none abstaining.

13. Board Business & Committee Reports

a. Governance Committee (Ms. Maria Salcedo)

i. Proposed Resolution on Board Training

Ms. Salcedo reported that the Committee is looking at working with a training consultant and reiterated a commitment to ongoing training as evidence of fiduciary responsibility. She asked for a motion to approve scheduling this training.

Mrs. Sutton moved to approve this Board training and Mr. Meneses provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

ii. Proposed Resolution on Attendance Tracking Best Practices

Ms. Salcedo shared that MCPSC encouraged the Board to adopt a resolution on attendance tracking, specifically that the Board must ensure appropriate attendance audits are undertaken and the annual audit includes attendance audit provisions.

Ms. Phillips moved to approve this resolution and Mr. Nelson provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining.

b. Academic Excellence Committee (Mrs. Johna Sutton)

Mrs. Sutton deferred her Committee report this month.

c. Diversity Committee (Mr. Miguel Meneses & Mr. Derrick Nelson)

Mr. Meneses confirmed that work continues on a DEI dashboard and deferred further report.

Mr. Hile reminded the Board that there will be a Board interview next Tuesday in relation to the charter renewal process. Mr. Norris and Mr. Hile are working on a document broken out by topic to provide talking points. He asked the Board to please make every effort to be at the Commission meeting on Tuesday. Mr. Norris reminded the Board that during the virtual hearing, the Board will need to be engaged for both hours, but most especially the second half.

Mr. Durphy offered his services to the Board for training and governance and he underscored the importance of the attendance audit.

Ms. Salcedo also stated that as a Board member and as the Chair of Governance Committee she wanted to be clear she wants to continue the partnership with CWCS, but her "strong nay" vote is reflective of her frustration with the negotiation process that started in October 2019.

2. Adjourn

Mr. Phillips moved to adjourn and Mr. Nelson provided a second. The motion was unanimously approved with none abstaining. The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 pm.

[/rb]