



RMAE Board of Directors MINUTES

Date: 09-12-13 6:30pm

LOCATION: Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen, Admin Building, Evergreen, CO

Meeting Minutes

Document Revision: October 9, 2013

Document Approval: October 10, 2013

Call to Order at: 6:38 PM

BOD Members in Attendance:

Ned Parker, President
Aaron Lessig, Vice President
Thomas Seybold, Treasurer
Dana Price, Secretary
Bob Fiore, Parent Representative
Jamie Price, Parent Representative
Seth Anderson, Parent Representative
Kristen LaJoy, Community Representative
Dan Cohen, Director

Others in Attendance:

Alan Scheik, Gina Coco, Nancy Fiore, Mitch Goldenberg, Tim Lane, Drew Schnieder, Steve Campbell, Martha Weeks Green, Kelly Breuer, Rosanne Jalbert, Christine Schoen, Emily Smit, Kristi Hintz, Christopher Hintz, Kate Collier, Phyllis Adams, Mona Vick, Shawwna Jermano, Sharon Hughes, Ingrid Palmer, Barb Street, Pam Rohal, Deb MacPhee, Len MacPhee, Frances Vaughn, Kasity Briley, Tamara Stoltz, John Morrill, Tony Bryant, Rachel Smith, Julie Ann Courim, Jamie Brand, Ann Hushen, Karen Hines, Jackie Mohr, Jan Douglas, Jen Goslau, Krista Emrich, Melissa Nease, Annie Hunter, Beth Mathis, Ann Fowler, Kirsten Hennessy, Karen Garbarek, Laurie Shields, Angela Hensiek, Courtney Maxwell, Jeanne Schneider, Dina Walton, Kelli Anderson & Tami Courtney

Reading of Vision & Mission Statements

Public Comment

Ned welcomed to crowd and set the tone for the many expected public comments:

- RMAE Board Policy Manual [Policy 2.5 – Public Attendance at Board Meetings, (d)]: Although the board wishes to encourage everyone to attend its open meetings, it must be remembered that board meetings are conducted to carry on the business of the school. Board meetings are not “public meetings”, but meetings held in public, and accordingly public participation must be controlled and limited to the “Public Comment” section of the agenda so that the board can deal with its agenda within a reasonable time.
- Board bylaws [Article IV. Meeting of the RMAE Board, (H)(1), (2), and (3)] do not allow spontaneous “Public Comment” to be a two-way communication.
- Comments should be respectful and limited to 3-minutes per person.
- Comments regarding AAA and the MS Math report will be given after the AAA report (see below).

Ned began with a short story: Last Spring, a slick, wet snow storm hit campus during morning drop off. Two parents saw the opportunity to help. One grabbed a snow shovel and started clearing a path. The other grabbed the snow plow driver and cussed him out. That driver will not bid for snow removal this year because he can't handle the liability associated with our involved parents. We at RMAE truly appreciate parent help and want you to be involved. However, please lower your voices and pick up a shovel.

Consideration of Consent Agenda:

- Board of Directors (BOD) meeting Minutes from 8 August 2013

Motion: Christine made the motion to accept the minutes, Aaron seconded.

Discussion: None

Vote: 9-0 approval

Committee Reports:

AAA: Gina reported for AAA. She handed out a bound document entitled “2013 TCAP Results and Math Improvement Program History”, approximately 120 pages long [A bound copy of this report with exhibits is located in Administration office for review]. The Board questioned why this had not been provided several days before the meeting for our review. Gina was asked if this document had been approved by AAA. She stated that AAA does not formally approve documents to be given to the Board, that this material had been developed and reviewed by AAA over the last two years. Kristen asked if we were going through the entire packet. Gina answered no, but the Board has the documentation to review at their pace.

Gina read a prepared statement included within the AAA document, stepping through the Math Improvement Program History and referencing each individual figure/table within the report. Ned interrupted her after about 18 minutes, noting that she had used a proportionate amount of time considering the other committee reports to be delivered tonight. Gina tried to speed up her delivery.

Gina summarized her personal history of a passion for education and change in perspective toward math caused by key teachers and local school policies. At RMAE, she found the math program lacking in opportunities and plans to accommodate advanced learners. After effort, RMAE allowed exceptional students to learn math with the grade above. During her in-class volunteering, she found some students lacking fundamentals being pushed into topics beyond their current abilities.

AAA reviewed TCAP scores; Gina found middle school math scores far below what would be acceptable, especially at a charter school. The Director offered the following reasons:

- Core knowledge math curriculum teaches at a certain pace and topic order and that the standardized tests were geared toward a different public school math curriculum.
- RMAE kids were years ahead in math and that made them score lower on the tests. They had learned the topics but not freshly reviewed them before taking the TCAP.

AAA researched to either prove or disprove the premise that our TCAP scores were suffering because of advanced learning and/or core knowledge. AAA found that “many” parents complained that their children were not prepared for math in high school. The Director told Gina that was not the case. AAA contacted Greg Carver, the head of the math department at Evergreen High School and poled a sample of “similar” core-knowledge charter schools, finding best practices to be:

1. Daily math
2. Leveling in math, most successful schools leveled all the way down to Kindergarten.
3. Regular testing, like NWEA, was used to continually decide how to teach each class
4. Math teachers were teaching 5-7 classes per day, as opposed to our 4 per day, better utilizing their teaching resources.
5. Saxon math or Singapore math was the curriculum used.
6. Though there was a goal of all students taking Algebra 1 in 8th grade, most schools had 40-60% of students hitting this goal and the schools felt that meeting them where they were was more important.
7. No other school was attempting to go through 2 courses in one year, which is what RMAE was doing in 6th grade in order to get all the kids to Algebra in 8th grade. Most of the successful schools were starting a year ahead or allowing many kids to move a year ahead as early as Kindergarten.

Other evidence for daily math was cited from Jefferson Academy and EMS. AAA concluded that RMAE’s lack of daily math and leveling are the keys to our poor TCAP scores rather than anything to do with Core Knowledge or advanced students.

Per Gina, the Director and the MS coordinator argued that daily math was impossible due to scheduling issues, coordinating subjects into blocks, and lack of resources at RMAE. After much hard

work, Gina presented several working schedules, only to be given yet another “reason” it wouldn’t work. She suspected various motivations and personality conflicts behind this resistance.

The math subcommittee reported to AAA, who subsequently recommend to the Board to implement a daily math schedule and level math in grades 6-8. The Board accepted this recommendation, passed a motion, and integrated it into the Director Objectives for the 2013-2014 academic year.

To prepare for leveling, the staff administered diagnostic placement tests to RMAE students in the spring of 2013. The Director did not group students by ability over the summer, choosing to wait for a second placement test at the beginning of the school year to capture the current student body and abilities. AAA warned that planning was imperative for program success.

At the August Board meeting, the Director stated that, in a compromise, middle school would not have daily math and instead implement math 4 days a week. Gina expressed a strong opinion that the Director acted unilaterally and violated a Board-approved directive. In this and hiring a new MS math teacher without AAA parent input, she felt that RMAE had moved far away from our original Charter and explicit parental involvement.

For 2013-2014, the Director stated that 5 & 6th grade would level. 7th grade will teach two sections of Pre-Algebra, grouped and paced by ability. 8th grade will now teach two sections of Algebra, grouped and paced by ability, with the lower group potentially significantly reviewing Pre-Algebra. Exceptional student (either end of the spectrum) can receive breakout instruction from Helen.

Gina protested that this arrangement does not meet the Board directive for daily math or math leveling. She feels AAA is being ignored. AAA parent representatives no longer want to continue with AAA unless major and decisive action is taken by the Board. AAA is an inherent right to Charter schools that requires parent involvement.

Jamie asked if the Board could respond before we went to public comment. Ned said there would be a limited rebuttal. Tom asked Gina a question regarding a vote taken by the BOD in August about teaching 5 blocks of Math over 4 days, the way it was explained to the BOD at that time was that the request in the Spring was to teach the 5 blocks not necessarily over 5 days.

Dan clarified by stating it was definitely requested every day. Whether you do it 3, 4 or 5 days a week they are still taking the standard 200 minutes of Math, the issue is the effectiveness of those 200 minutes over 5 days versus 3 or 4.

Gina stated that in February the motion was made and passed by the BOD that Math would be taught every day and in June the directive was given again to do the daily Math. In August, the Director notified the Board and AAA that it couldn’t be done because of a scheduling issue. According to the BOD Manual, in order to undo a previous motion, a 75% vote by the BOD needs to take place. [The Bylaws of Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen, Revised 7.20.2011, do not contain this requirement. The Rocky Mountain Academy Board Policy Manual, Revised 7/20/11, Policy 2.7- Policy Making, mentions a 3/4ths vote but only in relation to reversing a previously approved policy, not a general motion. Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised does stipulate a 2/3 majority vote to rescind, repeal, annul or amend a previously adopted motion in most cases.]

Ned looked up the August BOD minutes and during the discussion at the time, he had asked about the financial implications of every day math. He tried to clarify the motion to direct the Director to implement the change within available budget constraints, but this was not recorded in the minutes. The Board stands by the motion as recorded.

Gina stated AAA didn’t ask for any additional dollars or staff. It is strictly a scheduling issue and utilizing the same staff and budget we have. Other schools are teaching 5-7 sections and have the same budget we have.

Ned acknowledges that Gina has said she can make the schedule work, but it comes down to Dan and the staff to make the schedule work in an effective and beneficial manner. The BOD has to abdicate & trust Dan to make the best decision possible.

Gina put all the limitations to the schedule in the documents, which she received from Carrie Quinn. The question is whether or not Math becomes a priority for MS.

Bob is very aware that we went to 4 days as opposed to 5. He thought it was a good compromise to move in the right direction. Need to trust Dan and the administration to take what they are directed and do the best they can with all other considerations. There is a level of trust. AAA makes recommendations to the BOD, but the BOD facilitates, instructs and directs. With regards to AAA forcing an issue, everything goes through the BOD and Bob wanted to make that clear for those at the meeting.

Ned said there was not a formal vote taken during the August meeting.

Aaron asked if there was anything else approved during the February meeting. Gina responded yes, Math leveling and that Helen was behind doing leveling as well.

Public Comment:

Kelly Weist – She sat on AAA for 3 years & wanted to expand on some history. We did have 4 Math curriculums in 5 years. We changed curriculums ultimately on a motion from the AAA committee to the BOD moving from Investigations, which JeffCo is based on. The committee headed by Nancy Fiore chose the MacMillan Math. Our kids have had 4 years with the new Math. There is no surprise that some of our students are behind due to changing staff members & scheduling constraints. Yes, we are lower in Math than we should be and the committee should be investigating why. However, it should not come at the expense of other subjects such as Science. My child is gifted in Science, the fact that he will not have as many labs this year is an issue for us. Science has been short-changed for years, but has not been addressed by AAA. Leveling, in and of itself is not a problem, but how it is implemented is the issue. We have not heard from AAA about their recommendations for implementing except that they disagree with the Director.

Kathy Grubb – has had children at RMAE for 11 years. We have had leveling in the past a lot. Look back at the TCAP scores from then and see if that is the magic bullet. When her son, Paul, was here, there was leveling. RMAE is small and when the groups were split into the high and the low, the social ramifications was just plain ugly. You need to look at the whole picture. It was one of the reasons leveling was stopped. Whenever my daughter found out which class she was in would come home and sob over it. I'm not saying this is a reason not to level. Just to say, "the TCAP is low and therefore we have to level" is short sighted. I went to AAA last May and I was treated very rudely. I went because I understood AAA wanted to level. As a parent I wanted the opportunity to give my opinion to the committee and was told very forcibly and rudely that my opinion didn't matter because leveling was going to happen this fall.

Sharon Hughes – I have been here since the school started and have seen the Math go back and forth and in my opinion it is a lot of wasted money. The school has limited resources and budgets and every time we turn around, someone's opinion is changing curriculum and it's not a teacher – it's a parent. Parents are coming up with the ideas to change curriculums and there goes more money down the drain. The leveling of Math devastated my daughter and because of that she still has problems with Math. I agree with Kelly, it's not all about Math. There is a whole lot of other things out there in the world of curriculum that matter as a whole. It doesn't have to be all about Math. If your child is gifted than do something with a tutor outside of school. It doesn't have to affect the whole school body because 1-10 parents want something different. Look at the whole picture. It's all about the grouping. I thought this charter school was about the grouping. We have topnotch teachers and the best Director we have ever had. I know there are parents that aren't happy because they went into Dan's office with a list of "I don't likes" and Dan told him no. He's backing up the teachers. The teachers are the ones who went to college and were taught to teach. No I'm not a full-fledged teacher, but I've been at this school long enough to have seen what's happened. To see some of the undercurrents. I don't like it. I'm getting tired of these undercurrents being hidden all of the time. He is not the first director to be brought under the gun. I'm here because of the children and because I support this guy. I refuse to see a hatchet brought down on him.

Jackie Mohr – Found out about this topic late this afternoon in an email. I sit on the Foundation and have been at the school for about 10 years. Wants to share her years at RMAE. Her daughter is a freshman at EHS where she is taking all honors, in Spanish 2, but it's too easy and they want to move her up to 3. Singing has been her sport, but this summer took volleyball and is now on the HS team. Lots of things are different in HS. She is not the naïve parent and is grateful for the RMAE experience as a whole. Her

daughter now has a hard time deciding what to wear to school because for the last 9 years she's worn a uniform.

Annie Hunter – Unfortunately with the AAA presentation, she tuned it all out. She asked the BOD what the purpose of the meeting was. Ned clarified that this was Public Comment and not the time for a two-way engagement. Ned explained how to request agenda items and where agendas are posted. Tom asked that another person speak if they were ready.

Martha Weeks Green – Wanted to concede that the AAA committee has put their heart and soul in what they have done. She understands what it is like to work so hard yet come up against a brick wall. She empathizes with the committee. With that said, she stated that at least one member should have been at back to school night when Mr. Koch was face to face with 25 pissed off parents that didn't understand that this change was happening. Dan was trying to cope also. This was a huge motivator for my son after going through the EMS program that he will take Algebra as a freshman. MS is an opportunity to learn the skills on how to organize themselves, the skills on dealing with their teachers, forming social groups, managing their time. Going forward, change is always painful. The minute reference about the letter that went home doesn't specifically say we are going to level Math. I think there is merit to what Gina is saying in her proposal, but we are behind the curve now and we are backfilling now.

Len MacPhee – They chose to move their children out of RMAE for a variety of reasons. A letter was passed on to the BOD. Ned acknowledged receiving it and forwarding it to the other BOD members. His wife served on AAA and saw a lot of conflict. It was not all generated by the parents who have been working very hard trying to do some very good things including the Math leveling and daily Math. We have experienced, unfortunate in my estimation, an undercurrent of discrediting those who are trying so hard to help. It's not just a one-way street; it's been going the other way, which has been very difficult for us. We chose to leave for those reasons and in addition to that we have found an erosion of what brought us to this school originally – traditional values, traditional Core Knowledge, accountability and discipline. There is less of that than when we started at this school 4 years ago. That is dangerous to the school. Charters are really important, they are a way for us to distinguish ourselves, to be different than the public schools, they are a way for educational choice to take place and I think that is going backwards. Deb stood up to continue Len comments. Ned told her she had a minute and a half to speak. Deb requested the BOD, "Ask yourselves why people come to a Charter." We respect the teachers, but wished the teachers respected us. If we wanted to be told to abdicate your authority as parents and outsource their education, I can get free transportation, a gym and auditorium at our public schools. Participating on the AAA committee put her in the line of fire because I wanted to see some improvement in some areas. Does a Justin Bieber fan club elective reflect a Core Knowledge, elevated curriculum? In that committee she was rebuffed. It was not an environment in which parent opinions were respected. She addressed Kathy Grubb to explain why leveling and daily Math would improve our scores. If kids are bullying each other, address the bullying. Ned told her at this time, her combined time of 3 minutes with Len was complete.

Gina, requesting to comment as a parent, said there are a lot of parents who aren't here because they were afraid to speak up. If you look up the 2010 and 2012 directory books to compare students, there is a 38% turnover of students. Nobody has that kind of turnover. A charter should have thousands on their waiting list and they don't lose parents. We can pretend there isn't a problem, but numbers don't lie. People are leaving silently. She knows there is a personal attack going on and what is happening, she is here because she wants the best for the school. She believes that Evergreen needs a Charter school and has doubts RMAE will continue if we don't get competitive with the local schools. In 5th grade, more than 10% of students have left. In the charter renewal, it specifically states we have to address MS math problems. We made that commitment to the district. We haven't done anything to fix it so here we are in the same place as we were in 2008. People are arguing to keep it the same. Why would people want their children to go into HS without the foundations they need and have to repeat Algebra again as a junior. This is from Greg Carver.

Christine Schoen – commented on the 38%. If students are leaving and others are coming in, are these numbers really true. If we followed kids who started in K and all the way up we may have some valid numbers.

Melissa Neace – parent of an 8th grader, prefaced with this is not a political comment. Her daughter came in 6th grade behind the gun in Math. With tutoring and help from teachers, she made a big commitment this summer and worked very hard. The first thing she heard was that she would be a remedial Math student even though she was not tested. She would love to see Math 5 days a week and leveling, but without doing current testing and accounting for summer school and tutoring you can't "ring a different bell." Very disappointed with the way it was handled. Set aside the emotional and power plays and figure out a better way to bring to students.

Ned called a close to Public Comment at this time.

Jamie wanted to ask a couple of questions of staff regarding this topic. He asked Dan or if the Math teacher was available. Can you explain what Math leveling is or is not, in your professional opinion, and the pros and cons and how effective it is in our school?

Dan stated he didn't think he could because it isn't as simple as that. And it would take significant time to cover things such as leveling as a practice versus at a school like this; what are the impacts to scheduling when you go 5 day and I don't want to dishonor the importance of it by trying to give you or these folks a feel for what takes more than 5 minutes to get a feel for.

Jamie wanted to get a general idea and will fill in the blanks as Dan explained.

Dan defined leveling as in the main a practice of saying, regardless of topic, you would have some sort of data that would show those students who are strong, at level or under that. You would move them into different classrooms for that topic so that their abilities would drive things such as pace of the class, depth of knowledge within the class. The proponent's side would say if you don't put a kid in Spanish 2 who is ready for Spanish 2, why would you put a kid in Algebra who isn't ready for Algebra? It would try to whittle things down into such a simplistic thing because we do what I just said all of the time. It is absurd to think that when a kid passes Spanish 1 they won't struggle in Spanish 2, it is absurd to think that when a kid passes Pre-algebra they won't struggle in Algebra. Again, it depends. You can go from putting kids in rooms based on ability. You can call those things different topics, same grade level. Same grade level one takes Algebra, one takes pre-algebra; 7th grade one takes Pre-Algebra, one takes a class that doesn't have a name because 6th grade Math is called 6th grade Math. I suppose this would be a more rigorous version of leveling. Folk weren't clear what we have done. We did take whatever data we did have and did give an assessment in the fall and placed kids into those two groups. My opinion for this school is that in rooms of 20-22 kids, even if you do what we have done now, which is to place them by ability, I expect the teacher to differentiate even in the higher end as well as the other end. We haven't done this and we are waiting to see how things play out. See how the pace goes and possibly move kids if necessary. Possibly conclude that we may need a truly different math class. We felt we didn't have enough evidence to start the year that way in any grade. They are placed in their rooms based on our perception of ability. The second thing you should know is that to be perfectly clear, a MS schedule is as critical to a MS success as scaffolding to a building. Scheduling has absolute effect on your MS, the culture of it. We never said it isn't possible, yes, it's possible, but I don't have time to tell how a schedule is critical to the middle years. The schedule that we put into place over the last 4 years would be 100% compromised. Let's be on the record that I spoke to the AAA chair about going from 5 to 4 day math before coming to the BOD.

Ned suggested we schedule a working session with the parents to discuss the importance of MS scheduling perhaps late September to October and it becomes an educational working session.

Ned skipped ahead to:

New Business:

The State of AAA:

Ned asked Gina if AAA still existed and who was on it. She stated yes, Angela Hensiek, Laurie Shields, 3 teachers, Dan and Marcy as the community rep even though she wasn't voted in. Nancy resigned because she was frustrated that things weren't being implemented and she tried to get words sent out to parents. Ned was under the impression that based on an email from Nancy the members of AAA had stopped functioning as a group, with most parents considering resignation.

Ned asked Deb if she was on AAA before she left the school, the answer was yes.

He asked if there were any governing documents. Nancy stated yes and that Ned had them. He requested to see from AAA a set of bylaws to show how you are having elections, what is the term of service, how do you select officers, what is your position relative to the BOD and staff and are you obeying open meeting laws? AAA is defined by the CDE and has to exist. Ned wants to see RMAE's implementation in writing. Nancy stated she does have those documents but Kelly Weist volunteered she did. AAA has to have a majority vote and then those suggestions are brought to the BOD for decisions. Ned would like to see AAA as a more documented entity.

Dina stated that if the BOD makes a decision, as a subcommittee, AAA needs to accept that decision and then move on like other committees.

Dana asked when the BOD passes a motion and it doesn't happen, who is then accountable? Dan answered the Director. Ned said typically the BOD would assign. In the case of math implementation, it would fall to the Director who then would pass it down to the teachers. Dina stated that if the BOD feels that something that has not happened even though they gave a directive, that is part of an evaluation. If the assignee is not following through, then the discussion has to be made. Dana said she understood, however, half of this BOD is brand new and there were decisions that were previously made that we are being held accountable. Gina cited the BOD manual specifically requiring that, for a motion to be turned around, there needs to be a vote with 75% approval. There was no vote. AAA was told by the BOD to move forward with what we are doing, AAA does the work and then it isn't implemented. AAA doesn't want to have final say, but when they have approval/directive from the BOD it is AAA responsibility then from the State perspective, to hold us accountable. Kelly Weist said not in a personnel situation. Gina agreed and both Dana & Kristen replied that this is not a personnel situation. AAA recommended a math improvement plan. It is then their job to say was it implemented and did it work? Was there any improvement? This is all state mandated.

Dina stated that from the BOD perspective that there is a different interpretation on how that directive was discussed and how that vote was made. Ned stated there are two points: to implement leveling within the scheduling constraints. Leveling is limited to two paced sections. However, Dan couldn't make the schedule work within his vision of MS blocking and so presented a compromise to us. Gina stated that there are no constraints. If the BOD is going to decide to undo their motion, a 75% approval needs to take place. Bob stated, as an attendee to that meeting and vote and also the meeting where the 4-day vs. 5 day came up, we took the directive and voted on the suggestions given by AAA with a lot of data to move the school forward knowing RMAE has an issue with scores. We instructed the Director through our vote to go and get that done. The Director came back to the BOD and said this is what I can accomplish, it is going in the direction we want to go, but it is not full implementation. That was brought directly to the BOD and we accepted that without a vote because we thought it was the best we could do. Gina reiterated the BOD policy in regards to undoing a motion. Bob stated there is some latitude and agreed that we did not follow the rules. Gina stated that not having respect for BOD policy is not fair to AAA. Dan stated the BOD didn't do anything. He sent a letter to the President saying that we would destroy everything we created in the schedule if we went to daily math. He can't do it. Also, he has some training that was telling him not to do it. He did contact AAA; there was nothing inappropriate about that. The second item, leveling, he admitted to the Director that he consciously didn't follow that directive. He doesn't feel it needs to be discussed further. He stated the BOD didn't do it, he did it and he admitted it.

Aaron's concern is that we have some information from testing that says we are getting crushed on math, we have data from surveys saying that 30% are falling behind, 30% are at level and 30% are ahead. We had a vote, the concern is: are we following policy, but also are we doing something to change the direction of the math program? He isn't hearing anything definitive that says we are. Dan answered by stating that is because the question hasn't been asked. The question has never been asked, other than the 2 directives given by AAA, what else are we doing? Aaron asked Dan whether or not he was on that committee. Yes he is. What Aaron cares about is the kids and the trajectory of the math program. What he isn't comfortable with is "we can't fix the schedule therefore we can't change the math program." If daily math or leveling is not the way to go, what are we going to do to help the kids and what are the tools we will give the teachers to help them? The teachers need to feel enabled to help the kids. When is the appropriate time to discuss? Dan stated we are trying to whittle down into a couple of minutes a larger discussion. Ned spoke again about a working session and said it would be nice to take our best stab at this. Aaron said he thought it would be great to ask the teachers if they could come up with a methodology to make this work. Ned doesn't want to waste the teacher's time as well. Can we

have a quick consensus? As a point of order, we can't take a vote tonight because taking action on math is not on the agenda. It would be possible to place it on the agenda after the working session. The discussion of AAA MS daily math and leveling will be tabled so we can move on with the Agenda.

Middle School Trips:

This agenda item was moved up in order to accommodate some parents that were in attendance. Ned stated that we as the BOD are presenting Tuesday night with the main discussion being finances. He wanted to highlight to the BOD that when students hit 6th grade, parents have to pay for these trips. Money that goes towards these trips is money that is money out of pocket and not available for fundraising. We are already imposing on MS parents a financial burden above and beyond K-5 parents.

6th grade has a single trip 100 Elks for approximately \$200; 7th grade has 100 Elks and Sea Camp for approximately \$1600, this is not trivial; 8th grade has 100 Elks plus a trip to be determined for approximately \$1100. The total budget for a MS student through all of these trips is about \$2900. This will come up at the SOS and the BOD needs to be aware. When we start looking at financial asks (annual giving, auction, etc.) we need to be aware of the continual nickel and diming with snack shack, pizza, etc. Is there any way to bring this under control? Is there a way to centralize MS trips to 8th grade? Do our kids have to take a MS trip? Optional or Mandatory?

The general consensus seems to be that Sea Camp is the trip to save, but it's a 7th grade trip. This could be shifted to 8th grade with enough forethought and warning, to become an educational end to an RMAE school experience. It is my understanding that we can't skip a year as this would mean we would lose our "slot" and not be able to be scheduled back into the program. We could declare this year, next year or whatever an optional year. Fill it with our student who choose and open up the remaining slots to the Bergens or Country Day to fill our commitment. Then the next year, offer it as our 8th grade trip. This is just an idea and not a motion.

Mr. Bryant stated Sea Camp is a curriculum-based trip. It is the chance of a lifetime for these kids. Is it only a 7th grade curriculum trip? No, it's all over MS. He went a few years with 6th grade, but then it was moved to 7th grade. 8th grade science is Physics, so it fits best in 7th. Ned is not trying to take away Sea Camp, but we need to recognize the value of each trip, is it curriculum-based and can we reduce the net burden on families? The 8th grade trip has strayed from Washington DC and is currently viewed as not curriculum-based and just a party trip.

Rachel Smith said that whoever is making these decisions should be taking into consideration the philosophy of bringing kids together in the outdoors in a nonacademic setting. It doesn't always have to be just about curriculum. Sometimes kids need team building time, which is really important to our philosophy in MS. It's important to have the kids feel better and feel good.

Angela Hensiek wanted to make sure that it's important to realize that all families may not be able to fiscally contribute to the school and trips.

The Family Handbook talks about MS trips along with a budget. Dan suggested that a school ought not rotate parent opinion on trips because the school will never be able to honestly and with confidence say why we believe in trips.

Ned – no action will be taken tonight.

Financial:

Dina – 2012-2013 final end of the year budget is complete and was sent out to Ned, Tom & Dan. She needs final approval for the audit. The BOD needs to approve where we ended up. Ned did not know it needed to get out for review and vote. Dina will get it out next meeting. The District needs to have it by Nov. 1. Dina will email the budget out tomorrow, please email her immediately if there are any questions. The audit – still working the arbitrage of the bond that we refinanced. Charter Renewal – waiting on some information from the district to see if they have a checklist or any changes. Dan stated we needed to add our intent on how we will handle 191. Fees – getting better. Part of the fees is the NWEA testing. If your child doesn't pay this fee, she is not sure how this is going to work/look. If you don't pay these fees, your child doesn't get tested. Kelli asked why we couldn't pay our fees online through JeffCo. Dina isn't sure, wondering if there is a glitch or if she entered something wrong. This system was just allowed for Charters this July. Due to credit card security through JeffCo, the protocol is

you may not hold a card number on file. This needs to be figured out. Snow removal – trying to figure out a new option. She has heard that the reputation of our parents is not good.

Pam Rohal asked if there was a safety issue with snow removal and could there be a late start. Dan wanted to know what he should tell parents when he calls for a late start and the other schools don't. Safety is the issue. Dina said the decision to come late is up to the individual parents. The snow conditions change on this road very quickly. Jamie is concerned about the safety issue. Is it possible if we have a report 12 hours in advance can we call a late start for the next day. Drew Schneider - There is a budget for snow plowing which is fixed. What it comes down to is more sand and more plowing, which is in excess of the budget.

Foundation:

Kelli – there is a long-term Sustainability for Charter Schools webinar on Sept. 16 from 6-8 pm. They will be serving dinner. Please RSVP now.

Grant Preparation – in order to comply with grant requirements, the Foundation will have a financial Audit and is in the process of creating a 2013-2014 budget. Phyllis Adams, the Grant Writer, has spent time investigating sources. How many at one time depends on what we are looking for as far as grants are concerned. She has spoken with Dan about most of these. Most grants want audits and budgets and RMAE needs to decide what they need. Tom stated that at one point there was a summation of findings to date. Phyllis said there isn't much to summarize at this point. The idea was she would survey what is out there and see what is available for RMAE. The BOD is looking for a formal report. She is confused by what we are asking for. She understood that it was more effective for the Foundation to apply for these grants rather than from the school. Kelli wants to make sure we are covering all of our bases. Kelli thinks she should apply from both ends, the Foundation and the school. What the BOD is asking for, given her professional experience as a grant writer, where are the areas that Charter schools usually get funding? Clarification on what is out there, what are our options? Give the BOD some form of feedback. She prioritized with Dan. She will put together a list of some best guess choices for getting money. If she knew Jon said she would provide a list she would have come prepared. Dina said there are actually books at JeffCo with Grants. She is willing to bring Phyllis down to look at them.

Annual Giving – reviewing letter options. Will discuss timing and review drafts in the marketing meeting next week. Corporate Donation Program – The Foundation's goal is to ask for money's outside of RMAE families

Sponsorship Program - Tami is working on this right now. Banners on the fence, different levels of sponsorship. More to come. Working with PTO as well to make sure we aren't double dipping.

Field Committee update:

Tim reported:

- Jefferson County Planning and Zoning approved the plan set (dated 8-12-18) and issued the NOI permit on 9/3/13
- Silver Eagle Excavating (SE) and Pine Grove Excavating ended up being the only two contractors to bid. All other "large" contractors like ESCO declined to bid (job too small, and/or they are all booked well into 2014)
- Based on the more meticulous nature of the bid, and Drew's experience with inspecting their work as a certified Professional Engineer, Silver Eagle was chosen. They are not the low bid. The higher cost is due to a more thorough methodology in estimating costs from the provided quantities. (both bids attached)
- On 9/11/13, the MAMFA Board voted to donate \$1,000 to our project. This amount completes our \$50,000 Matching Gift Target, to receive the full \$50,000 pledged in the spring and will bring our fund total to \$155,274 (spreadsheet attached)
- For purposes of the grading, our budget is as follows:
 - **\$104,274** **Cash on deposit as of 9/12/13 (attached spreadsheet)**

- o \$56,617 Silver Eagle Excavating bid
- o \$1,500 Blasting contingency
- o \$11,644 20% contingency
- o \$2,235 Geotechnical Testing & Construction Testing
- o **\$32,278 Remaining Cash Balance at end of grading**

Project Timing:

- SE can start September 30th, 2013, and has estimated 4 weeks to full project completion. We investigated options for working over Holiday, but SE’s employees have already been given Thur-Sun of Thanksgiving off, and their minimum estimated time for completion of major work (tree clearing, cut/fill/compaction, and moving excess dirt) is 10 days. This means heavy work would still be happening after the break, with greater potential for extended weather delays.

Protections for RMAE:

- The Board originally asked for a 10% contingency fee to be set aside, but we have increased that to 20% (Jamie Price recommendation)
- Silver Eagle’s bid includes safety fencing to isolate the construction area from the rest of campus, and additional costs in hauling excess materials across campus during weekends ONLY.
- An additional “Safety Plan” will be drafted and executed by Silver Eagle, and presented to the Board before work commences (Jamie Price recommendation)
- We are negotiating a Construction Contract with Silver Eagle, using an Attorney who is donating her time. This will also be presented to the Board before work commences.
- We will have parent volunteers stationed at the perimeter safety fencing at all times when kids are outside for recess, lunch, PE, etc., to help ensure kids stay outside the fencing and clear of any equipment or ongoing work inside the fence.

Board Resolution:

We are asking the Board to vote immediately on the following:

- Approve Silver Eagle to commence field grading on September 30, 2103, contingent on presentation of a Safety Plan and Construction Contract, on or before September 26, 2013.

Donation	Amount	Stipulations	Tax letter sent	
PTO	\$19,700.00			
Anonymous	\$10,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation		
Lane Family	\$9,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation	5/9/2013	
Campbell Family	\$29,544.00		5/15/2013	
Lane Family Company Match (WPX Energy)	\$1,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation		
Lane Family Company Match (WPX Energy)	\$9,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation		
Steve Campbell	\$20,000.00	\$10,000 Eligible toward Match Donation	8/29/2013	
David Wilson	\$7,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation	8/29/2013	
Brian Shields	\$3,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation	8/29/2013	
MAMFA	\$1,000.00	Eligible toward Match Donation		
Matching Gift	\$50,000.00			
Total Revenue	\$159,244.00			\$159,244.00
EXPENDATURES				
Vendor	Total amount	Work performed/description	Completed	Payments
Starting account				\$159,244.00
High Point	\$1,970.00	Grading and GESC Plans		-\$1,970.00

Engineering				
High Point Engineering	\$1,200.00	Drainage, Design Changes		-\$1,200.00
Bear Valley Design	\$800.00	Soil Investigation, cut and fill recommendations, pavement section		-\$800.00
Remaining amount				
				\$155,274.00
			Reserved	\$78,300.00
				\$76,974.00

RMAE BID FORM Silver Eagle Excavating (303-642-7464 office)

Proposed Start Date: 09/30/13

Proposed Completion Date: 10/28/13

Expected Project Length: 1 month

RMAE to provide survey staking prior to cutting and final grade staking toward end of project

RMAE to provide independent soils compaction testing

Turf company to install crusher fines and turf following field grading (and adequate budget)

RMAE to relocate green house to level pad created by contractor

Item	Quantity	Unit	Cost/Unit	Total
1 Mobilize Equipment	1		1000	\$1000
2 Porto-let	1		400	\$400
3 Silt Fence – Temporary erosion control	250	LF	1.6	\$400
4 Remove trees 4" to 18" diameter (average 8") – Cut trunk to 6 ft lengths, chip slash and broadcast over area around playground, haul off stumps	11		150	\$1650
5 Scrape and stockpile topsoil – Varied from 6" to 3 ft . Average depth 1.5 ft .	40,773	SF	.1	\$4077.30
6 Cut dirt	2990	CY	3	\$8970
7 Fill and compact dirt 90% to 95% Standard Proctor	3032	CY	4.5	\$13,644
8 Water for compaction (Will reduce after final invoice from EMD)			1	\$5000
9 Cut drainage swale along north property line, tie to existing	165	LF	6	\$990
10 Relocate excess dirt to adjacent parking area (compaction in quantity above)	1776	CY	6	\$10656
11 Spread topsoil over finished slopes			1	\$2000
12 Reinforced rock check dams	24	LF	30	\$720
13 Sediment Control Log	520	LF	2.5	\$1300
14 Hydro-mulch (flexterra)	13000	SF	.12	\$1560
15 Double-net straw mat	7500	SF	.5	\$3750
16 Orange Safety Fencing (t-posts on 10' centers)	400	LF	1.5	\$600
17 Level pad for green house below road	1	N/C	0	0
Sub-total:				\$56,717.30
1 Optional Item A: Blasting – Do not think necessary	100	CY	15	\$1500
2 Contractor Item:				0
3 Contractor Item:				0
Sub-total:				\$58,217.30
20% Contingency Fee				\$11,643.46
Total:				\$69,860.76
Owner Costs:				
1 Geotechnical Testing	1	LS	1235	\$1235
2 Construction Staking	1	LS	1000	\$1000
Total:				\$72,095.76

Exclusions: Permits, fencing, trash/recycling bin, trash surround, soils testing, turf, crusher fines,

PHASE 2	
Cut dirt	375 CY

Fill dirt	333 CY
Field turf	0 SF
Surrounding turf	0 SF
Hydro-mulch (flexterra)	5,250 SF
Jute netting	0 SF
Type 3 guardrail	220 LF
4' fence	0 LF
2'x2'x4' concrete block for wall	160 EACH
Curb and 2' gutter	820 LF
Asphalt	16,470 SF
5' sidewalk	1,320 SF
4' sidewalk	1,150 SF
4' concrete pan	790 SF
10" drain line	512 LF
6" connectors at building	5 EACH
Silt Fence	350 LF
Rock check dam	84 LF
Sediment control log	0 LF
Soil riprap 9"-12" dia. Rock	3 CY



CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE

DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)
9/12/2013

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW. THIS CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE ISSUING INSURER(S), AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OR PRODUCER, AND THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER.

IMPORTANT: If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must be endorsed. If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

PRODUCER Security First Insurance Agency 7851 S. Elati Street Suite 100 Littleton CO 80120	CONTACT NAME: Stephanie J Huber
	PHONE (A/C No. Ext): (303) 730-2327 FAX (A/C No.): (303) 730-2930 E-MAIL ADDRESS: shuber@securityfirstia.com
INSURED William Gavlas, DBA: Silver Eagle Excavating 11577 Coal Creek Heights Drive Golden CO 80403-9746	INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE NAIC #
	INSURER A ACUITY A Mutual Ins Co 14184
	INSURER B Pinnacol Assurance 41190
	INSURER C :
	INSURER D :
	INSURER E :

COVERAGES **CERTIFICATE NUMBER:** 13/14 GL WC **REVISION NUMBER:**

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

INSR LTR	TYPE OF INSURANCE	ADDL INSR	SUBR WVD	POLICY NUMBER	POLICY EFF (MM/DD/YYYY)	POLICY EXP (MM/DD/YYYY)	LIMITS
A	GENERAL LIABILITY			L61353	5/5/2013	5/5/2014	EACH OCCURRENCE \$ 1,000,000
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY						DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (Ea occurrence) \$ 250,000
	<input type="checkbox"/> CLAIMS-MADE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OCCUR						MED EXP (Any one person) \$ 10,000
	GEN'L AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER:						PERSONAL & ADV INJURY \$ 1,000,000
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> POLICY <input type="checkbox"/> PROJECT <input type="checkbox"/> LOC						GENERAL AGGREGATE \$ 3,000,000
	AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY						PRODUCTS - COMP/OP AGG \$ 3,000,000
	<input type="checkbox"/> ANY AUTO						COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (Ea accident) \$
	<input type="checkbox"/> ALL OWNED AUTOS	<input type="checkbox"/> SCHEDULED AUTOS					BODILY INJURY (Per person) \$
	<input type="checkbox"/> HIRED AUTOS	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-OWNED AUTOS					BODILY INJURY (Per accident) \$
	<input type="checkbox"/> UMBRELLA LIAB	<input type="checkbox"/> OCCUR					PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident) \$
	<input type="checkbox"/> EXCESS LIAB	<input type="checkbox"/> CLAIMS-MADE					\$
	<input type="checkbox"/> DED <input type="checkbox"/> RETENTION \$						\$
B	WORKERS COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY			4125359	8/1/2013	8/1/2014	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WC STATUTORY LIMITS <input type="checkbox"/> OTH-ER
	ANY PROPRIETOR/PARTNER/EXECUTIVE OFFICER/MEMBER EXCLUDED? (Mandatory in NH)	<input type="checkbox"/> Y/N	N/A				E.L. EACH ACCIDENT \$ 500,000
	If yes, describe under DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS below						E.L. DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE \$ 500,000
							E.L. DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT \$ 500,000

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES (Attach ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, if more space is required)

CERTIFICATE HOLDER**CANCELLATION**

drew@insightengineering.or Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen 2959 Royale Elk Way Evergreen, CO 80439	SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, NOTICE WILL BE DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE S J Huber/SHUBER <i>Stephanie J Huber</i>
---	---

ACORD 25 (2010/05)

© 1988-2010 ACORD CORPORATION. All rights reserved.

INS025 (201005) 01

The ACORD name and logo are registered marks of ACORD

Board Comments:

Bob's concerned and would like to hear from Dan & teachers. How will that kind of heavy work adjacent to school affect classrooms. He is not familiar with the level of distraction. Tim compared it to the build out of the basement. Dan stated there wasn't significant impact during the build out. In regards to the field, noise is noise. One question is the product (a field) worth the noise? It is what it is. What about the PE program while the construction is going on? We are planning on moving that program to the bubble so can we back up the start of the construction to mid-October. Mr. Campbell will donate the field across the street for those 2 weeks if Dan commits to moving the gym program to two weeks earlier. Rachel's input for her classroom, later is better. The noise is obvious and we will just have to deal. If it is hot, she won't be able to open those windows with the construction happening. Suggestion is to move it out 2 weeks further into October because of weather issues. Beginning of October has a longer weekend. No one can guarantee the weather. Tim would like for us to remember the tremendous gift the school has been given. We are here today with a contractor that has a specific window to work in and they are looking for BOD approval today. If we don't move forward now, it won't happen until next summer and by then the money will most likely be gone.

Drew – week 1 is the heavy excavation. Week 2 is a lot less. Most major dirt work will be complete. At that point they are effectively done with the big equipment & dirt.

Bob just wants to make sure that the MS faculty can live with this. Mr. Bryant asked would it be noisy, etc.? Yes, but is it worth it, you bet.

Seth is wondering why the committee is suggesting we not use Pine Grove? Drew said they are a great company, but Pine Grove couldn't start much later and they couldn't give us a straight number. It was more of a guess. They felt better going with a more secure bid. On the quantities, who generated them? It was based off of the grading plan, John Tompkins and the new topography that was graded out. We feel comfortable with the numbers. The price is the price. They put in a rock clause just in case. When will we do the geotechnical testing? Day 1 & 2. Seth wants to see this in the contract.

Dina to contact Joel to make sure the school is covered as far as liability.

Bob wanted to make sure that once it was finished to Phase 1 will kids be able to run on it and he wants to make sure there is no landscaping that the kids could possibly ruin. Drew said the flat area would be hard-packed, native material dirt that kids can run on. A lot depends on whether we can start on time.

Turf in the spring. EPRD is applying for the GoCo grant on our behalf to pay for part of the paving of the fire road, a sidewalk, planting of trees to fully complete the project. We won't have an answer regarding the Grant until mid-December. If it doesn't go through, we will still have enough funds left to do the turf and fencing, but it would not complete the road, parking or sidewalk.

According to Dina, the Building Corporation is the entity that needs to enter into the contract if the BOD approves to move forward (Bldg Corp owns the land). We will have a limited contract with EPRD that is renewable. Aaron asked if we have liability insurance from the district as a BOD Member? Dina said yes as long as you are acting in that capacity. For new members there is a holding corporation that is the part of RMAE that owns the land under the playground and field, not JeffCo. Seth wanted to know if we were asking anything up and above what is stated in the insurance policy such as a pollution policy. Tom felt that once JeffCo looked at the policy they would let us know if we needed anything further. Jamie is comfortable with everything that was presented. The contingency is terrific. The safety thing has been discussed in regards to the kids and their intent is to document a formal safety plan. One thing that isn't included is a recommendation from Jamie that we hire a contract administrator. Someone who can be involved in negotiating the final contract, final closeout, warranty issues, insurance, work changes, etc. Jamie believes a third party person would be ideal. Dina asked if the school attorney could be part of that? Jamie said he could, but what he is talking about is someone to work with the attorney and to provide oversight on the entire project. Does the county have staff that we could utilize? Dina feels it should be someone familiar with Charter schools. Jamie has advised the BOD that there are liabilities with any construction project particularly one with children involved on the premises and we have a duty to consider. Also he asks the BOD to consider some sort of representation of the contract. Maybe it can be deferred as we move forward with the other items. Ned thinks the constraints of the timing will not allow for us to try and find a representative. He suggested Jamie vote no if he is not comfortable with moving forward. He wants to make sure oversight and liability issues are taken care of.

Motion: Bob motioned to approve Silver Eagle's bid with contingencies of approved Safety Plan & approved Construction Contract, Tom seconded.

Approval: 9-0

Abstentions: None

Motion: Ned motioned the BOD recommends the RMAE Building Corporation enter into contract to excavate a flat field per the JeffCo approved notice of intent permit as documented on 9/3/13. Aaron seconded.

Approval: 9-0

Abstentions: None

***As a Foundation Board member Melissa Neace mentioned that there needs to be information disseminated to the Parents about the contrarian message that is being sent regarding the Field \$ vs. the Annual Giving ask. This needs to be communicated really well to the parents. Dan said there was a letter that was addressed to the community regarding this very issue. Maybe this Tuesday, remind the parents.

Motion: Ned is made the motion to adjourn for the night and to reconvene Saturday morning at 9:00 AM, Tom seconded.

Approval: 8-0

Abstentions: Christine because she will not be there.

**We will finish committee reports (*Marketing, PTO, Preschool, Facilities / Tech, Director's Report, President's Report*) and Dina will email the 2012-2013 budget for approval, as well. Tom asked if Dina could send Friday morning. Dana will post the Agenda Friday morning.

Next Meeting – September 14, 2013

Adjournment: 10:26 PM