

Journey School
A California Public Charter School

March 6, 2011

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES (AS REVISED)

Approved on June 23, 2011

6:30 p.m.

At Journey School

27102 Foxborough

Aliso Viejo, Ca 92656

Journey School Office: (949) 448-7232

www.journeyschool.net

Marc Damikolas, Council President: Present

Dr. Kris Powell, Council Vice President: Present

Jon Kaplan, Council Treasurer: Present

Jan Geisendorfer, Council Secretary: Present

Kimberly Brown, Council Member: Present

Diana Graber, Council Member: Present

Cheryl Moe, Council Member: Present, Arrived at: 6:37 p.m.

Bettina Spretke, Parent Cabinet Member: Present

Bonnie River, Educational Trustee Member: NOT PRESENT

Julie Hatchel, CUSD Member (NV): NOT PRESENT

Staff present at meeting: Shaheer Faltas

Others present at meeting: Franci Sassin, Terry Walker, David Burlison, Maria Faltas & Allyson Damikolas

	AGENDA ITEM	SPONSOR	TIME
1	Call to Order, Roll Call and Review of Norms/Roles Meeting called to order at: 6:32 p.m.	Marc Damikolas	6:32
2	Inspirational Passage	Shaheer Faltas	

3	<p>Approval of Agenda*</p> <p>Motion by: Kris Powell</p> <p>Seconded by: Marc Damikolas</p> <p>Approval: Unanimous</p>	<p>Marc Damikolas</p>	
4	<p>PUBLIC COMMENT: <i>Reminder: Please fill-out a speaker card; see policy above for guidelines</i></p> <p>David Burlison: Questioned since this is a ‘new item’ is the Council able to vote tonight? Answer: The item was agendized to be able to vote if needed, and this is not a ‘new’ item since it has been discussed in previous meetings and Council is not necessarily voting to change it tonight. David added that when he was on the board, these kinds of issues were handled by the administrator since the Council had more pressing issues to address. He stressed the importance of a clear adherence to charter and law.</p>	<p>Marc Damikolas</p>	
5	<p>DISCUSSION / ACTION ITEMS</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A. Lottery and Admissions Practices*: Clarification of alignment of current lottery practices with the school charter</p> <p>Shaheer requested 15 minutes to review policy (Shaheer distributed ‘Administrative Reflections on Lottery Issues 3/6/11’ to all present.) and “deliberate on the heart of the matter.” He requested that by the end of the meeting, he would be able to get written clarity from the Council on how to proceed with the lottery process.</p> <p>Shaheer summarized the three issues presented by Cheryl Moe as follows:</p> <p>First, that the lottery is conducted as agreed upon in the charter, specifically that in the enrollment priority Section, definition of “siblings of continuing students” is used.</p> <p>Second, that applicants are not moved up in the priority pool during the lottery process based on a sibling securing a spot in the lottery.</p>	<p>Shaheer Faltas</p>	

Third, that applicant residency is verified and correctly noted as “in” or “out” of CUSD boundaries.

Cheryl read the email that she sent to Shaheer on 3/6.

“These are the concerns that I raised at the lottery on 3/4/11. That the lottery is conducted as agreed upon in the charter petition, specifically that the enrollment priority, definition of "siblings of continuing students" is really used. That interludes do not take place where applicants are moved up in the priority pool during the lottery process based on a sibling securing a spot in the lottery. Also, that the residency is verified and correctly noted as "in" or "out" of CUSD boundaries. And that the lottery follow Board Approved Charter and Policies.”

1. Can you include this statement in the Public Packet?
2. In the Charter it states "Journey School will make final admission decisions and will do so in accordance with its admissions policies and procedures."
3. Can you please provide these policies with Council/Board approved dates and provide procedures with dates as part of the Public Packet?

The question raised by Shaheer is whether giving any type of preference to siblings of new applicant students (who are clearly not continuing students since they are new applicants) during the lottery process inconsistent with the approved charter or with any law?

Shaheer stopped the lottery process because Cheryl stepped forward with a different interpretation.

The following are considerations to inform our decision:

Very important to note that the enrollment priority section of the charter is different from the lottery section. The section on “enrollment priority” can be interpreted as applying to who is given a space and would therefore avoid the lottery.

A reasonable interpretation of the language in the lottery section is that priorities given during the lottery should mirror the enrollment priorities used to place students. Thus, the current practice of giving applicants a sibling priority is aligned with the charter. A key point is

in the past we have not had an enrollment administrator and we didn't have consistent guidelines.

In summary, the current lottery process per the charter has been followed. There is not an ongoing violation of the charter, rather a difference of opinion in the interpretation of a few key words.

There are also additional questions to consider in the future. The only item to decide tonight is how to proceed with the definition of terms and how that affects the lottery process so that it can proceed. Nothing else needs to be decided tonight.

Shaheer also noted that the school's attorney had reviewed all the pertinent documents and does not find anything wrong about the current practices as described to him. He has email correspondence.

Shaheer asked each board member to review the 'Administrative Reflections on Lottery Issues 3/6/11' and speak briefly about this issue:

Kris – Appropriate for Shaheer to ask for direction. We must speak as one voice.

Jon – He has no problem with enrollment policies. Policies need to be clarified. In future, it would help to have minutes clearer, and more detailed so we can reference past conversations.

Diana – She thinks letter to CUSD should be retracted. Cheryl wants stricter policies and to micro-manage administrator but our past practice has been the same as current.

Cheryl – She stated that Shaheer does need direction and policy. She has been bringing up enrollment/admission issues and the need for updated policy for some time. Last May, after reviewing the enrollment/admissions process of 2010, she stated she met with Marc and Shaheer to review the process and requested a more thorough review of the admissions/enrollment policies. Accountability is an issue. Important to give Shaheer guidance.

Marc- Wants to give clear direction to Shaheer. Asks Cheryl if she believes we are still in violation of charter? If she does then an investigation is necessary. As a board we must

address this.

Jan – Disappointed that Cheryl wrote a letter to CUSD on this topic, when at the last board meeting in February 2011 Shaheer committed to bringing an overarching policy on enrollment and lottery practices to the next board meeting. Jan suggested putting in family names rather than individual names to give each family the same chance in the lottery. This might address the issues raised by sibling preferences.

Cheryl – Commented that she brought up this topic at previous board meetings including Oct. 2010 and Feb. 2011.

Kim – Remembers giving Shaheer direction on this matter in the past. This is an operational policy. There are administrative policies and board policies. There is nothing in the charter that negates our current practice. Current practices are well documented. Disappointed because it feels like we are moving backward.

Cheryl-- stated that the approved minutes did not reflect giving Administration direction on this matter.

Bettina – Understands Cheryl's frustration because she is confused about definition of "continuing student". She read her notes from February board meeting where this was discussed and is still unclear on what the Council directed. Shaheer asked if she is able to move forward.

Diana asked how to respond to CUSD about this, given the letter that was written. Shaheer suggested we send the meeting notice and minutes to Julie Hatchel, CUSD liaison.

Marc again asked Cheryl whether she thinks we are in violation of charter as an investigation should be initiated if so. Cheryl did not indicate that there was anything that needed an investigation.

Diana Graber noted that Cheryl had a child who would be in the lottery process for a space at the school. For this reason, Cheryl stated that she would abstain from the vote.

Shaheer reviewed procedures and policies included in a white binder including:

- "Journey School Enrollment Best Practices and Lottery Procedures

	<p>2011”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Journey School Charter Excerpts – Relevant to Enrollment & Lottery Procedures 2011” • “Journey School Grade Placement Guidelines – By Age 2011” • “Journey School Council Policies – Relevant to Enrollment & Lottery Procedures 2011” including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Enrollment Capacity Policy, Board approved 6/24/10 * Enrollment Capacity Policy, Board approved 3/8/07 * Waiting List (Admittance) Policies revised 4/6/06 * Journey School Lottery Procedures, approved 4/6/06 <p>Motion to: Direct Shaheer to move forward to adhere with continuing past practice in accordance with current practice.</p> <p>By: Marc Damikolas</p> <p>Second by: Kim Brown</p> <p>Vote: Bettina Spretke opposed; Cheryl Moe abstained; all others approve.</p>		
6	<p>Adjournment</p> <p>MOTION to adjourn made at 7:30</p> <p>BY: Marc Damikolas</p> <p>SECOND BY: Kim Brown</p>	<i>Marc Damikolas</i>	