



Somerset Academy of Las Vegas

Somerset Board Meeting and Retreat

Date and Time

Saturday August 5, 2017 at 8:30 AM

Location

6630 Surrey Street Las Vegas, NV 89119

Agenda

	Purpose	Presenter	Duration
I. Opening Items			
A. Call the Meeting to Order		John Bentham	1
B. Record Attendance and Guests		John Bentham	1
C. Public Comment			5
Public Comment and Discussion (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.)			
II. Items of Business			
A. Approve Minutes	Approve Minutes	John Bentham	2
Approval of minutes from the April 25, 2017 telephonic board meeting, the May 23, 2017 board meeting, the June 22, 2017 annual board meeting, and the July 11, 2017 telephonic board meeting.			
B. Enrollment	Vote	Kristie Fleisher/ John Barlow	10
Discussion and Possible Action to Approve Revised Grade-Level Maximum Enrollment for the 2017/2018 School Year			
III. Governance			
A. BoardOnTrack Training	Discuss	BoardOn Track	180
IV. Lunch			

A. Lunch	FYI	John Barlow	60
-----------------	-----	-------------	----

V. Governance Continued

A. BoardOnTrack Training	Discuss	BoardOn Track	180
---------------------------------	---------	---------------	-----

VI. Executive Director Report

A. Report from Executive Director John Barlow	FYI	John Barlow	15
--	-----	-------------	----

VII. Closing Items

A. Member Comment	Discuss	Somerset Board	5
--------------------------	---------	----------------	---

B. Public Comment	FYI		5
--------------------------	-----	--	---

Public Comment and Discussion (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.)

C. Adjourn Meeting	Vote	John Barlow	
---------------------------	------	-------------	--

Cover Sheet

Approve Minutes

Section: II. Items of Business
Item: A. Approve Minutes
Purpose: Approve Minutes
Submitted by: Jenn Elison
Related Material: DRAFT 04-25-17 Telephonic Board Meeting Minutes.pdf
DRAFT 5-23-17 Board Meeting Minutes.pdf
DRAFT 6-22-17 Board Meeting Minutes.docx
DRAFT 7-11-17 Board meeting minutes.pdf

BACKGROUND:

Board meetings were held on May 23, 2017 and June 22, 2017; as well as telephonic board meetings on April 25, 2017 and July 11, 2017; as such, approval of the minutes for each meeting is needed from the Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

Move to approve the minutes from the April 25, 2017 telephonic board meeting, the May 23, 2017 board meeting, the June 22, 2017 annual board meeting, and the July 11, 2017 telephonic board meeting.

MINUTES
of the telephonic meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of SOMERSET ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS
April 25, 2017

The Board of Directors of Somerset Academy of Nevada held a public telephonic meeting on April 25, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.

1. Call to order and roll call

Board Chairperson Noble called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. Present were Board members Cody Noble, Carrie Boehlecke, Eric Brady, John Bentham, Travis Mizer, and Will Harty.

Board member Sarah McClellan was not present.

Also present were Somerset representatives Principal Elaine Kelley and Principal Jenni Martinez; as well as Academica Representatives Crystal Thiriot, Ryan Reeves, Jacob Smoot, Trevor Goodsell, Bob Howell, and Arthur Ziev.

2. Public Comment and Discussion

There was no request for public comment.

3. Consent Agenda

- a. Possible Action Giving Somerset Academy of Las Vegas's Executive Director Approval to Apply for Grants Deemed Necessary, While Still Needing to Seek Board Approval for the Acceptance of the Funds Awarded from Any Particular Grant**
- b. Approval of Funds Needed to Purchase Kitchen Equipment for Somerset Stephanie in Order to Participate in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)**

Member Bentham asked for confirmation as to whether or not this was a complete list of necessary NSLP kitchen equipment and asked if due diligence had been done to verify this fact. Ms. Crystal Thiriot addressed the Board and stated that the list had come from the NSLP committee which had inventoried the Stephanie campus to verify that they had everything needed to facilitate the program.

Member Bentham moved to approve the consent agenda. Member Brady seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

4. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Proposed K-8 Site at Valley/Turkey

Mr. Arthur Ziev addressed the Board and stated that a six acre property had become available at the intersection of Valley and Turkey, adding that the North Las Vegas Traffic Engineer had deemed it a great location for a charter school. Mr. Ziev stated that this was larger than the typical K-8 site, which might make it a viable option for five classes in each elementary grade with the ability to carry that number over to the middle school (for a total of 1,125 students), as the Board had previously requested. Mr. Ziev noted that the land had already been graded, which would offset some of the development costs. Mr. Ziev explained that some other recommended sites did not turn out to be viable options. Mr. Ziev stated that the property was now available and that a non-binding letter of intent had been drafted subject to the Board's approval.

Member Noble asked regarding the cost of the property, to which Mr. Ziev replied that it was 1.9 million. Mr. Ryan Reeves addressed the Board and directed them to the recently emailed support material supplement that contained map codes of where wait-listed students were living.

Member Noble asked if the other possible sites had been thoroughly looked into and if the numbers had been run for each, to which Mr. Ziev affirmed that he had looked into them and found them improbable for various reasons: possible industrial site, high cost, major intersections which would not receive city approval, etc. Member Noble asked specifically regarding a site at 6900 North Pecos, to which Mr. Ziev replied that this was located on a hard corner, which would not garner approval as a school zone, as well as the fact that it was only five acres at a higher cost. Member Noble stated that they had built other schools on five acres, to which Mr. Ziev replied that it would be much harder to budget with the lower student count for a higher costing site; however, the primary reason was the location itself, with Mr. Reeves affirming those explanations. Discussion ensued regarding the viability of the site and the end goals that this campus would accomplish, primarily the desirability of this campus as a feeder to Losee High School.

Member Harty stated that he was also concerned that this particular site would not be viewed as a natural feeder for Losee High School and that, like the Stephanie campus, they might lose students once they got to middle school.

Ms. Thiriot described the information taken from the provided maps and noted that the wait-lists appeared to support a charter school in the Valley/Turkey area. Ms. Thiriot explained that Member Noble had asked which high school the North Las Vegas students were attending, stating that 45% were moving to area high schools; however, the remaining 55% were going primarily to Losee High School, save for one student who was going to Sky Pointe. Continued discussion ensued regarding the need to market Losee as a desirable option for high school.

Mr. Reeves recapped the reasons behind staff bringing this particular site before the Board, emphasizing the fact that they would by no means waste the Board's time with non-viable properties, adding that it was approval by the State to build another K-8 in the North that prompted staff to search out properties. Member Harty stated that they were not bound to grow just because they had State approval, adding that it was the Board's responsibility to make sure the growth was responsible. Mr. Reeves agreed, adding that the wait-lists and need to feed the Losee campus were both good reasons to continue growth. Member Harty asked if this site could possibly be purchased by a sister school or other charter if Somerset hesitated, to which Mr. Reeves replied that he was

not aware of any sister schools looking to build in that part of town; however, there were additional new charter schools and expansions applying to the State for approval in the Las Vegas valley.

Discussion ensued regarding potential retention at the current high schools and the target enrollments. Member Noble asked for further verification that no other viable property was available aside from the Valley/Turkey site, to which Mr. Ziev verified that fact, emphasizing that they had looked in-depth for properties to feed the Losee High School campus. Mr. Reeves further affirmed that fact, adding that the Board could look into enacting an enrollment policy which would give priority enrollment at Losee to the Valley/Turkey students; and a lesser priority to those wishing to attend Sky Pointe. Mr. Reeves also informed the Board that he had confirmed that the site could be held for a year if they wished to delay the opening until the 2019/2020 school year.

Member Boehlecke stated that culture was a huge aspect of retaining students and that students and parents would be willing to travel an extra few miles to a desirable school. Member Bentham agreed and stated that they might be overthinking the location slightly in that it was not a significant amount of drive-time difference. Member Harty stated that, while agreed, he suggested that they be mindful of the rest of the Somerset family and how other campuses could be affected by growth.

Member Noble asked if an immediate decision needed to be made, to which Mr. Ziev replied in the negative, stating that they had a non-binding letter of intent; however, cost-wise it would be prudent to make a decision within the next sixty days during the inspection period. Member Brady stated that they would definitely want to discuss the contract and the goals they hoped to accomplish; however, Somerset was financially stable and there was a demand for growth from the community.

Mr. Reeves stated that, although the Board was under no obligation to make a decision at that time, it might be wise to gage the overall opinion of the Board in order that they not incur additional costs if the interest level was not there. Member Noble stated that he had not heard that any Board members were uninterested, with Member Mizer stating that he was interested but did have some concerns.

The Board agreed to add this item to the agenda for the May 23, 2017 meeting.

Member Bentham asked if they could change the name of the street from “Turkey,” to which Mr. Ziev replied in the affirmative. Member Bentham asked if they could get additional retention in formation, to which Ms. Thiriot replied in the affirmative.

5. Discussion for Possible Approval of Janitorial Services for the Somerset System Based on the Following Bids:

- a. ABM**
- b. Accurate**
- c. Brilliant**
- d. Jan Pro**
- e. Merchants**
- f. One Heart**

Mr. Jacob Smoot addressed the Board and stated that they had received janitorial bids to replace ISS, which, as of the month of May, would no longer be servicing schools. Mr. Smoot stated that they had conducted a pricing analysis and used the mandated rubric, which resulted in their recommendation of ABM, adding that one company had come in with a lower bid. Mr. Smoot stated that One Heart was new to the area and, in reviewing their bid, it did not appear that they would have the capacity and ability to flawlessly service the Somerset system.

Member Bentham asked Member Brady for any insight into the subject, to which Member Brady stated that he had worked with ABM in the past and they were a large company with the capacity to service Somerset; however, he would abstain from voting on this item. Member Noble asked why they would not go with the lowest bidder, Merchants. Mr. Smoot replied that, with the issues that Somerset has had in the past, he was not confident that Merchants could satisfactorily service the schools at that price, adding that he was confident that ABM could perform well.

Member Mizer asked how long the contract was for, to which Mr. Smoot replied that it was for three years but could be terminated for cause at any time; although the price would be locked in for those three years. Member Mizer stated that, where janitorial did not have a direct impact on students, it might be best to go with the lowest bid. Principal Martinez addressed the Board and stated that they had had issues at her campus in the past and that it did impact the students, in that teachers were spending valuable class time cleaning what should have been done by the cleaning crew.

Member Bentham moved to approve ABM as the janitorial service provider for the initial three year term. Member Boehlecke seconded the motion. Member Brady abstained. The remaining Board members voted to approve with one dissenting vote.

6. Member Comment

There were no member comment at this time.

7. Public Comments and Discussion

There was no request for public comment at this time.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Approved on: _____

_____ of the Board of Directors
Somerset Academy of Las Vegas

DRAFT

MINUTES
of the meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of SOMERSET ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS
May 23, 2017

The Board of Directors of Somerset Academy of Nevada held a public meeting on May 23, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at 4491 N. Rainbow Blvd., Las Vegas, Nevada 89108.

1. Call to order and roll call

The meeting was called to order by Board Chair Cody Noble at 6:08 p.m. Present were Board members Travis Mizer, Carrie Boehlecke, Will Harty, Cody Noble, Eric Brady, John Bentham and Sarah McClellan.

Also present was Executive Director John Barlow, Principal Dan Phillips, Principal Andre Denson, Principal Reggie Farmer, Assistant Principal Kate Lackey, and Counselor Janna Cash; as well as Academica representatives Clayton Howell, Trevor Goodsell, Ryan Reeves, Crystal Thiriot, and Arthur Ziev (via telephone).

2. Public Comments and Discussion

Ms. Jennie Sauter, a teacher at the Somerset Losee campus, addressed that Board and stated that with the approval and support of the administration of the Losee campuses as well as Jacob Smoot with Academica, she had secured \$30,000 needed for the Somerset Losee garden project; adding that the community had raised an additional \$1,800. Ms. Sauter stated that garden project was sponsored by Urban Seed Foundation and she explained the benefits the garden project would give to the school.

Public comment was made by the following individuals regarding concerns including the culture of Sky Pointe Middle/High School, communication, and discipline: Holli Moore, Rebecca Rasmussen, Carrie Harvey, Trisha Bawden, and Anne McGuire. Debra LeVanway, Taylor Sinquefield and Shawn Campbell addressed the Board to make them aware of how good Somerset Academy had been for their children and to express appreciation for the teachers.

Public comment was made by the following individuals in support of Principal Denson: Heather Carson, Zina Canfield, and Tiesha Moore. Katie Otteson addressed the Board to make them aware of a situation between her daughter and a Sky Pointe staff member, stating that she did not receive support from Dr. Denson in addressing her concerns.

Mike Heywood spoke about his concerns with the admittance policy. Steve Hardy spoke about his frustration with the priority waitlist and lottery system. Brooklyn Damas addressed the Board to introduce and promote her sport league. Larry McKnight, a teacher at Sky Pointe, spoke about his concerns regarding the installation of security cameras in the classrooms, including the legal implications.

Member Harty stated that, although the Board did not respond to the public comment, the concerns were noted and the Board appreciated the parents' involvement. Member Bentham stated that Somerset Academy had a progressive discipline policy that was available on the website; adding that if parents had concerns they could bring them to the attention of the administration and Executive Director Barlow.

3. Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes from the December 5, 2016; January 19, 2017; March 16, 2017 Board Meetings; and the February 23, 2017 Telephonic Board Meeting
- b. Internet Safety Policy
- c. Retention Bonuses
- d. School Financial Performance

Member Noble asked in any Board member wanted to pull any items off of the consent agenda. Member Harty asked to pull item c, Retention Bonuses. Member Bentham stated he had a question on the Internet Safety Policy.

Member Noble moved to approve items a and d. Member Brady seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

Member Bentham stated that when he reviewed the internet safety policy he noticed that it did not mention cyber bullying and asked if would be appropriate to include cyber bullying if students were on campus using campus hardware. Executive Director John Barlow addressed the Board and stated that he would check to see if cyber bullying should be included in the internet safety policy or in the student behavior guidelines. Member Bentham stated that it would be helpful to have it in both places.

Item b was tabled

Member Harty asked Mr. Goodsell if the retention bonus amounts had changed in the last two years. Mr. Trevor Goodsell addressed the Board and stated that the only change was an increase for support staff from \$100 to \$250. Member Harty stated that he would propose a 10% increase, which would be about \$36,000 and asked Mr. Goodsell if that amount would cause any financial distress, to which Mr. Goodsell stated it would not. Member Noble asked Executive Director Barlow to put this item on the agenda for the next Board meeting so that it could be discussed.

Member Noble re-opened the discussion stating that, along with the 10% increase requested by Member Harty, he would request that the retention bonuses be paid after the first pay period of the next school year to ensure that the staff members had returned. Executive Director Barlow stated that the teachers were scheduled to report on August 2nd and the first pay period following that date was August 15th. Member Noble stated that this was acceptable.

Member Noble moved to approve the retention bonuses as presented with a 10% increase, with the understanding that the retention bonuses would be paid sometime after the first pay period of the next school year to ensure that those receiving the retention bonuses had come back to work for our school. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

4. Review and Approval of Financial Advisor Agreement with Specialized Public Finance Inc.

Mr. Clayton Howell addressed the Board and stated that the purchase options were becoming available for the Losee and Stephanie campuses; adding that the school was obligated to stay in the lease until month thirty-seven; however, from month thirty-seven through month sixty there was an option to purchase the building, with

a purchase price increase around the fiftieth month. Mr. Howell stated that one of the first processes was a submission of an application to the Department of Business and Industry; adding that Academica was recommending Specialized Public Finance Inc. Mr. Howell explained that Robert Caldwell, Somerset Academy's previous financial advisor, was no longer working with charter schools and had recommended Specialized Public Finance Inc.; adding that the rates were favorable.

Member Brady stated that he had met with Special Public Finance Inc. and reviewed the proposal.

Member Harty moved to approve the agreement with Specialized Public Finance Inc. as presented. Member Brady seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

5. Review and Approval of Underwriter Agreement with Robert W. Baird & Co. Inc.

Mr. Howell stated that the underwriters were responsible for selling Somerset Academy's bonds and that Robert W. Baird & Co. Inc. was one of the largest underwriters for charter schools in the country; adding that they had assisted D.A. Davidson on the last bond issue.

Member Bentham moved to approve the underwriter agreement with Robert W. Baird & Co Inc. as presented. Member Harty seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

6. Approval to Submit Application to the Department of Business and Industry for Bond Financing

Mr. Howell stated that Somerset Academy needed to submit an application to the Department of Business and Industry; adding that the application fee was \$1,000. Mr. Howell further stated that there would also be a \$50,000 deposit to cover all the associated costs with the Department of Business and Industry; adding that this was the same process that Somerset Academy had used last time in issuing bonds through the state. Member Noble stated that there had been discussion about which properties the bonds would cover and asked at what point they would be locked in as to what properties were included. Mr. Howell stated that the only two sites presently available for purchase were the Losee and Stephanie campuses; adding that if the Lone Mountain campus became available before completion they could submit an addendum.

Member Noble moved to approve the submission of the application to the Department of Business and Industry for Bond Financing. Member Harty seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

12. Discussion and Possible Approval of the Somerset Academy Student Volunteer Hours Policy

Executive Director Barlow stated that after the previous Board discussion on the reduction in student volunteer hours, the counseling department held a meeting to discuss volunteer opportunities. Ms. Janna Cash, lead counselor for Somerset Sky Pointe High School, addressed the Board and stated that the first graduating class had 54 students, and that 52 of the students had completed their volunteer hours; adding that the two who had not completed the hours were focusing on their academics. Ms. Cash further stated that the Somerset website had links to volunteer opportunities; adding that the counseling goals were to have college and career lessons and hold fairs, as well as offering National Honor Society in 9th-12th grades. Executive Director Barlow stated that the National Honor Society had very strong service opportunities; adding that he was looking to create a student

volunteer support organization made up of parents in order to assist in looking for ways to publicize and remind families of service opportunities.

Member McClellan asked if this would be a system wide organization, to which Executive Director Barlow replied that it would be system wide and that he would ask the principals for suggestions for members; adding that this would augment the services that the schools were doing and remind families that Somerset was a service organization. Member Bentham stated that he had contacted Principal Denson and Principal Phillips about a service opportunity; adding that the students who had volunteered had represented Somerset Academy incredibly well. Member Harty asked if there had been any recommendation on the number of hours to require. Executive Director Barlow stated that their recommendation was to keep the 100 hours. Member Bentham stated that during the last discussion they had discussed a tiered level of service hours for additional distinctions. Executive Director Barlow that there was a National Service Award with different layers with which they could align; adding that it was a national organization that included Presidential Awards.

Member McClellan asked if the students who had not met the requirements were going to receive their diplomas, to which Executive Director Barlow stated that, because it was part of the Somerset charter, they must be completed to graduate; adding that they would adjust the hours for a student entering after their freshman year. Member McClellan asked if there was information on the status of juniors at the Losee campus. Principal Dan Phillips addressed the Board and stated he did not have a running total; however, the hours had been logged and he could get the information for the Board. Discussion ensued regarding the legalities of being able to withhold a diploma for not completing the service hours.

Member Noble stated that they had the opportunity, as a Board, to do something different, something better, and build service into the fabric of what Somerset Academy was; adding that it did not make sense to water down the requirements. Member Boehlecke stated that the requirement had been in place since the beginning of Somerset Academy of Las Vegas and it was important to build that culture and connect the students to the beneficial things that they could do for others. Member Boehlecke further stated that they needed to build a support system to ensure that the students were working on their hours all through high school; adding that the point of the service hours was to grow the understanding of service.

Member McClellan noted that the principals had stated that it could be an overwhelming task to log the hours and track the service opportunities; adding that they needed to provide support so that the burden would not be on the administrators. Principal Phillips stated that the Enjoli Knisley, the lead counselor, was tracking the service hours for the Losee campus. Discussion ensued regarding tracking student volunteer hours and opportunities. Member Noble stated that the 100-hour total could be pro-rated to 25 hours per year for students entering Somerset Academy after their 9th grade year. Executive Director Barlow stated that action was not needed; adding that the dialog that had ensued clarified the Board's expectations regarding the service hours.

7. Discussion and Approval of the Final Budget for the 2017/2018 School Year

Mr. Goodsell referred the Board to the support materials and stated that he had included a presentation of some of the key numbers, including days cash on hand, net income, per pupil funding, SPED funding, and expense by category. Mr. Goodsell stated that the per pupil increase was anticipated to be \$90 per pupil which would be a 1.4% increase, and therefore the budget included a 1.4% increase in the salary expense item; adding that CSAN fees had also increased. Mr. Goodsell further stated that all of the schools had been converted to fiber internet, which resulted in an increase; adding that some of the SPED contracted services had been moved to a salary line with the hiring of specialized personnel.

Member Harty stated that he would like to see a summary page with the projected year and next year's budget side by side. Mr. Goodsell stated that a summary had been included in the tentative budget; adding that the final budget had a summary of page with the tentative and final budgets side by side. Member Harty asked, with the budget revenue calculated at 95%, what the enrollment numbers actually were. Mr. Goodsell stated that the students were counted four times per year and the average was 98%. Member Noble asked how the budget related to the bond funding. Mr. Goodsell explained that, while the standards for bonds change, they currently liked to see 100 days cash on hand, and Somerset had 55 days cash on hand; however, they would also want to know that the school was in a healthy position, and that the financial advisor and underwriter both stated that Somerset was in a strong position. Member Harty clarified that if Somerset did not meet the standard they could still issue bonds; however, it would be at a higher rate.

Mr. Ryan Reeves addressed that Board and provided a legislative update including the proposed weighted funding for SPED and ELL students, adding that, although it was not included in the governor's budget this year, it was expected that facility funding would be a recommendation for the next legislative session.

Member Noble moved to approve the final budget for the 2017/2018 school year as presented. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

8. Discussion and Formation of a Finance Committee

Ms. Crystal Thiriot addressed the Board and stated that, as had been discussed at a previous meeting, it was advised that the Board form a finance committee to review the financial agenda items prior to the Board meetings in order to increase the efficiency of the Board. Member Bentham stated that the National Charter School Association recommended that every charter form a finance committee. Member Harty clarified that the financial related items could be reviewed outside of the Board meeting and then approved in a consent agenda by the Board. Discussion ensued regarding membership of the committee and the Treasurer having the authority to select the two additional members. Member Boehlecke asked if a Board member who was not on the committee could attend committee meetings; adding that she enjoyed the discussions and might want to observe. Member Harty stated that it would be an open meeting and anyone could attend; however, a Board member who was not on the committee would not have a vote in the committee meeting.

Member Noble moved to approve the formation of a finance committee. Member Bentham seconded the motion.

Member Brady stated he would like the flexibility to make the committee bigger if needed. Member Harty stated that the committee would consist of the treasurer, two additional Board members, two non-Board members, and the Executive Director.

Member Noble opened the floor to a vote, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

9. Discussion of the Scope of the Finance Committee and the Education and Curriculum Committee

Discussion ensued regarding who would serve on the finance committee, with the determination that Member Harty and Member Mizer would join Member Brady on the finance committee.

Member Noble moved to approve the scope of the finance committee as set forth in the materials. Member Brady seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

Member Noble asked if they needed to form a curriculum committee. Executive Director Barlow stated that he would suggest that they form a curriculum committee after Ms. Jefferson had some time in her new role as Curriculum Director.

10. Discussion Regarding the Plans for the Skye Canyon Campus

Ms. Thiriot stated that the Board had asked that she, along with Executive Director Barlow and Assistant Principal Lackey, take into consideration the needs of the school in conjunction with the plans for Skye Canyon, therefore they walked many campuses and met with Turner-Agassi representative Arthur Ziev and John Lopeman, the architect, to develop a plan to meet the needs of the school. Executive Director Barlow stated that they had looked at the challenges that were being faced in the current buildings and that Mr. Ziev was able to meet most of the requests.

Assistant Principal Lackey addressed the Board and stated that Mr. Ziev had been very accommodating with most of the requests including adding electrical outlets, adding ten feet to the gym, and changing door locations. Member Brady asked about the road going around the campus. Assistant Principal Lackey stated that it was the car loop; adding that the developer had insisted on an additional entrance to the property. Member Bentham asked how the parking would compare with Lone Mountain and Sky Pointe; adding that the church next to the campus was used as overflow for the Lone Mountain campus. Assistant Principal Lackey stated that she had counted the spaces on the site plan and it looked like there would be one hundred. Executive Director Barlow stated that there would be a park to the north of the campus where additional parking might be available.

Member Boehlecke asked if all the key issues, such as hallway size, that other principals had mentioned were addressed. Assistant Principal Lackey stated that if the hallways were widened they would lose square footage in the classrooms. Executive Director Barlow stated that they had explored the possibility of putting a library in the empty space above the entry corridor; however, they were told that, structurally, it could not be done. Arthur Ziev addressed the Board and stated that the first level of approval was by the Skye Canyon developer and that they could not even ask the city if Skye Canyon did not approve; adding that it would require adjusting the front of the building and was a highly impractical and inefficient use of space.

Member Noble stated that the Board would like more candor from Mr. Ziev, with better explanations of why a request was not feasible. Discussion ensued regarding the approval process for changes and having the Board more involved in building plans in the future. Mr. Reeves stated that he would obtain a more detailed explanation regarding the library request denial.

Assistant Principal Lackey stated that she had also requested access to the building in May to facilitate holding a summer camp. Mr. Reeves stated that they were working to obtain a temporary certificate of occupancy

for summer school; adding that they would not have to commence payments until the building was completely turned over to Somerset Academy.

11. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Valley Turkey School Site

Mr. Reeves stated that enough interest had been expressed at the recent telephonic Board meeting to continue pursuing the Valley Turkey property. Executive Director Barlow stated that, with the correct signage, the building would market itself; adding that this location could be a great feeder for the Losee high school. Executive Director Barlow further stated that he, along with Principal Denson, Principal Phillips, and Principal Pendleton, had visited nearby Shadow Ridge High School for an accreditation, and they felt like Somerset could easily compete against that school.

Member Mizer asked Principal Phillips to share his opinion of the location. Principal Phillips stated that, although it might seem like a natural feeder site for the Sky Pointe campus, he was going to have a program that no one could compete with and that would be worth the travel; adding that Losee's band program was better than most CCSD band programs. Member Brady stated that the waitlists in the Valley Turkey area look like they could support a school. Ms. Thiriot referred to the support materials and stated that, out of 128 8th grade students at the North Las Vegas campus, 43 would be attending Losee high school and 54 would be attending Sky Pointe high school; adding that they would lose some to magnet schools and to Legacy high school. Member Boehlecke stated that students would travel a long distance to attend the school they wanted to attend; adding that the band program would attract many students.

Member Brady stated that, although it would be nice to be closer to the Losee campus, there was a demand for an elementary school in that area; adding that he had consulted an independent developer and had been assured that this site was the best option available. Member Bentham stated that they could appoint the Valley Turkey site to have priority seating at Losee high school. Executive Director Barlow stated that they would ensure that students would not want to go to another school.

Member Harty stated that his concern was that they continued to build without an overall strategy of where they wanted to end up and how big they want to grow; adding that every additional campus was a financial risk. Member Brady stated that, with growth, the risk was minimized; adding that if one campus were to drop below sustainable enrollment levels the other campuses could help support them until enrollment was built back up. Mr. Reeves stated that the need for a feeder school for the Losee high school had previously been addressed in an amendment that the Board had approved and submitted to the state authorizer. Member Harty stated that he had expressed the same concerns at the time of the amendment and had been assured that they were establishing the opportunity for growth but were not obligated to grow. Mr. Reeves stated that North Las Vegas was growing and new charter schools were entering the area, therefore Somerset needed to be able to secure the students in elementary to feed the high school. Discussion ensued regarding the new charter schools entering the area.

Member Mizer stated he was concerned that they would be setting Principal Phillips up for failure if they built a feeder school that did not end up feeding his school and asked Principal Phillips if he would prefer to take this site or wait for one closer to the Losee campus. Principal Phillips stated that he would take this site; adding that the location, in the Aliante community, had students who would want to be a part of the Somerset community. Principal Phillips further stated that the Losee band program was instrumental in keeping students at Losee high school; adding that the more they were involved in the community, the more people would see that Losee was the

place they wanted to be. Principal Jenni Martinez addressed the Board and stated that the demand for band at the North Las Vegas campus was so great that they would be offering band in 5th grade; adding that because they had a great teacher and a great program, the students would want to continue on to Losee high school.

Member McClellan stated that the Board's goal had been to have three feeder schools for each high school; however, she was still concerned that this site would end up as a feeder for Sky Pointe and they would have to build another campus closer to Losee. Member Bentham stated that the demand was there and Somerset had the quality and a great program; adding that, with the long waitlist, they would be doing the Somerset system a disservice if they did not move forward with this property. Member Noble stated that the Valley Turkey location did not seem to naturally push students to Losee; however, they had been told that there were currently no other suitable sites available. Member Noble further stated that, in order to sustain a high school, they needed three feeder schools and he would like Somerset's high schools to be filled with Somerset students; adding that, if they could not find another place, this place would fit well enough for him to support it. Discussion ensued regarding adjusting the priority enrollment to ensure that the students were feeding the schools the Board intended for them to attend. Member Noble asked for Academics staff to research the legality of assigning priority. Member Mizer stated that he still felt like they were being pressured into making the decision before they were ready.

Member McClellan moved to approve the Valley Turkey school site. Member Brady seconded the motion, and the Board voted to approve with one dissenting vote.

13. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Installation of Cameras Inside Somerset Academy Classrooms

Mr. Reeves referred to the support materials and stated that the Board had requested two firm bids for the camera system; adding that the bids were \$366,528 from Intellatek and \$378,149 from Brantley Security Systems. Member Noble asked if the cameras contained audio to which Mr. Reeves replied that they were capable, but the audio could be turned off. Member Boehlecke asked where the cameras were currently located in the schools. Mr. Reeves stated that they were at the exterior entrances, the hallways, the multi-purpose rooms, and the cafeterias.

Member Bentham stated that the Florida Somerset campuses had classroom cameras and the teachers and administrators enjoyed having them; adding that, although they could be helpful in reducing and investigating disturbances, they could open up some liability issues. Member Mizer stated that, from a parent's point of view, they would be good; however, from a professional standpoint, they could be a disaster. Member Harty asked if CCSD or other school districts had classroom cameras. Mr. Reeves stated that CCSD did not have classroom cameras. Discussion ensued on the budgetary reasons that cameras had not been included when the first campus was opened. Executive Director Barlow stated that, if the cameras were being considered for security reasons, he would rather see additional security personnel. Member Boehlecke stated that cameras might be an important discussion to have at a later date; adding that it was not a black and white issue.

Member Noble stated that he was not going to call for a motion on this item.

14. Executive Director Update

Executive Director Barlow reported on the following celebratory items:

- Somerset Sky Pointe middle/high school was one of the first charter schools in Nevada to be approved to be a full member of the NIAA.
- Losee middle/high band received superior ratings at the Clark County High School band festival.
- Lone Mountain took second place in the Battle of the Books and Losee middle/high school received a fourth place seat.
- Lone Mountain and Losee elementary schools were recognized as showcase models for The Leader in Me program.

Executive Director Barlow stated that all of the campuses would be using The Leader in Me program, the Charlotte Danielson mentorship model, the MAP assessment, and Kagan Structures to help define the Somerset Academy system of schools. Executive Director Barlow further stated that they were just completing the principal evaluation cycles. Member Bentham asked if the Florida Somerset schools used the MAP assessment, to which Executive Director Barlow replied that the Florida schools used the systems their state required; adding that Nevada required the MAP assessment for grades 1, 2, and 3.

Member McClellan asked if all of the campuses would have an early out day once a week in the coming year. Executive Director Barlow stated that the day after Easter and the three days before Thanksgiving were banked time and in order to make up the banked time the schools would have one day per week with an early dismissal; adding that all of the Somerset campuses would still have more than the required number of minutes per day.

15. Member Comment

Member Mizer asked if they had checked on obtaining a SNHD permit for the farmer's market that was mentioned in the first public comment. Principal Kelley stated that she would be meeting with the teachers and administrators involved and she would ensure that they discussed the SNHD permit requirements.

16. Public Comment

Dr. Robert Stauffer spoke in support of Principal Denson. Ms. Joanna Theresa requested that the Board discuss creating a teacher salary based on education level and experience rather than an open negotiation to ensure that teachers would feel valued.

17. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

Approved on: _____

_____ of the Board of Directors
Somerset Academy of Las Vegas

DRAFT

MINUTES
of the meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of SOMERSET ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS
June 22, 2017

The Board of Directors of Somerset Academy of Nevada held a public meeting on June 22, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. at 7058 Sky Pointe Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89131.

1. Call to order and roll call

The meeting was called to order by Board Chair Cody Noble at 4:17 p.m. Present were Board members Travis Mizer (via telephone-left at 5:30), Carrie Boehlecke (via telephone-arrived in person at 4:45), Will Harty, Cody Noble, Eric Brady (left at 7:00), John Bentham and Sarah McClellan.

Also present was Executive Director John Barlow, Principal Andre Denson, Principal Reggie Farmer, Principal Sherry Pendleton, Principal Reggie Farmer, Principal Jenni Martinez, Principal Gayle Jefferson, Principal Elaine Kelley, Assistant Principal Kate Lackey, Principal Lee Esplin (via telephone); as well as Academica representatives Ryan Reeves, Crystal Thiriot (via telephone), Trevor Goodsell, Kristie Fleisher, Colin Bringhurst, and Arthur Ziev.

2. Public Comments and Discussion

Ms. Sheryl Slakey addressed the Board to express concerns regarding the Athletic Sports Board and its association with the NCSSL.

3. Consent Agenda

3.a. Internet Safety Policy Revision

3.b. Review and Approval of NSLP Related Items

3.b.1. Review and Approval of the Procurement Policy

3.b.2. Review and Approval of the NSLP Meal Charge Policy

3.b.3. Approval of NSLP Vendor

3.d. School Financial Performance (Not for Action)

Member Noble asked in any Board member wanted to pull any items off of the consent agenda. Member Noble asked to pull item 3.c., Nepotism Policy.

Member Noble moved to approve items 3.a. and 3.b. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

4. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Administration Structure of Sky Pointe

Executive Director John Barlow addressed the Board and stated that he and Principals Kelley and Esplin had recently visited the Florida Somerset schools and observed their K-12 models which consisted of one administration for each entity, even when they were at separate locations, with a lead principal and assistant principals over various grade levels. Executive Director Barlow explained that there were challenges with two lead principals located at one site and that this might be time to have a discussion as to the possibility of a transition to a K-12 administration at the Sky Pointe campus. Member Noble stated that he could definitely see the benefits of a more efficient structure, which might also solve some of the issues which had arisen in the past and make for a smoother transition between 5th and 6th grade. Member Noble further stated that, with the administration changes at Sky Pointe this year, now might be a good time to make changes in the administration structure, specifically to one which had proven successful in Florida.

Member Bentham echoed Member Noble's sentiments and stated that he would also support a change in the administrative structure. Member Harty stated that he could see a struggle in maintaining a consistent culture within Somerset, and that this change in the administration structure might be helpful, especially considering the data that came out of Somerset in Florida.

Executive Director Barlow invited the K-8 principals to speak to the transition from 5th to 6th grade and how it was more seamless in a K-8 model with one administration. Principal Sherry Pendleton addressed the Board and stated that there really was not much of a transition because the culture permeated throughout all grades, adding that their 5th graders had an opportunity to shadow the 6th graders. Principal Pendleton further stated that from a cultural and behavioral standpoint, there was not much of a transition. Member Harty asked if there was a difference between the cultures in the elementary versus the middle school grades, to which Principal Pendleton stated that there were some differences, especially emotional; however, expectations were the same throughout; adding that she could not speak to having multiple buildings as they had at the K-12 schools.

Additional discussion took place regarding the end-of-year surveys with a suggestion that those come from the campuses themselves rather than the management company, with the capability of selecting more than one student and grade.

Principal Reggie Farmer addressed the Board and stated that, although the expectations and procedures for K-8 students remained the same, there were differences in the way certain issues were dealt with in the middle school, taking into consideration the changes that middle school students were undergoing. Member Bentham agreed that it was clear from past meetings that the Stephanie campus had one seamless culture.

Principal Jenni Martinez addressed the Board and stated that when she came to North Las Vegas as principal she and her staff made a concerted effort to create a consistent progressive discipline policy, with only one minor difference between the elementary and middle school (hallway procedures); adding that this did help create that seamless culture, although it was sometimes difficult in the middle school where there was more turn-over and therefore less understanding of the Somerset culture.

Member Harty asked Principal Martinez to comment on the addition of a dean at the North Las Vegas campus. Principal Martinez catalogued the history of the North Las Vegas campus in the past year before a dean was put in place and after; adding that there had been a drastic improvement in that serious infractions had decreased and that the other administrators were able to focus on education rather than discipline.

Member Noble asked what it would look like in a K-8 campus to have one principal for K-5 and another for 6-8; to which Principal Farmer replied that you would have two different administrators with different

mindsets who might create a situation where the middle school students would have to assimilate to a whole new set of expectations and the culture of one singular school would be lost. Discussion ensued regarding the conflicts that could arise with two different administrators on one campus.

Member McClellan stated that, having had children attend in both situations (K-8 and K-12), she personally preferred the K-8 scenario with its seamless transitions and would, therefore, support the single K-12 administration at Sky Pointe. Member Boehlecke echoed that sentiment. Member Mizer stated that he had also observed the success in the Florida schools and believed that a single K-12 administration would be in the best interest of Sky Pointe. Member Brady concurred with the desirability of a seamless structure.

Member Harty stated that he would like to see the position of dean worked into the budget for the fall at each of the campuses that did not currently have one.

Member Brady moved to approve the transition to one administration K-12 at the Sky Pointe campus. Member Harty seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

Member Harty moved to add a dean position to the Sky Pointe administration. Member Bentham seconded the motion.

Executive Director Barlow pointed out that the motion regarding the dean would dictate how the Sky Pointe administrator would have to allocate funds. Member Noble stated that they could pull the motion and evaluate the financial impact; however, it was his opinion that the Board would like to see this happen. Member Harty also stated that he would pull the motion, but it was his recommendation that this take place before school opened in the fall.

Member Noble stated that they needed to address the issue of two current administrators and that the new leadership should have experience with both elementary and middle/high.

Principal Andre Denson addressed the Board and stated that Sky Pointe Middle/High had already budgeted for a dean (student advocate) for the coming school year, adding that in past years those duties had been shared between the middle/high administrators. Principal Denson stated that he would like to remove himself from consideration for the K-12 administrator position. Various Board members thanked Principal Denson for his work.

Member Noble stated that, as the remaining administrator, Principal Esplin should be considered for the position. Executive Director Barlow assured the Board that Principal Esplin had been informed of this possibility and had expressed a willingness to take on the position; however, he could not be present that night. Member Harty suggested receiving a transition update at the next meeting from the new principal.

Principal Denson recommended determining a transition period (December or next year) and offered to stay on in any useful capacity; adding that timing and the hiring of staff was crucial for the coming year.

Principal Lee Esplin joined the Board meeting via telephone and voiced his interest in the position; adding that he was also impressed with the K-12 administrations in Florida and that he would not recommend dragging it out too long. Executive Director Barlow proposed meeting with the new principal, forming a transition plan, and reporting on that plan at the next board meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the transition period and how it might be communicated to the Board.

Member Noble moved to approve the hiring of Principal Lee Esplin as the leader of the Sky Pointe K-12 campus. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

Member Noble recommended that Principal Esplin and Executive Director Barlow report to the Board as soon as possible to report on the transition plan how it would play out. Executive Director Barlow suggested that, as it would take time for him to collaborate with Principals Esplin, Denson, and Jefferson in order to formulate a plan; that he report to the Board around the third week in July.

6. Somerset Foundation Update

Mr. Scott Hammond addressed the Board and informed them that the Foundation had finally received 501(c)(3) status and could now legitimately solicit donations. Mr. Hammond noted the following highlights:

- Two new board members with four more being added by the end of November
- Many phone calls had been made resulting in funds raised, specifically for the Leader in Me program (#1 talking point with donors)
- Lights in front of the Losee campus (commitment from mayor - \$30,000 value)
- Great American Challenge Program
- Plans for five events during the school year:
 - o Basketball tournament with teams from all over the country held at Sky Pointe gymnasium (should net \$5,000)
 - o Mayoral challenge (should net \$5,000+)
 - o BYU volleyball exhibition game
 - o 2nd Annual Basketball Tournament in December
 - o School of Choice Gala
- Goal of bringing in \$9,000-\$15,000 per month

Member Harty stated that the Foundation board had been meeting regularly and suggested that this Board discuss the fact that Somerset had funded the Foundation Director position for the past year and that it was intended that the Foundation take over those expenses; however, it appeared that it would make more sense to run those expenses through Somerset; and reimburse Somerset by the Foundation in the amount of \$15,000 per month or a minimum of \$9,000. Member Harty suggested revisiting the situation in a few months once the Foundation had had an opportunity to properly fundraise under the recently obtained 501(c)(3). Member McClellan asked what would happen if the reimbursements did not happen within the three months, to which Member Harty responded that they would need to reevaluate the Foundation Director position; however, there was a plan in place to ensure that it would not be an issue.

Executive Director Barlow stated that he had suggested that, as Mr. Hammond often represented the interest of all charter schools, the Academica family of charters might consider contributing to his salary. Mr. Hammond stated that he would not feel entirely comfortable with that as there needed to be a fire-wall between this endeavor and his job as a state senator. Mr. Hammond mentioned that the bill regarding a matriculation agreement between charters did make it through the legislature.

Member Bentham led a discussion regarding strategic vision, with Mr. Hammond commenting on some of the obstacles he had encountered over the past year and some of the directions he was looking at for the future.

Member Noble suggested revisiting the situation in three months to determine how successful the Foundation Director had been before deciding how to proceed. Member Brady stated that the Board should determine whether Mr. Hammond would continue as an employee of Somerset so that the Foundation funds

would not go directly to Mr. Hammond’s salary; adding that they would also want to ensure that fundraising efforts going on at the school level were not in conflict with what the Foundation planned. Member Bentham recommended that the amount that would be reimbursed to Somerset would be a minimum of \$9,000 per month with a reassessment in three months. Member Harty stated that the Foundation board was created to manage the Foundation, but if the Somerset Board wanted to manage the Foundation, there might not be a need for a Foundation board. Mr. Colin Bringhurst addressed the Board and clarified that the Foundation board was its own entity and not a committee of the Somerset Board. Member Noble suggested that the motion state that the Foundation must make a donation in the amount of no less than \$9,000 per month. Some discussion ensued regarding how to proceed.

Member Brady moved to continue Mr. Hammond’s employment beyond August 1, 2017 as an at-will employee. Member Noble seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

3.c. Nepotism Policy

Mr. Bringhurst explained that the Nepotism Policy had been created at the suggestion of Member Harty in an effort to avoid the appearance of impropriety and ensure that the most qualified applicants were being hired. Some discussion ensued regarding the definition of “supervisor” and clarifications of relationships. Member Harty clarified that his intention was not that relatives could not be hired, but that, when they were, it was disclosed and equitable in order to avoid any perceived impropriety. Member Noble stated that perhaps the policy should require that disclosure take place in regard to any employee, not just supervisors. Member Harty suggested that the policy be approved with the proposed change. Member Noble stated that the documentation would fall into the hands of the Executive Director.

Member Noble moved to approve the Somerset Nepotism Policy with proposed changes to include “all employees” instead of “supervisor” on line three of item #1. Member McClellan seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

5. Annual Election of Board Officers

Mr. Reeves explained that each Board officer could serve for a total of three one-year terms, adding that the Board Chair and the Board Treasurer had both completed three one-year terms and that those offices must be filled by other Board members; and also that the other officers needed to be re-elected.

Member Harty Nominated John Bentham as Board Chair. The Board voted unanimously to elect John Bentham as Board Chair.

Member Bentham Nominated Will Harty as Board Vice Chair. The Board voted unanimously to elect Will Harty as Board Vice Chair.

Member Noble Nominated Carrie Boehlecke as Board Secretary. The Board voted unanimously to elect Carrie Boehlecke as Board Secretary.

Member Noble Nominated Travis Mizer as Board Treasurer. The Board voted unanimously to elect Travis Mizer as Board Treasurer.

Executive Directive Barlow clarified that Member Mizer, as Treasurer, would now also serve on the Foundation board. Member Brady stated that he would stay on as a member of the Foundation board.

7. Review and Approval of the Lease for the Skye Canyon Campus

Mr. Arthur Ziev addressed the Board and stated the Skye Canyon lease would need to be approved by the Board. Mr. Ziev stated that the lease would need to be signed once it was in its final form and had undergone approval by the school's legal counsel; adding that the school's legal counsel had approved the document thus far with some suggested changes. Mr. Ziev explained that this lease was similar to the other leases with Turner-Agassi and would go into effect on July 1, 2018; with three months of \$1 per month rent for property tax purposes, and the regular monthly lease amount beginning September 1, 2018. Mr. Ziev reviewed the exact amounts per the support materials, based on enrollment.

Mr. Ziev stated that the plans had been drawn to specifications by the principal including a larger gymnasium, some office changes, and the additional room above the entryway of the school (media room).

Some discussion ensued to clarify the appraised value and how it would affect the capped purchase price.

Member Noble moved to approve the lease for the Skye Canyon campus. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

8. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve a Start Date for the Valley/Turkey School Site

Mr. Reeves stated that with the Board's approval to move forward with a K-8 at the Valley/Turkey site, it was necessary to determine a start date, whether that would be the 2018/2019 or 2019/2020 school year; adding that there was a willingness on behalf of the developers to hold the site in the event that the Board chose to wait until the 2019/2020 school year. Member Noble asked what the cost would be to hold the site until the 2019/2020 school year, to which Mr. Reeves replied that there would be a higher purchase price and a higher per month lease payment in order to hold the property for a year. Mr. Ziev stated that the exact cost would be the interest for that year, for instance, \$175,000 on a property valued at \$2 million (potentially \$17,000 annually); adding that the Board might also want to take into account to dramatic increase in current construction costs.

Mr. Reeves suggested that they also take into account the difficulties of opening two campuses in one year in regards to enrollment, hiring teachers, etc. Ms. Crystal Thiriot addressed the Board and stated that teachers were drawn to administrators and specific schools and that this should not be too concerning of an issue. Executive Director Barlow stated that teachers and administrators within the system were looking for growth opportunities that opening new schools would provide. Member Noble asked if there would be any issues with getting the school built by the 2018/2019 school year, to which Mr. Ziev replied that, at that time, there were no foreseeable delays; and that permitting would begin in July.

Member McClellan moved to approve the 2018/2019 school year as the start date for the K-8 Valley/Turkey site. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

9. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Remodel at the North Las Vegas Campus

Mr. Ziev directed the Board to the support materials where the plans for the NLV remodel could be found, indicating that the principal had worked with the architect in order to confirm specifications; adding that it would be funded through bond proceeds. Mr. Ziev estimated a cost of \$50,000 or less, adding that they would come back to the Board if they anticipated exceeding that amount. Mr. Trevor Goodsell addressed the Board and stated that there were no financial reasons not to proceed; however, this would be the final project funded through the bond proceeds as they were looking to close out that account.

Executive Director Barlow asked if there was a possibility that this would be completed before school began; to which Mr. Ziev replied in the affirmative.

Member Noble moved to approve the remodel at the North Las Vegas campus not to exceed \$50,000. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

10. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Remodel at the Stephanie Campus

Mr. Ziev stated that the proposed remodel at the Stephanie campus consisted of enlarging the nurse's office and adding an additional office and storage under the stairway near the front offices; which should not exceed \$25,000. Mr. Goodsell stated that this would not be part of the current bond; however, it would be built into the bond they were currently working on for Losee and Stephanie. Mr. Ziev stated that they could do it that way if they did not want to begin the remodel until the next year; to which Mr. Goodsell replied that they would be fine to proceed now with budget of \$25,000.

Some discussion ensued as to the adequacy of the remodel and whether these changes were taken into account with the new campuses.

Member Bentham moved to approve the remodel at the Stephanie campus not to exceed \$25,000. Member Boehlecke seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

11. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding a Priority Seating Policy

Ms. Kristie Fleisher addressed the Board and stated that this policy had come about to clearly identify to which high school a middle-school student would receive guaranteed priority seating; adding that the policy did not take away the right to request a transfer to any campus. Clarifications as to the specifics of the policy were discussed by the Board, with the understanding that it was always to goal to make sure that seats were available to those students moving up through the system. Member Noble stated that this policy would not address the issue at the level of the siblings on wait-lists spanning years, to which Ms. Fleisher replied that they had been told it was not legally feasible to do so, as a full lottery needed to take place each year. Member Noble asked if legal counsel could look into this issue further, to which Mr. Reeves replied in the affirmative and also stated that they could seek approval through the SPCSA.

Member Noble stated that this policy would address the question at hand, which was to give priority seating to particular high schools based on the middle school the student attended; adding that this could become an issue in particular with the location of the Valley/Turkey site.

Member McClellan asked for the opinions of the principals. Principal Martinez expressed concern at losing students who had registered at North Las Vegas in the hopes of a transfer to Sky Pointe; however, this policy might take away any false hope parents might have. Member Noble clarified that parents would still be able to request a transfer to the school of their choice. Discussion ensued as to various scenarios that might arise with the influx of new students, including the need to create a culture where the students would want to continue on to their zoned high school.

Member Boehlecke moved to approve the Priority Seating Policy as presented. Member Harty seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

13. Executive Director Update

Executive Director Barlow stated that the first Sky Pointe graduation had taken place and added that there was one student who did not graduate at that time; however, she had since completed her course-work and they could now consider the Sky Pointe class of 2017 as graduating at 100%.

Executive Director Barlow reviewed some curriculum changes, including the move to MAPS; adding that they would continue to move toward other curriculum goals with the addition of Principal Jefferson as Curriculum Director; as well as the continued implementation of the Leader in Me program. Executive Director Barlow reviewed other platforms which would be adopted at various campuses.

Executive Director Barlow stated that they currently had every seat filled at every campus and would have approximately 7,000 students system wide in the coming year, with Ms. Fleisher confirming that this was the first year that had happened.

14. Member Comment

Member Bentham stated that there were schools mentioned at the Charter School Conference that met with parents at the beginning of each school year to discuss funding and request that parents give however much they were able in order to provide extra services; adding that they might want to look into preparing a brochure that would explain funding and put forth opportunities for donating. Discussion ensued regarding opportunities within the law that might encourage donations without making parents feel obligated, especially when they were already giving through volunteer hours.

12. Executive Director Evaluation

Member Noble stated that six of the seven administrators had filled out the survey and that the rubric score was 51/60; asking Executive Director Barlow if this was an acceptable and expected score. Executive Director Barlow replied that lower score was due to fact that scores from one administrator were missing.

Member Noble asked Executive Director Barlow to speak to some of the areas in which he excelled and those that required some future improvement. Executive Director Barlow stated that it was nice to see in the scores and comments that the administrators recognized that goals were being made and carried out, especially in respect to vision. Executive Director Barlow noted that one lower scoring area was his lack of attendance at campus events, adding that he had already determined several ways in which he could have more of a presence at the individual campuses.

Another improvement Executive Director Barlow had planned for the future was to help each administrator clearly interpret data and identify and define goals as a school, focusing on student achievement; adding that this could then be more clearly reported to the Board.

Member Harty stated that his suggestion would be to help improve the transition between middle and high school; adding that it was apparent that this was already being addressed by the Executive Director. Member Harty also encouraged Executive Director Barlow to step in with matters concerning parents who were utilizing the Grievance Policy to ensure that serious matters were addressed. Member Noble encouraged the Executive Director to support the Grievance Policy and its levels of progression, to which Member Harty replied that he hoped that there would be an open door for items of serious magnitude.

Member Boehlecke encouraged Executive Director Barlow to make sure that once the data was collected it would be utilized to the benefit of the teachers and students. Executive Director Barlow agreed and stated that much of the planned professional development would speak directly to the data and how it could best be utilized beyond just information.

Member Bentham asked Executive Director Barlow what had surprised him over the past year as his responsibilities changed and how he could use that information moving forward. Executive Director Barlow stated that he had been very careful to respect the principals' roles and never to step on toes and ensured that they knew that he had their back and that positive relationships had been forged.

Member McClellan stated that her critique would be that information was not always given to every Board member and that there were times she felt uninformed of situations where other Board members were aware.

Member Noble asked Executive Director Barlow what supports he needed from the Board, to which Executive Director Barlow replied that, with the growth in the system, they would need more instructional support. Executive Director Barlow stated that the addition of Principal Jefferson was an initial step in that direction; however, he could see a need for additional support in math and sciences; adding that he felt he had the support of the Board as well as the administrators.

Member Harty thanked Executive Director Barlow for his hard work and dedication, recognizing that not many realized the many areas in which he directed the system. Member Noble echoed those sentiments and offered his thanks as well.

Member Harty moved to extend the contract with Executive Director John Barlow with a salary increase in line with funding. Member Bentham seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

15. Public Comment

Sky Pointe teacher Amy Chapin addressed the Board and suggested that the teachers be involved in the Sky Pointe administration transition.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

Approved on: _____

_____ **of the Board of Directors**
Somerset Academy of Las Vegas

DRAFT

MINUTES
of the meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS of SOMERSET ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS
July 11, 2017

The Board of Directors of Somerset Academy of Nevada held a telephonic public meeting on July 11, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.

1. Call to order and roll call

The meeting was called to order by Board Chair John Bentham at 4:06 p.m. Present were Board members Will Harty, Carrie Boehlecke, Sarah McClellan, John Bentham, and Cody Noble (4:10 p.m.).

Board members Eric Brady and Travis Mizer were not present.

Also present was Executive Director John Barlow, Principal Lee Esplin, and Principal Jenni Martinez; as well as Academica representatives Trevor Goodsell, Allison Salmon, and Crystal Thiriot.

2. Public Comments and Discussion

There was no request for public comment.

3. Discussion and Possible Approval of Additional Funds for Text Books, Consumables, and/or Computers for the 2017/2018 School Year

Executive Director John Barlow addressed the Board and stated that, with the expansion of the campuses, they did not have sufficient money in the budget to cover the expenses for new sets of curriculum, text books and classroom equipment; adding that Trevor Goodsell and Allison Salmon had worked out a possible option to present to the Board. Discussion ensued regarding the expenses at the Sky Pointe campus, with Member Harty stating that Sky Pointe information had not been included in the documents, therefore they should not discuss that campus at this meeting. Mr. Trevor Goodsell addressed the Board and stated that the circumstances at the Sky Pointe campus had been rectified, and that this item addressed issues at North Las Vegas and Losee Middle/High.

Member Harty stated that, based on the support materials, the deficit at the two campuses was \$33,000 for the North Las Vegas campus and \$75,000 for the Losee Middle/High campus. Mr. Goodsell stated that the Board was being asked to approve \$15,000 for North Las Vegas campus; adding that they would use SGF funds to cover the remaining \$17,000. Mr. Goodsell further stated that the amount needed at Losee Middle/High campus was \$45,000; adding that the remaining \$29,000 would be covered with the 10% that was built into the Zions lease.

Principal Jenni Martinez addressed the Board and stated that she had not been included in the discussion to commit the North Las Vegas' SGF to cover part of the expenses. Mr. Goodsell stated that he had discussed it with Executive Director Barlow; adding that if they did not use the funds they would need to make cuts in other areas. Member Bentham stated that he was concerned that Principal Martinez was not aware of the commitment of the North Las Vegas SGF funds, and asked if Principal Phillips was included in the discussion about the Losee

Middle/High campus. Executive Director Barlow stated that he and Principal Phillips had discussed the options; adding that Losee Middle/High needed the SGF money to support the Leader in Me program. Principal Martinez stated that she would have to adjust some POs, do without some computers, and adjust a curriculum item; adding that she needed to refurbish forty-five donated computers with cables, keyboards, and monitors. Ms. Allison Salmon addressed the Board and stated that the state would be paying a portion of the NWEA math testing for K-3, which should save the North Las Vegas campus approximately \$2,500.

Member Noble asked what had caused the discrepancy that resulted in this situation. Ms. Salmon stated that Losee Middle/High needed to furnish thirteen new classrooms as well as music rooms; adding that Principal Phillips had kept his curriculum and technology very minimal. Ms. Salmon further stated that Principal Martinez was working to bring her campus into alignment with the Somerset objective, therefore she needed to purchase some curriculum pieces; adding that she had also been minimal in her furniture and technology needs. Member Noble asked how the needed items would normally be funded. Ms. Salmon stated that when they opened the new area at the Sky Pointe high school they had been able to make cuts in some areas and limit curriculum as well as use the 10% buffer from the Zions lease to cover the shortfall.

Member Noble asked why, if this had happened before, they had not anticipated the shortfall. Executive Director Barlow stated that when Ms. Salmon had asked for furniture requests it had been when the administrators had been involved with the end of year activities and assessments. Ms. Salmon explained that a portion of the summer purchase budget was funded from the regular operating budget based on the existing students, and a portion was funded from the Zions lease based on new student enrollment and additions to campuses. Ms. Salmon stated that furniture orders needed to be placed in May to ensure that they could be delivered and installed by the beginning of the school year in mid-August; adding that she and Mr. Goodsell had anticipated using the built in 10% from the Zions lease; however, the amount needed exceeded the \$29,000 available.

Member Noble asked if it was possible to borrow the funds that were needed. Member Harty stated that the budget had a surplus of over \$200,000, therefore they could use the surplus funds and would not need to borrow any extra funds. Member Harty further stated that the budget had been approved at 95% enrollment and every year so far they had achieved more than 95% enrollment; adding that, although they needed to do a better job of budgeting in the future, he was inclined to approve the funds. Member Noble asked if using the surplus funds would affect the upcoming bond issue. Mr. Goodsell stated that the proposed amount would be equivalent to about one half day cash on hand, therefore it would not make a noticeable difference in the bond rating. Further discussion ensued regarding the upcoming bond issue.

Mr. Goodsell stated that the motion should have an amount attached. Member Harty asked if stating that the amount was not to exceed \$75,000 would be appropriate. Member Noble asked if they would need to use the North Las Vegas SGF funds if they specified not to exceed \$75,000. Mr. Goodsell stated that they would not need to use very much of the SGF funds if they approved up to \$75,000. Discussion ensued regarding how the SGF funds were typically used.

Member McClellan moved to approve additional funds for text books, consumables, and/or computers for the 2017/2018 school year not to exceed \$75,000. Member Harty seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve.

4. Member Comment

Member Harty stated that the Board should discuss finding the funding for a student advocate position for the Stephanie campus; adding that it would be helpful to have an additional person helping with the discipline issues. Member McClellan stated that the campuses that currently had a dean or student advocate position had funded it from their existing budgets by making cuts in other areas. Member Noble stated that they had approved additional funding for a student advocate for the North Las Vegas campus. Member Harty asked Mr. Goodsell if they had adjusted the budget or approved an additional expenditure for the North Las Vegas campus, to which Mr. Goodsell replied that he would need to research the budget to determine which method was used. Executive Director Barlow stated that the dynamics at the Stephanie campus had changed, which resulted in Principal Farmer spending more time conducting investigations because of student misbehavior; adding that this resulted in Principal Farmer not being able to focus on helping his teachers improve. Discussion ensued regarding how the funding per campus was determined, with Member Noble asking to have a discussion on the construction of the budget included on a future agenda

5. Public Comments and Discussion

There was no request for public comment.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Approved on: _____

_____ of the Board of Directors
Somerset Academy of Las Vegas

Cover Sheet

Enrollment

Section: II. Items of Business
Item: B. Enrollment
Purpose: Vote
Submitted by: John Barlow
Related Material: Losee Enrollment.pdf
Sky Pointe Enrollment.pdf

BACKGROUND:

This item is in reference to the possible adjustment of enrollment targets due to exhausted wait lists.

RECOMMENDATION:

Move to approve the revised grade-level maximum enrollment for the 2017/2018 school year.



Somerset Academy - Losee Campus - 2017-2018

Home [Accept/Decline Student](#) [Student Record Lookup](#) [Lotto Center](#) [Report Center](#) [Email Center](#) [Registration Packets](#) [School Settings](#) [New Student Docs](#) [Users](#)

Administrative Interface As of Date 8/2/17

Applications	1,350	Group	K	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
Projected	1836	Projected	125	125	125	125	125	125	180	180	180	240	150	100	56
Applied	1841	Applied	290	224	223	172	200	203	238	159	109	3	3	7	10
Other Priority	0	Other Priority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sibling Priority	90	Sibling Priority	1	1	11	17	21	17	5	9	7	0	0	0	1
Transfer Priority	52	Transfer Priority	0	0	11	7	9	8	0	10	7	0	0	0	0
Wait List	1322	Wait List	206	174	180	122	150	151	169	96	64	0	1	5	4
Accepted	40	Accepted	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	7	5	7	6	5	1
Confirmed	32	Confirmed	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	13	3	5	1
Registered	1751	Registered	117	122	124	124	125	124	183	172	170	205	141	90	54
Total	1823	Total	124	124	125	125	125	125	184	181	179	225	150	100	56
Declined	424	Declined	64	29	9	14	13	11	68	31	12	114	30	21	8
Withdrawn	0	Withdrawn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Requested Transfer	36	Requested Transfer	0	7	3	3	7	5	4	2	4	0	0	0	1
Transfer Pending	2	Transfer Pending	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transfer Completed	5	Transfer Completed	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
NonReturning	0	NonReturning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd Choice transfer	0	2nd Choice transfer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Get Admission Entries by Guardian Last Name: [A](#) [B](#) [C](#) [D](#) [E](#) [F](#) [G](#) [H](#) [I](#) [J](#) [K](#) [L](#) [M](#) [N](#) [O](#) [P](#) [Q](#) [R](#) [S](#) [T](#) [U](#) [V](#) [W](#) [X](#) [Y](#) [Z](#)



Somerset Academy - Sky Pointe - 2017-2018

[Home](#)
[Accept/Decline Student](#)
[Student Record Lookup](#)
[Lotto Center](#)
[Report Center](#)
[Email Center](#)
[Registration Packets](#)
[School Settings](#)
[New Student Docs](#)
[Users](#)

Administrative Interface As of Date 8/2/17

Applications	2,214	Group	K	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
Projected	1985	Projected	100	125	125	125	125	125	180	180	180	270	180	150	120
Applied	3046	Applied	688	390	283	285	312	310	346	232	170	0	0	14	16
Other Priority	0	Other Priority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sibling Priority	149	Sibling Priority	0	5	4	15	46	46	1	16	10	0	0	0	6
Transfer Priority	134	Transfer Priority	0	20	16	22	21	19	2	16	17	0	0	0	1
Wait List	2571	Wait List	608	347	241	239	266	272	285	173	128	0	0	0	12
Accepted	33	Accepted	2	0	2	0	0	2	7	3	2	1	9	5	0
Confirmed	2	Confirmed	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Registered	1897	Registered	97	124	123	125	125	123	172	177	177	234	168	144	108
Total	1932	Total	100	125	125	125	125	125	179	180	179	235	177	149	108
Declined	436	Declined	14	10	13	5	7	7	28	16	15	228	54	25	14
Withdrawn	0	Withdrawn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Requested Transfer	26	Requested Transfer	1	7	9	2	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
Transfer Pending	1	Transfer Pending	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Transfer Completed	0	Transfer Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NonReturning	0	NonReturning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Get Admission Entries by Guardian Last Name: [A](#) [B](#) [C](#) [D](#) [E](#) [F](#) [G](#) [H](#) [I](#) [J](#) [K](#) [L](#) [M](#) [N](#) [O](#) [P](#) [Q](#) [R](#) [S](#) [T](#) [U](#) [V](#) [W](#) [X](#) [Y](#) [Z](#)