



# City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
53202

## Meeting Minutes

### CHARTER SCHOOL REVIEW COMMITTEE

**KEVIN INGRAM, CHAIR**

**Joyce Mallory, Vice-Chair**

**Ruben Burgos, Naryan David Leazer, Monique Liston, Desiree  
Pointer-Mace, and Glenn Steinbrecher**

**Staff Assistant: Linda Elmer, (414) 286-2231**

**Fax: 286-3456, lelmer@milwaukee.gov**

**Gayle Peay, 288-1540**

---

Tuesday, January 30, 2018

5:30 PM

City Hall, Room 301-B

---

**1. Roll call.**

*Meeting convened: 5:30 P.M.*

*All members present (Ms. Mallory arrived at 5:34 P.M.)*

**2. Review and approval of minutes from the November 9, 2017 meeting.**

*Ms. Pointer-Mace moved, seconded by Mr. Burgos, for approval of the minutes. There were no objections.*

**3. [170703](#)**

Communication relating to administrative matters of the Charter School Review Committee for the 2017-2019 school years.

**Sponsors:** THE CHAIR

*Ms. Peay said currently all seniors have to take the ACT and that will remain the same. But the question is if a junior scores well enough, why do they have to take the test again as a senior? Could juniors who score 20 or above be exempt from having to take it again as a senior? Ms. Pointer-Mace isn't opposed, but wonders why such a low score is accepted, rather than pushing students to do better. Mr. Burgos was concerned that a score would be put in writing but the benchmark may change in the future. Ms. Pointer-Mace suggested maybe "meets or exceeds the statewide average" rather than a specific number. Mr. Burgos said it's not only a score for the students, but also a score of the impact the school has on a student and how well it is educating its students. Another possibility would be to say it "meets or exceeds the college-ready score." The students take the test as juniors in the spring and in the fall as seniors so there is only a six-month period between the taking of the same test. Ms. Liston wanted to push students beyond being "average" and to strive to improve. Ms. Peay said there was also some concern in having to pay to take the test a second time. Ms. Mallory also encouraged schools to provide more rigorous classes so students can perform well on the test. Mr. Ingram noted that forcing all students to take the ACT hasn't resulted in a drastic reduction in scores. Mr. Leazer would suggest using the "college or career" ready number so our standard can change when that number changes. Ms. Pointer-Mace suggested choosing a higher number to use as an incentive in terms of they don't have to take the test a second time. Ms. Liston and Ms. Pointer-Mace wanted to work toward continuous improvement, rather than just*

accepting a 20 or a 21.

Mr. Ingram suggested tabling this and looking at the college readiness scores for each of the sub-test categories. Ms. Mallory, moved seconded by Ms. Pointer-Mace, to table this matter. There were no objections.

Ms. Peay said that the Pilot Scorecards on the schools went down and the body wants to have 3 years of data before setting expectations and move it out of the pilot stage (if the state assessment method doesn't change). Ms. Susan Gramling, Children's Research Center, said when the original scorecard was created, it was created based upon 3 years of data. The committee didn't want the school scores just based on the ACT, but on local measures as well as more interested in seeing improvement over time. Ms. Pointer-Mace would like to be able to track how individual kids do over time at the school. Do students improve at this school? Ms. Mallory would actually like to track a cohort of kids over time and tease out why students don't make progress, if they don't.

Votes on recommendations contained in the report:

Items #1. The Children's Research Center complete the pilot scorecard with data for all elements in each school's annual report.

Ms. Pointer-Mace moved, seconded by Mr. Leazer, to accept this recommendation. There were no objections.

Item #2. The Children's Research Center use these pilot scorecard data as well as the school's compliance with contract requirements to make its annual recommendation about each school's status to the CSRC. The CRC would consider the school's progress rather than any expectation set by the CSRC.

Ms. Pointer-Mace moved, seconded by Mr. Burgos, to accept this recommendation. There were no objections.

Item #3. The CSRC set new policies and expectation after the receipt of the schools' annual reports for the 2018-19 school year which will enable the members to utilize three years of comparable pilot scorecard data. It will also be added to this recommendation that CSRC will examine year-to-year data.

Ms. Pointer-Mace moved, seconded by Ms. Mallory, to accept this recommendation. There were no objections.

Item #4. The total scorecard results will be collected for each of the three years of this pilot that included year to year analysis in order to determine an appropriate expectation for the total pilot scorecard percentage.

Ms. Pointer-Mace moved, seconded by Ms. Liston, to accept this recommendation. There were no objections.

(this recommendation is to try to get over the "n" factor in which there are 10 or fewer students). CRC does change its calculations in an attempt to deal with this situation.

Meeting adjourned: 6:28 P.M.

Linda M. Elmer

Staff Assistant

This meeting can be viewed in its entirety through the City's Legislative Research Center at <http://milwaukee.legistar.com/calendar>.