

The Classical Academy  
975 Stout Road  
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Board of Directors Regular Meeting  
East Campus  
Monday, Dec 10, 2007

- I. Call to Order - Chairman Matt Carpenter called the open session to order at 6:04 p.m.
- II. Pledge of Allegiance/Roll Call.
  - A. Matt Carpenter led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.
  - B. Roll Call. The following Directors were present: Matt Carpenter, Chris Bender, Clark Miller, Steve Pope, Lisa Sutton, Chris Leland, and Steve Tomberlin. Also present: Mark Hyatt, President.
- III. Spotlight Recognition
- IV. Comments
  - A. From the Board. Matt Carpenter provided an overview of the various actions taken to date, and the options available for the facilities at the East Campus. While there are a variety of options ranging from remediating the current modulars to constructing a new building, he reminded the audience that it is unlikely that the issue will be resolved tonight. He thanked everyone for taking the time to attend and to share their thoughts, and described this issue as a TCA community issue, not merely an issue for the members of the East Campus. He promised the Board would work through this, and determine what's best for TCA as a whole. He closed by thanking Principal Diana Burditt for her leadership and commitment throughout this entire process, and he presented a gift to her on behalf of the Board, for her tireless sacrifices.
  - B. From the Audience.
    1. Robin Sedgewick asked three questions, regarding rent, grants, and remediation of the East buildings. Specifically she asked why we are paying rent to D20 for use of their facilities, since her research on the charter school act indicates that we are never to pay rent to our host district. She also inquired into how much rent we are paying. Next, she offered information on grants for charter schools, stating that some are available for safety and health issues. Finally, she asked for clarification on the duration of this "temporary move," whether remediation would take place, and the total price tag for all of these initiatives.
    2. Wendy Hamack-Smith expressed her appreciation for use of the D20 buildings. She offered her opinion that there has been a lack of communication from the Board until this week, and hopes to receive more updates every couple of days. She asked for a more informal meetings between the parents and the Board, perhaps on a Saturday. She inquired into the price tag for the remediation, and then asked what we have in reserves, and what is currently allotted for a new East building. She indicated that a large majority of parents are ready to raise money and would like to know what's available, so they can work to obtain the remainder.
    3. Leila Webb indicated her concerns paralleled those expressed by the previous speaker. While she was thankful for all that has been done recently, she indicated her confidence in the leadership is low, and that parents need to see some action.

4. Laurie Bossert provided a different perspective. As a member of the Financial Team, she offered insights into what the Administration goes through to balance the budget—she advised that it can't be accomplished without parent donations. She asked parents to please consider the whole picture—this is a huge, difficult issue involving not only East facilities but teacher pay and other financial considerations as well. She closed by thanking the original families who built the East Campus, and who gave so sacrificially in the beginning, as well as to the Administration and the Board, and urged parents to be as sacrificial as they can to solve this.

5. John Robillard used a personal story to underscore his position, and then applauded Diana Burditt for stepping up to the plate on this issue, although it had taken a long time previously. He inquired into the long-term financial plan for a permanent building. He then asked for specifics about what has TCA done for the District 20 community, since he considers it unlikely for other D20 voters to approve a bond or mill levy unless they can see what TCA has done for the community at large. He recommended developing our students as model citizens in tangible, clearly recognizable ways. He closed by asking the Board to demonstrate their leadership by addressing more specifically what the strategic plan is.

6. Brigitte Jensen described how she was recently motivated by the parental Letter of Understanding, specifically the phrase “everyone who shares in the benefits also shares in the sacrifices.” She asked that the East Campus not be placed on the back burner after the North and Central Campuses. She urged the Board to distribute a fund-raising letter before December 31<sup>st</sup> that is addressed to the North and Central campuses, stating that their campuses were partially funded by East contributions. She then asked how the decision was made to utilize other facilities rather than those on this campus. She closed by praising Diana Burditt as awesome, with a leadership presence everywhere, doing everything.

7. Yvette Stevens expressed concern about communications this last weekend, specifically how her high school student knew information about East facilities before she did. Although the information subsequently proved to be partially inaccurate, she felt it was very disrespectful that it was announced at the North Secondary Campuses without letting East parents know first. Matt Carpenter apologized for the communication breakdown. Yvette Stevens then praised Diana Burditt for all of her efforts, especially for her prompt responses to e-mails.

8. Sandy Hooten described her curiosity about the decision to move to temporary locations, especially in light of the thorough mold mitigation plan described at the recent Town Hall meeting. She asked whether the decision was driven by cost, or something else. She offered her preference for fewer, more reliable communiqués. She assured the Board that parents are partnering with them, and asked for continued accountability—parents can handle the truth.

9. Yvonne Strevette thanked both Diana Burditt and Becky Van Vleet for the fabulous job they have done. She then asked if there were any other buildings available in D20 that we could use, since it appears that there are a lot vacant buildings.

## V. Discussion Agenda Items

*These are specific items that the Board and/or staff would like to discuss and expand upon in greater detail than the materials that have been provided.*

### A. East Campus Facilities.

1. Mark Hyatt offered answers to several inquiries from the audience.

a. Rent: We agreed to pay rent to D20 in order to cover what we consider reasonable costs—facilities, utilities, custodial, maintenance, etc. We felt it was reasonable to pay \$18K per month for all the facilities.

b. Financial Reserves: TCA has close to \$750,000 in reserves, but by the spring we estimate close to one million dollars. These figures do not include the endowment (approximately \$300,000), and other reserves that we cannot and should not touch.

c. Decision to Relocate: In the past week, several variables changed, all of which escalated remediation costs. The number of modulars requiring remediation rose from 6 to 20, it was problematic to have students attending classes during the remediation processes, and our Workers' Compensation doctors told some of our teachers not to come back to work in un-remediated modulars. These combined factors led us to investigate other facility options.

2. Kevin Collins announced that Environmental Testing Company (ETC) had presented their report on all of the facilities to the Administration late this afternoon. After it has been reviewed, it will be available via the website. The bottom line is that the costs of remediation are very high (in order to meet the standards we've set), although there may be some cost tradeoffs if we can use volunteers to accomplish some of the tasks. He then introduced Glenn Morris and Doug Ayers, to provide an executive summary of their report (Attachment 1).

a. Glenn Morris stated that the complete report is 134 pages long, and it will provide a detailed classroom-by-classroom report, along with an outline of the planned protocol for each room. He reminded the audience that ETC makes recommendations independent of financial considerations. He then announced that while the gym does not require remediation, there were significant moisture issues under every other building. The moisture is the driving issue, and has caused some deterioration, mold, and wood rot. If the decision is made to remediate, the next step is to set guidelines for the remediation contractor. Then ETC will inspect and make sure that the work is accomplished to standards, and that the building is safe for occupancy. The standards will include a spore count of less than our guideline number of 690, with zero tolerance for only two types of mold. He re-emphasized that safety is their #1 concern, not economics. Mr. Morris continued with a summary of the protocols, which included installing a main drain on each side of the campus. French drains would be installed around each building, and connected to the main drain, and then gutters would connect each roof to the French drains. This should effectively get rid of the causal factor, the water. Then the aprons around each building would be replaced, and ventilation fans would be installed to keep condensation and moisture out of the buildings. Drywall would be repaired or replaced, any mouse debris would be removed or remediated, and further mouse-prevention measures would be added. All carpeting would be replaced with easy-to-clean flooring, any roof leaks would be repaired, and any compromised moisture barriers and insulation would be replaced.

b. Steve Pope asked if we'll receive more detail than just an overall number for each classroom, and whether there are still unknowns, such as damage behind walls. The response to both questions was affirmative. Lisa Sutton requested details on the additional costs, and how they escalated from the original estimate of \$150,000. Kevin Collins responded that the original estimate was for a very different order of magnitude, and that as we learned more throughout the complete investigation, then requirements, and therefore the costs, climbed. Initially, we knew of 3 – 5 buildings that had specific problems. Now we know that not only will all of the modulars (nearly 10 times the initial estimate) require some level of remediation, but also that the extent of the remediation is larger. Chris Bender inquired whether, in light of these new cost estimates, we could halt spending on any remediation efforts. Kevin Collins responded that we will ask the engineers to do a final look, and then we won't hire any contractors. Chris Leland announced that a team will be developing a more coordinated communication plan, which will include the daily web updates and a blog for frequent communications, and Special Delivery messages less frequently for larger issues. He asked for inputs in two categories: First, what information do you need? And second, if the available communications are not working, why not? Please e-mail inputs to [chris.leland@fotf.org](mailto:chris.leland@fotf.org). Steve Pope requested an exception to protocol to allow follow-up questions after the Board discussions. He then requested a hard copy of the breakdown in the cost increase, and inquired how long the entire remediation option would take, if pursued. Kevin Collins estimated 2 – 3 months, since the students would not be present while the

work was in progress. Steve Pope asked how far we had progressed in obtaining quotes from contractors. Kevin Collins replied that we lacked only a couple of quotes, so any changes in the overall estimate should be minor. Lisa Sutton inquired into how much had been spent to date, and Kevin Collins estimated \$70,000. When Matt Carpenter inquired how the money had been spent, Kevin Collins clarified that this estimate included work done since August of 2007.

3. Doug Hering began by responding to a question about grants, and then presented a financial update. He informed the audience that in the past we have received capital construction funds; however, we have to apply every year, and it is completely up to the state to grant money from the \$20-million-dollar pool. He noted that every project they approve relates to some health or safety concern, and that we did receive money for the roof at Central. Dr. Hering then presented the decision matrix on various facility options for the East Campus (Attachment 2) Option 1--a new steel building at East--is based on constructing a 50,000 square-foot building, and keeping the current gym. The cost estimate is \$4 million. Option 2--minor rehabilitations to the current modular buildings--does not represent a permanent fix, but would ensure the buildings were habitable for at least two more years. Option 3--major rehabilitations according to the protocol, or replacing the current modulares with a mix of new and used modulares--would cost between \$1.3 and \$1.5 million, and would be a potential 5- to 6-year solution, rather than a permanent fix. Option 4--using the first floor at North Secondary in addition to extra modulares--would cost a minimum of \$800,000, and would also be a short-term solution. Further, we'd need to install electric and plumbing lines up to the baseball field area. Option 5--a new building at either Central or North--would involve a permanent structure, and would over-task those facilities in terms of support and space for carpool, parking, gyms, cafeterias, etc. Chris Bender inquired whether the \$4-million-dollar estimate for Option 1 incorporates estimates for land costs and site preparations. Doug Hering indicated that these very rough estimates incorporate those considerations, although he emphasized that we have no design and no quotes at this time. Lisa Sutton asked how much we might expect to earn on a sale of the property at East, and Doug Hering responded with an estimate of \$1.5 to \$2 million dollars. Steve Tomberlin and Chris Bender inquired about leasing. Doug Hering responded that leasing costs would range from \$80,000-\$100,000 per month. Further, the costs to purchase an existing building would range between \$4 and \$8 million dollars, and would not include the costs to modify the buildings to meet our needs and code requirements. Steve Tomberlin then asked for estimates on how long it would take to complete each option. Doug Hering offered the following suggestions: Option 1 - would require 7-8 months of building time, after a design was approved; Option 2 - 2 months; Option 3 - 2-3 months; Option 4 - 7-9 months, and would likely be limited in contractor selection; Option 5 - no estimates available. Steve Tomberlin then asked if we would be able to use D20 facilities until next fall. Mark Hyatt responded that the district would be able to assist us to some extent, although the options may differ from the current locations, which are available until June. In response to debt restructuring questions from Steve Tomberlin, Doug Hering advised that our serial bonds would be difficult to restructure. Matt Carpenter suggested we coordinate with our BuildingCorp experts on these financial issues; Steve Pope and Chris Leland suggested the Board develop some specific questions. In response to a request from Steve Pope, Doug Hering provided an initial funding projection for Option 1 (Attachment 3). He outlined some of the planning assumptions, specifically an anticipated reduction in PERA contributions in 2014, which will have an impact on our ability to repay debt. Steve Pope inquired about the source for our capital reserves.

4. Matt Carpenter thanked the Leadership Team for providing a great level of detail on such short notice, and asked the Board to provide further direction. Chris Leland recommended obtaining a sense of the Board, to refine the options the LT should consider, and take advantage of momentum in the community.

*Moved by Chris Leland, seconded by Matt Carpenter, to articulate the sense of the Board, as follows: TCA will prioritize constructing a new permanent building to serve East Campus students, and will develop an initial financial strategy and timeline. At this time, this is not an approval of any option, but will enable the Administration to provide the Board with a better idea of where we are headed. Discussion continued.*

Steve Pope hoped for future specifics regarding money, funding, planning assumptions, and risk mitigation, and Chris Leland expressed the desire to hear more details from the BuildingCorp perspective. Chris Bender asked for more definition on a capital campaign and other financial details, but Steve Tomberlin cautioned against taking on any more debt, which might inhibit our ability to increase teachers' salaries. He also emphasized that we don't want to increase the number of students. Mark Hyatt offered to have our development expert share what he's planning for fund-raising, based on the results of the pending feasibility study. Lisa Sutton requested a special meeting before the January Board meeting. Chris Bender emphasized that the Administration should provide a plan that is specific, and not a rolling exercise; the goals should be clear and the ramifications of decisions should be clearly stated. Doug Hering distributed an additional model (Attachment 4), with the caution that the Board consider several options, for example, what to do if we receive additional money from a bond. Steve Pope asked when we expect to run out of modular space at the North campus, and Peter Hiltz estimated we'll have space for at least the next 2 years. In reference to the capital campaign, Steve Tomberlin asked if we could set a goal for more than we need to construct a building for East, and then use the additional funds for other priorities like finishing the high school, etc. Matt Carpenter advised that fund-raising goals be clearly stated from the onset of the campaign.

5. Matt Carpenter then permitted additional questions from the audience on the topic of East Campus.

a. Sandy Hooten inquired into the disparity between the original estimate for remediation of \$150,000 and the most recent estimate of \$1.5 million, expressing her extreme dismay at the exponential change. She also asked what amount was still owed to Environmental Testing Company (ETC), and strongly urged the Board to stop the remediation process immediately. Kevin Collins reported that the amount owed to ETC was small, and yet to be determined. He then attempted to describe the number of variables that changed in a short period of time, as new information became available, and how that substantively changed the planning factors upon which the estimates were based. Mark Hyatt emphasized that part of the cost increase was to ensure that a greater number of modulars would be safe for a sustained period of time--five years or more.

b. A parent requested that the plan be articulated before the D-20 choice window closed.

c. Elisa Pierce praised TCA's family environment, and then asked if it would be feasible to build additional buildings at the North or Central campuses. Doug Hering indicated that option had been explored, and there were many operational considerations--beyond financial considerations--that made the option untenable. For example, capacity for carpool, gym, playgrounds, etc. would be exceeded.

d. A parent suggested placing a moratorium on spending at the North campus until a building for the East campus was complete.

e. Tim McDonald responded to the earlier questions on the disparity in the remediation costs, offering his opinion that the TCA community pressed for information too early, before all variables were fully understood. He then suggested that we ask the city to test the ground water, and pursue the issue if there were any connections to the health-related issues.

Matt Carpenter closed by thanking the audience for their participation.

*Matt Carpenter called for a break at 8:48 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:06 p.m.*

VI. Petitions to the Board. Two families approached the Board with specific requests.

A. The Warren family asked for an exception to policy, to permit their son to return to TCA after he had withdrawn for six months. He is a current 8<sup>th</sup>-grade student who would resume as a high school student.

They proposed a “legacy plus” status be established for families in similar situations. Peter Hilts expressed that while he was confident in their son’s abilities, he was concerned about the precedent, since we are not planning to add slots for next year’s 9<sup>th</sup>-grade class. Doug Hering indicated that we would have to have 15% attrition or greater in order to have slots available for next year. Kara McIntyre outlined the current policy and priority for legacy status. Board members asked several questions about previous cases, and about how the attrition model was managed. Matt Carpenter clarified that the family’s request was a guarantee that their son would have a slot in the 9<sup>th</sup>-grade class, and asked for a motion from the Board. Chris Leland and Clark Miller offered insights into the development of the current legacy policy, and that it was written specifically in anticipation of this type of situation. Since no motion was presented, Matt Carpenter closed the discussion with thanks to the family and Kara McIntyre.

- B. A TCA family requested an executive session to discuss their petition.

*Moved by Clark Miller, seconded by Lisa Sutton, to adjourn to executive session per C.R.S. 24-6-402(4) (h), Personnel and Discipline Matters, at 9:45 p.m., for the purpose of discussing individual student matters. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

*Moved by Chris Bender, seconded by Lisa Sutton, to adjourn to public session at 10:30 p.m.. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

*Moved by Chris Bender, seconded by Chris Leland, to accept the expulsion recommendation of the Administration for student “A”. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

## VII. Consent Agenda Items

*These are items that are for information or for vote but do not require further discussion by the Board or staff at this time. In the event that new information is available since the publication of this agenda, prior to approval of the consent agenda as presented, the board or staff may remove any consent agenda item(s) and move the item(s) to the Discussion Agenda.*

- A. Two items were presented: Monthly Financial Report (Attachments 5 and 6), and Operations Update (Attachment 7). Minutes from the meeting on November 12, 2007 were unavailable, so that item was removed from the Consent Agenda.

*Moved by Steve Tomberlin, seconded by Clark Miller, to approve the Consent Agenda as revised. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

## VIII. Discussion Agenda Items (continued)

- A. New Course Approvals. Peter Hilts presented a handout (Attachment 8), outlining proposed high school course offerings for the 2008-09 academic year, requesting tentative approval from the Board. Chris Bender inquired into the philosophy behind the Sports Officiating course, and Chris Leland asked what it would offer beyond what is currently provided in our training. Peter Hilts responded that it would provide a way for students to apply our philosophy, while extending a passion for athletics into the realm of officiating. He cited the character and composure inherent in the requirements both for this course, and subsequent certifications available to students. Steve Tomberlin asked whether a certification option could be incorporated.

*Moved by Lisa Sutton, seconded by Steve Tomberlin, to approve the New Course Proposals as presented. Roll call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

- B. Building Community Within the Classroom Structure. Steve Tomberlin reminded the Board that the goal of this proposal was to build a stronger community by building stronger relationships. Since the classroom is typically where both students and parents spend the most time interacting, we should extend the amount of time a class is together, to provide a longer space of time for those relationships to develop, perhaps two or three years. Leesa Waliszewski reported that, anecdotally, it was not apparent that the advantages would outweigh the costs. However, it had launched a good discussion on whether to maintain Titan Teams for consecutive years. Chris Leland indicated that research on this subject showed that increasing the length of time did not have the desired outcome. He hoped this discussion would continue as East Campus students were dispersed, in order to maintain the sense of community.
- C. Parent Survey Plan. Kevin Collins provided a draft copy of the survey (Attachment 9), and outlined plans to distribute the survey electronically, similar to the Calendar Survey. Steve Pope inquired on limitation of branching the response date, and Peter Hilts indicated we can determine whether or not to branch the data. Kevin Collins highlighted that the intent was to obtain one survey per family, and that in order to accomplish this goal, some families may raise concerns about anonymity. He closed by asking for comments before approval at the regular meeting on Jan 14, 2008.
- D. General Fund Revenue Projection, FY08-09. Doug Hering provided a handout (Attachment 10), which he offered as a guideline, to set the baseline for the FY 08-09 budget process. He advised that the head count of the current 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade classes were used for the attrition model. He further indicated that the Governor's Office is predicting next year's inflation rate in the 2.8% range. Steve Pope asked whether the drop in enrollment for the home-school program was strategic or projected. Doug Hering indicated that it was projected, and is an extra-conservative estimate. Mark Hyatt advised of plans to market our Cottage School Program. Clark Miller asked when CSP enrollment might affect our 600 student maximum, and Peter Hilts stated 2009/10, although next year CHSAA will have reset the classification.
- E. Board Administrative Processes - By-law Review and Revision and Standing Subcommittees of the Board. Chris Bender reported on the recent sub-committee meeting, where progress was made on definition and categorization of core values, which in turn will indicate whether we need to make any bylaw changes, and how we will spend our time in Board meetings. Plans for the sub-committee include incorporating some of the results from the Heritage Night into the discussions, and bringing a document to the Board for a first read at the February meeting. Steve Pope asked how this would tie into the Board's administrative processes, and Chris Bender responded that once we understand and articulate the critical aspects of the school, then we can ensure we spend the time in our meetings emphasizing these critical aspects/core values--our priorities.
- F. Board Goals/Objectives for 2007-2008. Matt Carpenter presented a handout (Attachment 11), and proposed the discussion would be more appropriate for the next offsite. Mark Hyatt will work with the Lead Team, and propose a date for an evening meeting in January.
- G. Vision Subcommittee. Steve Tomberlin expressed the need for the subcommittee to regroup after the last discussion, since the message from the Board is that the vision should strongly tie to the mission statement. Next report will be at the January meeting.
- H. Review of Board Policies for the Election Process, Succession Plan, and Induction Process. Matt Carpenter distributed a handout (Attachment 12), with a suggestion to change most of page 1, and also to reduce redundancies and inconsistencies. He also recommended attaching the letter formats as exhibits. The Board discussed shortening the campaign period, such that vacancies are announced in February, and voting occurs at the April meeting. The Board agreed to vote on this change at the next meeting.

IX. Other Business

- A. The Board will hold a Special Session on Monday, December 17, at 6:00 p.m., at the East Campus, for the purpose of discussing issues related to the proposed construction.
- B. Lisa Sutton proposed drafting a Code of Conduct for leadership volunteers, such as PTOs, etc. Steve Tomberlin agreed, and offered that it should be consistent with other TCA codes of conduct. Lisa Sutton will present a first read in March.
- C. The Board thanked Peter Hilts for taking the initiative to address students on a difficult subject, following reports of off-campus behaviors that were inconsistent with TCA's expectations.

X. Future Agenda Items

- A. TCA Building Corp - Appoint Directors – Vote
- B. School Calendar Review (08/09 and 09/10) – First Read
- C. Curriculum Review – Information
- D. General Fund Revenue Projection, FY08-09 – Vote
- E. Future of TCA Latin Program – Leesa – First Read
- F. Vision Subcommittee - Information
- G. Board Elections in April - Vote

*Moved by Steve Tomberlin, seconded by Steve Pope, to adjourn to executive session per C.R.S. 24-6-402(4) (f), Personnel and Discipline Matters, at 11:39 p.m., for the purpose of discussing personnel issues. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

X. Executive Session

*Moved by Chris Leland, seconded by Clark Miller, to adjourn to public session. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

XI. Adjournment

*Moved by Matt Carpenter, seconded by Steve Pope, to adjourn at 12:35 a.m. Roll Call. Approved by unanimous vote.*

---

Matt Carpenter  
Chairman

---

Chris Bender  
Secretary