Mote Ed, LLC
Conyers, GA
(404) 432-8041
moteedllc@gmail.com
moteedllc.com

May 3rd, 2017
to: jcornwall@doe.k12.ga.us
Georgia Department of Education
Division of District Flexibility & Charter Schools

Dear Ms. Cornwall,

As the founding member of Mote Ed, I am writing this letter to thank you for considering the following proposal to renew Mote Ed, LLC as an approved provider of board training to governing boards of locally-approved, Georgia charter schools for the 2017-2018, school year. Mote Ed, LLC is an educational services company now in its second year operation. The company reflects my active support of the Georgia charter sector and broader education reform in the state, work spearheaded by dedicated individuals like you at the Department and your Division. I look forward to supporting this work in the coming year.

Sincerely,

Chad W. Mote

Founder – Mote Ed, LLC
MoteEdLLC@gmail.com
(404) 432-8041
MoteEdLLC.com

Innovative Education Solutions

PROPOSAL TO RENEW

Charter Governing Board
Training Provider
Georgia

Prepared and Submitted by
Chad W. Mote
Founder – Mote Ed
5/3/2017

Mote Ed, LLC
4316 Derbyshire Tr. Conyers, GA
(404) 432-8041
chad@moteedllc.com
moteedllc.com

Renewal Proposal for Approved Provider of Charter School Governing Board Training

Prepared by Chad W. Mote, Founder – Mote Ed

SECTION 1.

1A. Provider Overview

Mote Ed, LLC is an educational consulting company formed to help support educational reform efforts in Georgia. The company lends this support by providing innovative educational services with a professional commitment to individualizing services to fit the needs of each client. Mote Ed, LLC offers services through an individual provider model or if needed, facilitates consulting, professional learning, and strategic partnerships with talented experts in the region. Clients include PK-12 schools (charter, traditional, independent) and districts, primarily as well as organizations that intersect the broader education sector. Expertise includes but is not limited to

- Charter School Governing Board Training (approved provider, 2016/17), Focus area is Innovation Management/Strategic Planning/Resource Development
- Innovation management in educational organizations
- Computing, Computer Science Education, & Constructionist Gaming
- STEM, + A, +C Programming & Incubation
- All Facets of Curriculum/Instruction & Instructional Leadership
- Charter School Petitioning & Implementation
- Organizational Management, Continuous Improvement, Strategic Initiatives
- School Reform, Development, Turnaround
- Grant Proposal Development & Implementation
- Leader/Teacher Development & Support
- Support through Comprehensive Network

1B. Charter Board Training Experience

The company founder, Chad W. Mote, has worked extensively in PK-12 education, the charter sector, and with governing boards in numerous capacities including board membership, board advisory, school administration, and research. This experience encompasses a diverse range in school type, grade level, and in governing boards' trajectory for growth (see, Appendix A. Curriculum Vitae & 2C. Training List).

1C. Instructor Qualifications

Chad W. Mote has extensive professional development experience as an instructor as well as advanced work in research and practice in the areas of professional learning, school improvement, innovation, strategic planning, resource development, school management, operations, and personnel evaluation (see, Appendix A). Chad taught upper level sciences such as AP Chemistry; developed innovative programs that lead to substantial district funding; worked in multiple leadership roles in schools recognized nationally for being on the cutting edge of education; led or co-led charter design and implementation efforts, and participated in design-based research with leading learning scientists at Georgia Tech, MIT, & Penn through a doctoral fellowship in educational leadership. He will be defending his doctoral thesis at Penn this summer. Chad's research explores charter school innovation in niche markets, specifically innovative missions of Georgia charter schools from 1994 to 2015 and strategies applied by founders to generate them. Chad draws on this strong research foundation and his diverse experiences in GA and beyond to offer the following course, which naturally focuses on the strategic planning and management of charter school innovation by governing boards.

1D. Charter School Type Served by Training

This course is designed for locally approved Charter School Governing Boards, differentiated according to the needs of each Governing Board.

SECTION 2.

2A. Course Proposal Outline

Training Provider	Mote Ed, LLC	**Submission Date**	5/03/2017
Course Title	Innovative Practices of Highly Effective Boards	**Instructors**	Chad W. Mote
Course Description	This course is designed to support the continued growth of highly effective boards and to assist boards that are ready to make this transition. The course focuses on research-based practices innovative boards use to drive innovation in their organizations such as strategic planning and board-led resource development.	**Delivery Method**	- Direct Instruction - Case Studies - Video Vignettes - Document Analysis - Large and Small Group Activities
		Proposed Fee	$600 - 3hrs, Part I alone $1000 - 6hrs, Part I & II; + mileage if completing in two, ½ day sessions

Mote Ed, LLC
4316 Derbyshire Tr. Conyers, GA
(404) 432-8041
chad@moteedllc.com
moteedllc.com

2A. Course Proposal Outline Continued

Alignment to Standards

The course consists of two options: Whole Board Governance Team Training alone (Part I, 3hrs.), or Whole Board training followed by concentration on special topics within the Standards for Effective Governance of Georgia Nonprofit Charter School Governing Boards (Part I & II, 6hrs).

Part I – Domain I-IV, VIII; Part II – Domain VI, I-VIII special topics.

- Domain I: Governance, Standards A, B, C, D
- Domain II: Strategic Planning, Standards A, B
- Domain III: Board & Community Relations, Standards A, B, C
- Domain IV: Policy Development, Standards A
- Domain VI: Personnel, Standards A, B
- Domain VIII: Ethics, Standard A

Proposed Location	Contracting Board's School or Location Requested by Client	**Length of Course**	Part I alone = 3 hrs. Part I & II = 6 hrs.

Overall Course Objective

- Participants will understand membership expectations for effective board governance.
- Participants will identify individual and whole board professional learning needs.
- Participants will be able to develop a strategic plan designed for innovation and school improvement.
- Participants will understand that an effective board positively contributes to the effectiveness of the charter school CEO.

Submitted By	Chad W. Mote Founder, Mote Ed	**Type of Charter School**	✓ Locally Approved Charter Schools

2B. Course Syllabus

Innovative Practices of Highly Effective Boards, Course Syllabus

I. Submitting Agency & Provider Mote Ed, LLC

II. Course Title Innovative Practices of Highly Effective Boards

III. Contact & Instructor	Mote Ed, LLC Chad W. Mote Founder www.moteedllc.com	4316 Derbyshire Tr. SE Conyers, GA 30094 moteedllc@gmail.com (404) 432-8041

IV. Course Description

This course is designed to support the continued growth of highly effective boards and to assist boards that are ready to make this transition. The course identifies research-based practices that highly effective boards use to manage innovation in organizations such as board driven resource development. Participants apply practices to three domains – or sources – of innovation (1) board capabilities - diversity, knowledge, social capital (2) strategic planning – emphasis on resource development (3) and organizational leadership. The course is structured to meet training requirements set forth in O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2072 for existing and new governing boards and members. Training requirements addressed include Whole Board Governance Team Training to enhance board effectiveness as a standalone option (Part I), or in combination with three additional hours on a concentrated topic (Part I & II). Part II builds on Part I by focusing on special topics within the Standards for Effective Governance of Georgia Nonprofit Charter School Governing Boards for locally approved charter school governing boards. Part I builds a foundation grounded in current innovation research applied to the charter school context, followed by focused activities on the topics of strategic planning and resource development. Part II supports in-depth application of these innovative practices in the context of special or focal topics based on findings from Part I, aligned to the Governing Board's & CEO's professional learning plan, strategic plan, and Annual Training Plan.

V. Contact Hours 3-contact hrs., Whole Board Governance Team Training (Part I)
+3-contact hrs., Topics on Standards for Effective Governance (Part II)
= 6-total contact hours (Part I & Part II)
or = 3 hours Whole Board Governance (Part I only)

VI. Major Activities

i. Direct Instruction - Overview of course topics and Standards for Effective Governance according to charter type.
ii. Case Studies - Innovative Effective vs. non-effective vs. effective but non-innovative.
iii. Document Analysis - Charter contract, strategic plan, and fundraising exemplars.
iv. Group Activities - Discussions of documents/strategies, short presentations.
v. Action Steps for Executing Resource Development Strategy

Mote Ed, LLC
4316 Derbyshire Tr. Conyers, GA
(404) 432-8041
chad@moteedllc.com
moteedllc.com

VII. Training Goals and Objectives

Goal 1. Participants will understand board characteristics associated with highly effective boards and organizational innovation.

Objectives – Participants will be able to

- Describe the roles of effective members
- Describe the importance of diversity related to innovation
- Explain the board process for new member induction
- Understand board characteristics associated with highly effective boards

Goal 2. Participants will understand how board learning and board diversity affect highly effective practices that promote organizational innovation.

Objectives – Participants will be able to

- Analyze and describe current strengths and weaknesses of their board
- Identify resources available to them
- Develop individual and whole board professional learning plans

Goal 3. Participants will understand that highly effective boards drive strategic planning and resource development, which affect organizational innovation.

Objectives – Participants will be able to

- Adopt a research-based process for strategic planning
- Evaluate current status of strategic plan
- Align charter goals with strategic plan
- Develop a process for oversight and plan review
- Define the board's strategy for resource development
- Create action steps for board to execute resource development strategy.

Goal 4. Participants will understand that an effective board positively contributes to the effectiveness of the charter school CEO.

Objectives – Participants will be able to

- Critically examine the Board's role in relation to its Authorizer & School Leader
- Develop a sustainability plan for leadership transitions; Board & School Leader
- Co-develop goals and performance indicators; Board Members & School Leader
- Develop an integrated professional learning plan for the growth of these leaders
- Identify strategies to promote leadership for innovation, at both the governance and organizational level.

VIII. Target Audience — Governing Boards of Locally-approved Charter Schools

IX. Training Times — Part I. 3-hrs., AM or PM; times TBD with client.
Part I. & II. Whole Day, 9am – 3:30 pm/30 min lunch.
or Two ½ Days – 3hrs. each, TBD.

2C. List of Georgia Training Participants in 2014-2017 and References

Mote Ed, LLC provided training to the governing board members of Leadership Preparatory Academy during the 2017 school year. These participants evaluated the course as follows.

Table 2C. Training Participants & References

LPA Board	*LPA Leadership*	*Evaluation Results*
B. Gutter- Parker/Chair Ray Hill/Vice Chair Philana D. Swann Donrich Young Wanda Gilliard Lisa Haygood	Lonnie Hall/CEO TonyaWilliams/CAO	I. Increased Knowledge of Standards 1.5 pts.* II. 88% Strongly Agree (Rated 5, Avg. 4.88) - the *Course was relevant* - *Content/activities met expectations* - the *Trainer was effective* - the *Course met needs* of the board III. Board consensus - allot more time for strategic planning & resource development

*Board-rated, Post-training on a 5 pt. Likert Scale

Board members/administrators listed above can speak to the quality of this training at.

- Leadership Preparatory Academy, (678) 526 - 2578
  6400 Woodrow Road, Lithonia, GA 30038

Previous board development experience may be discussed with the following references.

- Rockdale Career Academy, Board of Directors
  Jill Oldham, CEO; (770) 388-5677
- Miki Edwards, Chair GA College & Career Academy Network; (706) 752-4900
- Danny Brewington, Ed Innovation Partners; (706) 247-4478

2D. Participant Evaluation of Training Course: see Appendix B

2E. Agreement of Nepotism Assurance: see Appendix C

SECTION 3.

Appendix

A. Curriculum Vitae
B. Participant Evaluation of Training Course
C. Agreement of Nepotism

Chad W. Mote
MoteEdLLC@gmail.com; chadmote@gmail.com
4316 Derbyshire Tr. Conyers, GA 30094
404-432-8041

Education

University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education 2010-present
Teaching, Learning, & Leadership Division
Ed.D., Doctorate of Education in Educational Leadership *to be conferred summer,* 2017
Innovation in charter niche markets: Specialism in the Georgia population of charter schools and five "special" cases.
R. Quinn, Chair. Assistant Professor - Teaching, Learning, & Leadership

University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education 2010-2012
Principal Certification, School Leadership Program
E. Ball & P. Dawson, Co-Directors - School Leadership

University of Georgia, College of Education 2006
Ed.S., Specialist of Education in Instructional Technology
Thesis: *Video streaming as an approach to science teaching.*
M. Orey, Chair. Associate Professor - Ed. Psychology & Instr. Technology

University of Georgia, College of Education 2003
M.Ed., Master of Education in Science Education

University of Georgia, Department of Psychology 1998
B.S., Bachelor of Science in Psychology

Teaching Certification Current
Georgia, 7-12th grade Science—Certified to teach any science
Georgia, Gifted Education—Certified to teach the gifted in science and AP Chemistry

Educational Leadership Certification Current
Pennsylvania Principal Certification, K-12
Georgia Educational Leadership Certification, P-12

Professional Experience in K-12 Education

Educational Leadership Experience

Founder of Mote Ed, LLC 2016-present
Mote Ed is an educational services organization based in GA
- Providing professional development & educational consulting services
- GADOE approved provider of governing board training to charter schools
- Consulting judge to the National STEM Video Game Challenge

- Partnered w. National STEM Video Game Challenge & University of North GA to run a video game coding workshop in rural district, Lumpkin Co.

Assistant Principal 2013-2016
Rockdale College and Career Academy, Conyers, GA

- Comprehensive experience in building leadership; evaluation, human resources, operations, discipline, testing, strategic planning, Board of Directors development, 1:1 technology initiative
- Co-mentor and co-supervisor of approximately 60 faculty and staff; primary evaluator of 20 employees
- Chair or Lead Admin of RTI, 504, Assessment (SLO & Benchmarks), Faculty Council, PBL, Grants, Technology, Professional Learning, Safety Nets
- Managed professional development and safety net budgets
- Wrote proposals for grants and developed partnerships leading to over $25,000 in funding for the school
- Facilitated school and district level professional development sessions
- Co-led AdvancED and Career Academy Accreditation Process
- Participated in yearlong, district principal pipeline program

Project Director of the "STEAM Collaborative" 2010-2013
Race to the Top, Georgia Innovation Fund, Venture Grant

- Led the development of partnerships with Georgia Tech, University of Georgia, MoWerks, Ed Innovations Partners, Novelis, and the Steffen Thomas Museum of Art
- Led the charter conversion process to create the first, rural STEAM charter school of Georgia
- Directed school turnaround and transformation to support traditionally underrepresented students in STEM
- Managed budget and state reporting for the only Venture grant in Georgia to succeed in its purpose—to create a charter school

STEM Coordinator & Director of STEAM Academy 2012-2013
Union Point STEAM Academy (UPSA), Union Point, GA
Project Director role above led to position

- Leadership in human resources, operations, discipline, RTI, testing, organizational succession, budgets, and professional development
- Co-managed $2.8 million dollar operating budget
- District liaison to GaDOE in Science, Math, STEM
- Building and district (GCSS) level STEM activities

Principal Intern 2011-2012
Science Leadership Academy (SLA) of Philadelphia
University of Pennsylvania, School Leadership program

- Conducted focused principal leadership activities throughout the year under Principal's (C. Lehman, ISTE Leader of the year) supervision

- Wrote successful proposals and developed partnerships
- Clocked over 1000 hours during internship in one of the nation's premier project-based learning and 1:1 schools

Teach for America Mentor 2010-2011
University of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia School District, Philadelphia, PA

- Mentored and evaluated first year, Teach for America teachers throughout the Philadelphia School District in multiple, K-12 schools (traditional, charter, alternative, themed, and magnet)
- Served as certifying agent for the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the University of Pennsylvania

Director of Credit Recovery & Summer School 2006-2010
Apalachee High School, Winder, Georgia

- Developed, implemented, coordinated and managed the computer-based, Credit Recovery program, which provided approximately 800 "at-risk" students credit for failed courses
- Supervised teachers for AHS (4 years) and district (1 year)
- In 2006, implemented and managed NovaNET Summer Extension program for the entire district

Teaching Experience

Science Educator 2002-2010
Apalachee High School, Winder, Georgia

- Successfully taught students Chemistry, Advanced Placement Chemistry, Gifted Chemistry, Physics, Physical Science, Human Anatomy & Physiology
- Successfully served a broad range of students from 9th-12th grade including special education and gifted youth

Lead Teacher, Advanced Placement (AP) Science Program 2007-2010
Apalachee High School, Winder, Georgia

- Implemented first AP Chemistry program in the district
- Instrumental in increasing AP Science enrollment by 300% in three years
- Strategic planning and partnership activities with industry and higher education

Professional Community Counseling Experience

Individual Counselor, Social Services Technician II 1997-1998, 2000-2001
Child and Adolescent Services, Advantage Behavioral Health
Athens, Georgia

- Provided individual counseling services, primarily activity therapy to children and adolescents and families in the Northeast GA region (*10 counties*)

- Served a wide range of patients in multiple settings; schools, homes, site-based, outdoor therapeutic
- Mentored other rising counselors

Group Counselor, Social Services Technician III 1998-2000
Child and Adolescent Services, Advantage Behavioral Health
Athens, Georgia

- Co-developed and implemented new group counseling program (*InnerQuest*) for two districts
- Advocate, counselor and liaison in dozens of schools, social, criminal justice, non-profit, higher education, state, local, federal, and business organizations

Professional Research Experience

Research Assistant 2011-2012

Preparing the Next Generation of Computational Thinkers; National Science Foundation
University of Pennsylvania, Y. Kafai coPI (w. Resnick, MIT & Benkler, Harvard)

Creative Code: Youth Collaborative Programming; Lenovo Foundation
University of Pennsylvania, Y. Kafai PI

- Conducted classroom observations and interviews of Scratch computer programming activities of K-12 students
- Supervised peer mentoring groups
- Led Scratch workshops for middle and high school students to create STEM video games for entry into National STEM Video Game challenge
- Liaison with lab schools to support and create innovative models/methods which were rare or completely new to K-12
- Conducted data analysis
- Published, presented, and contributed new knowledge to the emerging field of the learning sciences

Founding Team Member 2007-2010
Direct to Discovery, D2D Project
Barrow County Schools, co-PI E. Morrison (w. Huff, Mathews, & Ready Georgia Institute of Technology)

- Developed curriculum to incorporate current research on solar cells developed from carbon nanotubes into chemistry classrooms
- Piloted and implemented D2D model in my chemistry and AP chemistry courses using videoconferencing to connect students to STEM laboratories, scientists, & researchers
- Analyzed results and presented findings as proof of concept, which led to $1,700,000 Race to the Top grant

GIFT Fellow, Georgia Intern Fellowship for Teachers 2008

Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI), Atlanta, Georgia

- Conducted novel nanoscience and photovoltaic research at GTRI
- Acquired laboratory skills in carbon vapor deposition, thermal evaporation, electron microscopy, and clean room techniques
- Developed action plan to incorporate scientific research in my high school chemistry classes

Research Associate 1999

Developmental Trends Study

University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, R. Loeber PI

- Conducted and videotaped structured and unstructured interviews to document the course of disruptive behaviour disorders over time
- Administered the NEO Personality Inventory
- Scored the Hare Psychopathy Checklist from participants in homes, schools, mental health facilities, juvenile justice facilities, and adult prisons

Publications and Presentations

Journal Articles—Research & Practice

Mote, C., Kafai, Y. & Burke, Q. (2015). Start your own online competitions. *EdTekHub.* ISTE.

Mote, C., Strelecki, K., & Johnson, K. (2014). Cultivating high-level organizational engagement to promote novel learning experiences in STEAM, *The STEAM Journal, 2* (1).

Mote, C., Kafai, Y., & Burke, Q. (2013). Epic win: Inspire engagement through online competitions and collaborations. *Learning & Leading with Technology (ISTE), 4* (41).

Mote, C. (2013). Two approaches to promote STEM research for traditionally underrepresented students: Direct to Discovery & the Union Point STEAM Academy. *The Journal of Experimental Secondary Science, 3* (2).

Mote, C. (2006). Video streaming as an approach to science teaching: a comparison study. *Instructional Technology Monographs, 3* (1).

Conference Proceedings, Presentations, and Workshops

Mote, C., Hagan, C., & Smith, J. (Jun, 2016). *Supporting teachers in cross-curricular collaboration for high quality projects.* Presented at the International Society for Technology Education (ISTE) national conference. Denver, CO.

Mote, C., Scott, D., Smith, J. (Feb., 2016). *Cross-curricular collaboration for project-based learning.* Presented at the Georgia Charter Schools Conference. Atlanta, GA.

Hall, A., Mote. C., Anglin, J., & Hagan, C. (Feb., 2016). *Design and implementation of a gifted advisement program in a CCA to support underachieving youth.* Accepted presenter at the Ethnographic and Qualitative Research Conference. Las Vegas, NV.

Mote, C. (Nov., 2015). *Innovation frameworks and models.* Presented at Georgia Educational Technology (GaETC) Conference. Atlanta, GA.

Mote, C. (Nov., 2015). *More than computers, cords, and chargers: Preparing your school for a 1:1 technology initiative.* Presented at Georgia Educational Technology (GaETC) Conference. Atlanta, GA.

Davidson, S. & Mote, C. (Nov., 2015). *Redefining the media specialist's role to instructional leader.* Presented at Georgia Educational Technology (GaETC) Conference. Atlanta, GA.

Mote, C. (April, 2015). *Innovations in college and career readiness.* Presented and served as a Panelist at the Emory University Policy Summit, Educational Leadership for Educational Equity. Atlanta, GA.

Mote, C. & Jeselnik, G. (Nov., 2014). *Coding for virtual events.* Presented at the Georgia Educational Technology (GaETC) Conference. Atlanta, GA.

Burke, Q. & Mote, C. (2014, June). *Feeding competitive streaks and fostering collaborative determination: Grounding STEM coursework in a national video game challenge.* In Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of the Learning Sciences. New York, NY: ACM Digital Library.

Burke, Q. & Mote, C. (2014, June). *Feeding competitive streaks and fostering collaborative determination: Grounding STEM coursework in a national video game challenge.* Symposium "Motivating and Broadening Participation" at the 2014 meeting of the International Conference of the Learning Science, June 23rd – 27th, Boulder, CO.

Kafai, Y. Burke, Q. Fields, D. & Mote, C. (2014, June). *Motivating and broadening participation: Competitions, contests, challenges, and circles for supporting STEM learning.* Paper presented to the International Conference of the Learning Science (ICLS). Boulder, CO.

Mote, C., Burke, Q, & Kafai, Y, Jeselnik, G. (June, 2014). *STEAM video game production for online competitions and collaborations.* Presented at the International Society for Technology Education (ISTE) national conference. Atlanta, GA.

Burke, Q., Kafai, Y.B. & Mote, C. (April, 2013). *Using and analyzing games for learning: expanding contexts of games-based research.* Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association (AERA) SIG-Media, Culture, and Curriculum. San Francisco, CA.

Burke, Q., Kafai, Y., & Mote, C. (April, 2013). *The "holding power" of making video games: Grounding STEM coursework in a culture of authentic competition and collaboration.* Presented at AERA conference, San Francisco, CA.

Kafai, Y.B., Burke, Q., Griffin, J., Powell, R. Grab, M., Slattery, M., & Davidson, S., & Mote, C. (2013, April). *A cascading model: Undergraduates as mentors and mentees in a computer science service-learning course.* Div. C, Engineering & Computer Science panel at the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco, CA.

Burke, Q., Kafai, Y., & Mote, C. (2012, July). *For the win: Middle-schoolers' use of Scratch in the national STEM video game challenge.* Paper presented to the 3rd Scratch Conference, July 25-28, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Kafai, Y.B., Burke, Q. & Mote, C. (2012, June). *What make competitions fun to participate? The role of audience for middle school game designers.* Proceedings of the 11th Annual IDC, 6/12-15, Bremen, Germany (p. 284-287). NY, NY: ACM Dig. Library.

Mote, C. (May, 2011). *STEM-based video games and learning cultures.* Presented at the University of Pennsylvania, Scratch Day conference. Philadelphia, PA.

Ludovice, P., Hunt, W., Matthews, W., Lockart, V., David, S., Payne, C., Gottfried, D., Fernandez, F., Childs, K., & Mote, C. (2010). *It's Elemental.* Presented to "The Black Box." Georgia Institute of Technology. Atlanta, GA.

Mote, C. (May, 2010). *Direct to Discovery as an innovative model for STEM learning.* Presented to public school superintendents and stakeholders via videoconference. Atlanta, GA.

Ready, J. Book, G. Huff, C. Mote, C., & Moulds, P. (Dec, 2010). *An innovative approach to extending material science education resources to K-12 classrooms in the US and abroad.* Paper presented to the Material Research Society Conference. Boston, MA.

Pater, J., Evans, J., Matthews, W. & Mote, C. (Nov, 2009). *Direct to Discovery: Expanding research laboratories into K-12 classrooms to enhance STEM education.* Paper presented to the IADIS International Conference. Rome, Italy.

Mote, C. (Oct, 2009). *Direct to Discovery session showcase.* Presented at the Broadband 2020 Conference, Georgia Institute of Technology. Atlanta, GA

Mote, C. (Aug, 2009). *Incorporating live research on photovoltaic cells and nanoscience in high school chemistry.* Presented at GIFT, Georgia Tech. Atlanta, GA.

Honors & Grants

Innovation Fund, Innovation in Teaching Competition 2015

Nominated and co-wrote application with Tom White, one of five winners for 9-12 CTAE, Audio Video Technology and Film pathway. Rockdale Career Academy.
$3000 to Teacher; $4000 to School

Dart Foundation STEM Grant 2014; 2015
Wrote two successful proposals to connect CTE pathways to STEM concepts in academic courses via drones, robots, & weather station construction.
$5,000; $5,000

Education Sports Entertainment, ESE. Grant 2015
Co-wrote proposal to develop a new sports broadcasting "institute" for the Audio Video Technology & Film (AVTF), career pathway program at RCA.
$8,000

Snapping Shoals, EMC. Mini-Grant 2014; 2015
Wrote two successful proposals to implement cross-curricular, STEM projects to link Career Technical Education (CTE) to STEM at the Rockdale Career Academy.
$2,000; $2,000

Rockdale County Educational Foundation Mini-Grant 2014; 2015
Wrote two successful proposals to design, build, and utilize an outdoor classroom through Architecture, Engineering, Construction courses at Rockdale Career Academy.
$1,500; $1,500

Race to the Top Innovation Fund, Venture Grant 2010-2013
Writer and Project Director for RT3, Venture Grant.
Led the "STEAM Collaborative" and created the Union Point STEAM Academy
$52,000

William King Foundation Grant 2011
Wrote proposal to purchase seven Apple laptop computers to aid seniors in their capstone project at the Science Leadership Academy of Philadelphia.
$10,000

Most Innovative Action Plan (GIFT) 2010
Georgia Intern Fellowship for Teachers, Action Plan Achievement Award for a project to connect chemistry students to current research at Georgia Tech.
$500

Professional Membership and Service

Board of Directors Member, Steffen Thomas Museum of Art 2013-2014
American Educational Research Association (AERA) 2012-2014
International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) 2012-present
Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD) 2012-present
Professional Association of Georgia Educators (PAGE) 2002-2010, 2012-present

B

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

Powered by
Google Forms

Richard Woods, Georgia's School Superintendent
"Educating Georgia's Future"

Charter School Governing Board Training

Nepotism Assurance Agreement

As an instructor/trainer for Mote Ed, LLC, I will not provide charter school governance training to charter school governing board members who are immediate members of my family without obtaining prior approval from the Associate Superintendent for Policy and Charter Schools or his designee. For the purpose of this assurance, immediate family members shall include a spouse, child, sibling, parent or the spouse of a child, sibling or parent.

C W Mote
Signature

Chad W. Mote
Name [printed]

5/3/2017
Date

Fowder, Mote Ed
Organization

Richard Woods, Georgia's School Superintendent
"Educating Georgia's Future"

Please provide responses to all three hypothetical questions given below.

Hypothetical #1 – You are working with Charter School XYZ's founding board that is comprised of mostly parents. The school is in its first year of operation. The board has hired a principal and the principal has hired a staff. The school is located in a wealthy part of town and does not provide transportation. As a result, the students are majority high income. The board has issues with the way that the teachers are trained and on-boarded onto the staff. The board also has concerns that their Principal is not handling carpool well. Some teachers are complaining that the principal is too strict. Lastly, the facility has had many issues and concerns including a leaky roof. As a result of all of these things, the board is meeting today to consider firing the principal. Also one board member is related to a teacher.

- How would you advise this board in terms of duties, roles and responsibilities, and next steps?
- What are some considerations moving forward to avoid these conflicts?

Hypothetical #2 – A well-established charter school has recently come under public scrutiny for not reflecting the diversity of the community served by the charter school. The school has decent student achievement data, and has been in existence for over ten years. The board does not believe that there is anything it can do to diversify. It also believes that it does not need to diversify. The board is about half parents and half other community members.

- What would you do with this board and why?
- What are the issues here?

Hypothetical #3 – An established charter school is having some serious board turnover in a way that is unprecedented. You are the board's trainer. You attend a board meeting and notice that there is not any real discussion. The items pass without any questions or comments. There is not time for public comment. The principal's report is sparse and does not include any academic data. Additionally, the CFO was unable to answer questions about the financial documents. When asked questions, the principal spoke up to answer questions about the financial statements. Several board members seem to have a very friendly demeanor with the principal.

- What are your thoughts on this?
- What are some suggestions you would make to the board?
- How would you incorporate this into the training?

RESPONSES TO THREE CASE STUDIES

MOTE ED, LLC

Chad Mote

HYPOTHETICAL CASE I – Roof Leaks & System Leaks

Problem to Address

This case illustrates board policies and/or procedures that are inadequate or not functioning properly due to poor execution and areas for the school leader to address. Both stem from board misinterpretation of its roles, duties, and responsibilities in governance as well as communication gaps between the school leader and the board.

Training Advice & Moving Forward

1. The Leaky Roof

A persistent failure to address facility issues often illustrates one or more of these issues. The leaky roof is a common maintenance problem that schools encounter, yet it also serves as a non-threatening example to illustrate a much deeper problem in governance and leadership personally attributable to the board and school leader. Thus, I introduce the leaky roof as ubiquitous problem, reflecting bigger issues, in order for the board and leader to find solutions to both.

Case Study of Roles, Duties, Responsibilities

I begin with a policy study of two cases, one inefficient and one efficient.
In one case, the school leader must make a board recommendation to approve costs to repair normal "wear and tear" – a leaky roof – common in all school buildings.

This was due to board policy requiring the school leader to secure board approval for service/purchase requests above $2000. In one month, a roof was allowed to leak for four weeks before it was repaired.

In the second case, the CFO did a cost analysis of building maintenance in similar charter schools, finding that service costs exceeded $40,000 dollars once a year, on average, but a typical year held 14 services, $1,000 each service. Using this data, the board implements a policy that the School Leader may approve building maintenance work up to $40,000. This policy also stipulated tracking the number of services in the monthly CFO budget report, and in the proposed annual budget.

Alignment to Code & Standards

The first board correctly assumes pursuant to 10.4-9.06 it has the "authority to make…financial decisions and resource allocation decisions" (p. 2). However, an effective board "supports and recognizes that operational issues are the responsibility of the School leader…" (p. 8, Standards for Effective Governance, 2017). The school leader must also bring policy constraints affecting operations to the attention of the board. The second board understands its policy role and the need to engage in effective practices aligned to Governance and Financial standards. In line with budgetary best-practices, the costs were ultimately reflected in a line item of the proposed annual operating budget, posted twice for public input, pursuant to O.C.G.A 20-2-167.1.

Issue of Application

The intention of these case studies is to reveal this primary issue. The board should ask, "Are we facing a leaky roof or a leaky system?" The primary issue is revealed by board reflection – or intentionally by me - and subsequently applied to the other issues they face. Either this board does not trust the school leader to make sound decisions, and/or the board's interpretation of this role is preventing effective governance. Second, the leader may not trust the board to help solve the problem. In either case, communication gaps exist.

2. Evidence for Considering Firing the Principal

Consideration for firing the principal should be guided by his or her performance on the evaluation system "adopted by the State Board, " (p. 8) LKES, and in upholding the principal's professional standards. Absent a clear ethical violation, the board should take a systematic approach to evaluate the School Leader, using data to make these decisions. As the Model Code of Ethics explains, "render all decisions based on available facts and…independent judgment and refuel to surrender…judgment to individuals or special interest groups" (p. 1).

Certain leadership domains are of concern in this case; organizational management (leaky roof, carpool), school climate (too strict), instructional leadership (training, induction), and possibly communication and community relationship (if the carpool hinders this). State rules require that two board members are LKES credentialed. These members should have outlined the evaluation process, which provides a temporal process for addressing issues periodically during the school year, which requires evidence from much more than these data sources. Training should try to establish these board members as leaders with the most knowledge on the subject and group knowledge seeking to find out more about the process and standards.

Driving questions for the board to consider include: Does the evidence reflect an issue with board procedure and policy? Does it provide evidence of a possible consistent lack of execution by the School Leader? Does this reflect communication problems between the board and school leader?

3. Parent Board Doesn't Reflect Stakeholders

The board has "created a culture where input is sought, heard, and valued" (p. 10) in alignment with Domain III, Standard A. My questions are, "Whose input?" How is it processed? How is it valued?" and I argue that a homogenous culture facilitates different answers than a diverse culture would. A primary point in my training is on the nature of innovation. The fact is that innovation is driven by learning and primarily diversity in the

people engaging in innovation; cultural, ethnic, intellectual, gender, age, etc. Diversity opens up sources of knowledge, what knowledge is available, and the types of knowledge attained. A parent board limits how the board processes information, practices possible, and how it functions. Second, a simple question that all boards recognize is, "Does the board allow for all stakeholders to be represented?" The board in its current form will have substantial difficulty in "effective collaboration and engagement of internal and external stakeholders" (p. 12, Domain III). Case studies and self-reflection can illustrate this point.

4. Familial Relations Signify the Potential for Conflicts of Interest.

For the reasons outlined and clear language in the "Conflict of Interest Provisions," as a general principle, I recommend not serving in a board capacity of any public organization that directly employs a related family member. The Provisions stipulate clear restrictions in cases where board members employ immediate family members. However, steps must be taken in case where board member non-immediate family relatives, in order to minimize both conflicts of interest and negative public perception that these situations bring.

Both the board member and the board itself should seriously consider whether or not the benefit in this situation outweighs the risk. Immediate family members aside, Domain VII: Financial Governance clearly states that "no board member shall use or attempt to use [the] official position to secure…unwarranted privileges, advantages, employment for [oneself]…or others." (p.1) I reiterate here that the definition of the word "unwarranted" is subject to speculation, questioning, and interpretation that for cases of familial relationships represent a higher bar to justify and defend.

5. Parent Board Results in Parent-centric Organizational Practices

It is not surprising that the carpool is a primary concern. Parents pick up students and these issues are brought up to the Parents governing the school. Second, I suggest that the transportation policy is related to parent instincts to protect their students from

perceived problems around class, wealth, and ethnicity. This harkens back to effective practices in 3. Here, I reiterate to the board that GA Charter Contracts stipulate, "enrollment shall be open to any student who resides within the attendance zone" (page 6).

I also draw their attention to 10.4-9.06 outlining that "continued operation" that could be "contrary to the best interest of…the community" as a point of discussion. As I am not a lawyer, the legal code serves as language that can spark rich conversations and reflection by the board. On these points,

- What evidence can be found in the actions of the board show that its members are interested in input from all stakeholders and representing them?
- What are the implications of the transportation policy? Are students excluded?
- How is this justified publically? Personally for members?
- What values does the board wish to model for students, the school community, and broader communities?
- How does this practice affect the boards' ability to meet standards addressed in Domain III: Board and Community Relations?

These are all questions that boards should consider and include in their annual training program before moving forward. My focus would be to make these issues transparent with the board, and help them design a specific program with differentiation to adequately address them. I emphasize that until then they cannot fulfill their role, duties, and responsibilities as a highly effective board.

HYPOTHETICAL CASE II – Power of the Status Quo

Problem to Address

The Board comes under public scrutiny due to a lack of diversity in its membership. Essentially, the context has changed over the last ten years to value

diversity but the board hasn't. Decent student achievement bolsters the board's assumption that the status quo is acceptable; board culture reflects a strongly held belief that it doesn't need to diversify, its current level of diversity is fine/has worked so far, and it could not diversify even if it wanted to.

Underlying Causes & Training Targets

First, the board is now subject to its own socio-cultural reproduction. I never ceased to be amazed in just how persistent founding board imprints or founder imprints are on in charter schools. Modifications to these organizational blueprints are difficult and affect future success. Generally, this board has created policies, procedures, and roles that have over time only reinforced certain membership characteristics, a certain culture, and a certain way of functioning. Any force that threatens to alter the current board paradigm is met with opposite board forces to eliminate the threat, in order to keep things the same.

Second, these cases typically show similarities. Members have trouble seeing the board in the same way that people outside the group do, particularly in terms of diversity. Success serves as evidence to justify its lack of diversity, its methods of operation and its prior decisions, even when these factors are not directly related to this success.

The difficulty in charting a new trajectory lies in the fact that the current trajectory formed over the course of a decade. This results in both cognitive processes and behavioral patterns that are often efficient and hard to change. For example, most motorcycle accidents occur because car drivers actually do not see the motorcycle in front of them. Their brain reduces cognitive load to save time by only looking for what it expects to find on the road, other cars. Similar cognitive processes occur with individual board members, but board dynamics work in a similar way. The board approaches a type of problem in much the same way as it did before. Deviation from this pattern is met with a salient culture that punishes the new, while legitimating the olds.

Training Approach

This makes effective training very difficult. I believe that the board should be taught new strategies, reflect on these strategies, and apply them over and over for real transformation. However, the board must reflect on its pattern of behavior and how it processes information, experience cognitive dissonance, gain a sense of self-awareness at the individual and group level, then respond in new ways.

One approach I take is to set up new experiences. First, the board engages in sense making of new data on a problem that directly contradicts its current view of reality. Second, the board devises a strategy to solve the problem, which cannot be solved using prior decision-making heuristics. The somewhat predictable approach is employed and met with failure.

A new approach must be formulated, which is met with success. This occurs in a the training setting through structured activities, homework, and problem sets; hypothetical scenarios, case studies, exemplars, relevant data, applied practice, action research, self reports. It is important for the trainer to assess process and behaviors, make them transparent, and promote board-driven restructuring.

Yet, this process takes time and faces barriers already mentioned. Therefore, additional training should target new systems and new members. First, all boards face turnover, which they mitigate through strategic planning. I use this as an opportunity to show evidence that links innovation to diversity in board membership. We then create a job description that includes diverse skill skills, dispositions, and biographical traits. Second, boards are often willing to test new policies and procedures. We structure a new policy or procedure that deviate from current ones. These activities occur with innovation as a goal. In that diversity is a requirement for innovation, diversity becomes a fortunate benefit.

Boards understand this and in my experience are open to such activities because they do not see these activities as major threats to their identity. They see a few minor modifications, enacted piecemeal. However, the long-term affect on diversity and board operations can be profound because one change increases the likelihood of future changes via collective interaction effects with changes and random events. Collectively, the trajectory of innovation can be shifted due to ostensibly minor changes, which interact with stochastic events including shocks to the system such as new state law. However,

future states cannot be predicted. So, trainers try to shape the pattern of innovation by concentrating on certain foci such as diversity, which are incorporated into the process's logic and trajectory.

HYPOTHETICAL CASE III – Board Reality Mirrors Board Experience

Problem to Address

I see the problems described in this scenario stemming from a lack of experiences that inform the board's current reality. My doctoral research indicated that founder innovations in GA charter schools mirrored their experiences. Founder experiences confined to state boundaries resulted in charter schools similar to other charters in GA. Founder experiences outside the state and outside the field of education drove innovation in the entire state. New types of charter schools emerged when founders recombined elements from non-GA schools and non-education fields in new ways. Diverse experiences – and changes to GA charter law - were the primary mechanisms involved in innovation in the GA charter sector.

Training Approach

My approach here would incorporate four activities.

I. Analysis of an Exemplar Board meeting

This activity occurs as follows: (1) visit/record/review (trainer provided) a model or exemplary board meeting and analyze the tape as a group. Individual observations specify; discussion, procedures, public involvement, principal report, behaviors & statements by the principal-CFO-board members, and the feel of the environment; (2) promote discussion participation by having members report their observations, provide a big picture analysis with possible ways to address perceived concerns, listen to comments from other board members, and finally respond to these comments; (3) collaborate as a

group to identify common themes, collectively interpret what this data is telling them, and write a "unified" position statement; (4) review governing board standards and ethics documents; (5) discuss, revise, and write a new position statement.

II. Analysis of their Own Board meeting

Go through a similar or abbreviated process like the one above, focusing on their own board meeting

III. Develop an Action Plan to Incorporate Effective Practices

The trainer facilitates the process and suggests specific practices as needed. The board designs a plan, which incorporates effective practices, in the context of its next board meeting.

IV. Implement Plan at Next Meeting & Model these Practices.

Using the means available to them, board members role-play these practices. Then, they practice them in the real or authentic context of their next Board meeting. This could include index cards/document reminders that specify which practices will be modeled. The trainer records the session – if not a practice already – and critiques the meeting following the session. A specific request is made to gather input from the public aligned with the strategic plan at the meeting. The plan for the board meeting includes responses to the public.

This training would result in board learning on the topic of effective board meetings, which would widen its knowledge space beyond the current context. It would also result in application of this knowledge and practice. The trainer discusses the problem areas highlighted in this scenario with the board and individual members if these areas are not identified in the process.

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	●	○	○	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	○	●	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	●	○	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	●	○	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	●	○	most

https://google.com/forms/d/1.XIICKuTMA7qQE9wWPM38UwQH0YALbfgASyxIOgMgho/edit?usp=forms_home&ths=true

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	●	◯	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	●	◯	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

Good job!!!

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

Domain II - Strategic Planning

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

Continued training on strategic planning for future development of the school and shared student achievement.

Powered by Google Forms

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	✓	○	○	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	✓	○	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	✓	○	○	○	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	✓	○	○	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	✓	○	○	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	✓	◯	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	✓	◯	◯	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	✓	◯	◯	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	✓	◯	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	✓	◯	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	✓	◯	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

MAYBE Increase TIME ALLOTTED for the Training.

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

Powered by Google Forms

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	●	○	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	○	●	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	●	○	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	○	●	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	○	●	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	●	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

NONE

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

Planning

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

Committees

Powered by
Google Forms

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	✓	○	○	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	✓	○	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	✓	○	✗	○	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	✓	○	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	✓	○	○	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	✓	◯	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	✓	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	✓	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	✓	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	✓	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	✓	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

None

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

RESOURCE ATTRACTION

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

FINE TUNING, IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING THE MOST NECESSARY RESOURCES AND HOW TO SECURE THEM.

Powered by Google Forms

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	●	◯	◯	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	●	◯	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	●	◯	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	○	●	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	●	○	○	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	○	○	○	●	○	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	○	○	○	○	●	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	○	○	○	○	●	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	○	○	○	○	●	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

placing board members in areas based on their skill.

Powered by Google Forms

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	●	◯	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	●	◯	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	●	◯	◯	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	●	agree

12. **What are your recommendations to improve the course?**

13. **Referring to the standards for effective governance, on what domain(s) does the board need additional professional development?**

resources

14. **Referring to the domain(s) chosen above, on what standard(s) and/or elements does the board need additional professional development?**

Powered by
Google Forms

"Maximizing Board Potential" Course Evaluation

In an effort to improve our training in the future, please provide feedback for the course, Maximizing Board Potential for Innovation & School Improvement, by responding to the following items. Your responses are anonymous.

1. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	⊗	◯	◯	◯	most

2. **Rate your knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of effective board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	⊗	◯	most

3. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	⊗	◯	◯	◯	most

4. **Rate your of knowledge of professional learning needs and resources for board members AFTER the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	⊗	◯	most

5. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning BEFORE the training.**
   Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	⊗	◯	◯	◯	most

6. **Rate your knowledge of strategic planning AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	⊗	most

7. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement BEFORE the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	⊗	◯	◯	most

8. **Rate your knowledge of CEO management to promote innovation for school improvement AFTER the training.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
least	◯	◯	◯	◯	⊗	most

9. **The course was relevant to the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	⊗	agree

10. **The course content and activities met my expectations.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	⊗	agree

11. **The trainer was effective in meeting the needs of our board.**
Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
disagree	◯	◯	◯	◯	⊗	agree