



Report on Site Visit and Oversight Discrepancies

St. Louis Voices Academy of Media Arts

Re: Clarification of School Position and Record Regarding Site Visit, Instructional Review, and SPED Audit Communications

Purpose of this Report

This report is prepared to correct the false or incomplete narrative that St. Louis Voices Academy of Media Arts (“SLVA” or “the School”) denied a school visit, avoided oversight, refused a site visit altogether, or failed to cooperate with related review processes. The documentary record reflects something materially different: the School consistently communicated a willingness to participate in oversight activities, but requested that the Missouri Charter Public School Commission (“Commission” or “MCPSC”) provide proper notice, a clearly defined scope, required compliance materials, and a process aligned with the Commission’s own governing documents and the School’s legal obligations. The record also reflects that multiple review processes were being conflated by the Commission—namely the annual site visit, the instructional plan review, and the SPED audit—even though they were separate matters with separate purposes, timing, and compliance implications.

(Citations: Dec. 23, 2025 Commission letter; Feb. 18–19, 2026 site visit email chain.)

Executive Summary

The record does not support a claim that SLVA categorically refused a site visit or failed to cooperate with oversight. Instead, the documents show that separate review tracks were blurred together, scope and notice shifted over time, and unresolved Commission-side process issues were later portrayed as school noncompliance.

The Commission’s December 23, 2025 letter addressed ongoing monitoring related to the School’s Staffing and Instructional Support Plan submitted in response to the November 17 probation letter. That communication tied the proposed January or February visit to validation of the instructional plan and monitoring of issues identified in the November notices. It did not present the visit as the School’s standard annual spring site visit. (Citation: Dec. 23, 2025 Commission letter.)



By February, the Commission itself distinguished the annual site visit from the earlier January notice. In her February 17 email, Martha McGeehon stated that, pursuant to the site visit protocol, the Commission was happy to adhere to that timing and schedule a site visit in April, while also offering earlier optional dates because the Commission had been trying to schedule a site visit for some time now. That confirms that the annual site visit process was a separate matter governed by its own protocol and notice requirements. (Citation: Feb. 17–18, 2026 “Site Visit Scheduling Deadlines” and “SLVA site visit planning” email chains.)

The SPED record reflects the same pattern. On December 1, 2025, Martha McGeehon introduced Jeanne Rothermel as the Commission’s representative conducting the special education audit and directed the School to provide requested information and connect the auditor with necessary staff. That same day, the School confirmed a meeting for December 2 and offered to include its SPED Coordinator to answer questions and provide what was needed. On February 14, 2026, Jeanne Rothermel stated directly that MCPSC had already requested her final report and that she had supplied it to them the week before. Against that timeline, later suggestions that the audit was never done, that the School did not answer questions, or that it failed to provide requested information do not match the record. (Citations: Dec. 1, 2025 “SLVA Special Education Audit” email chain; Feb. 12–14, 2026 “SPED Audit Meeting” email chain.)

The record also reflects that the School was awaiting completion or clarification of separate compliance matters from Commission staff, specifically the instructional plan review and the SPED audit. On February 19, SLVA wrote that it was still waiting on those separate compliance matters and needed clarity on when the Commission would complete them based on the last probationary notice. That shows the unresolved status of these reviews was not attributable to school noncooperation, but to the fact that the Commission had not completed or clearly closed out those separate processes. (Citation: Feb. 17–19, 2026 “SLVA site visit planning” email chain.)

By February 19, SLVA affirmatively selected April 13–14 for the annual site visit and designated Dr. Nolan-Echols as the point of contact. That is incompatible with any claim that the School refused a site visit altogether. (Citation: Feb. 19, 2026 “SLVA site visit planning” email chain.)

Clarification of the Three Separate Review Tracks

A central problem in the current narrative is that three separate processes have been blurred together as though they were one.

1. Annual Site Visit

The annual site visit was the Commission’s standard spring review governed by the Compliance and Quality Monitoring Protocols and a 30-day notice framework. By the Commission’s own



February 17 email, this process was properly associated with an April timeline. (Citation: Feb. 17, 2026 “Site Visit Scheduling Deadlines” / “SLVA site visit planning” email chain.)

2. Instructional Plan Review

The instructional plan review arose from the School’s December submission of its Staffing and Instructional Support Plan in response to the November 17 probation letter. The December 23 Commission letter expressly tied the proposed early 2026 visit to validating whether that plan was being operationalized and to monitoring the issues identified in the November letters. (Citation: Dec. 23, 2025 Commission letter.)

3. SPED Audit

The SPED audit was another separate compliance matter and should not be conflated with either the annual site visit or the instructional plan review. The documentary record shows that on December 1, 2025, the Commission formally initiated the SPED audit by designating Jeanne Rothermel as its representative and instructing the School to provide requested information and connect her with relevant staff. The School responded that same day by scheduling a meeting for December 2 and offering participation from its SPED Coordinator to answer questions and provide needed information. In January, Jeanne Rothermel sent audit-related documents and stated that certain questions had already been cleared up through prior discussions. On February 14, she stated that MCPSC had already requested her final report and that she had supplied it the previous week. That sequence materially conflicts with any later suggestion that the audit was never done or that the School failed to cooperate. (Citations: Dec. 1, 2025 “SLVA Special Education Audit” email chain; Jan. 6, 2026 “date to meet again” email chain; Feb. 14, 2026 “SPED Audit Meeting” email chain.)

These distinctions matter. A school cannot fairly be accused of refusing oversight when the oversight body itself is blending separate reviews, changing labels, and carrying unresolved matters into February while simultaneously trying to schedule a later annual site visit. (Citation: Feb. 18–19, 2026 “SLVA site visit planning” email chain.)

Chronology of Relevant Events

1. December 1, 2025: SPED audit communication arranged

On December 1, 2025, Martha McGeehon advised that Jeanne Rothermel would be completing the special education audit on the Commission’s behalf and instructed the School to provide requested information and connect the auditor to any staff she needed to speak with. Later that same day, Jeanne Rothermel asked to connect by phone or Zoom to address immediate issues relating to services for students, and the School responded by confirming a December 2



meeting and offering to include its SPED Coordinator so questions could be answered and materials provided. (Citation: Dec. 1, 2025 “SLVA Special Education Audit” email chain.)

2. December 2–December 9, 2025: SPED audit work proceeds on the School’s side

Based on the School’s records and later contemporaneous statements, the audit work proceeded in early December and was understood by School leadership to have been completed on the School’s side by December 9, 2025. The later January and February emails do not reflect any deficiency notice stating that the School failed to participate, refused access, or ignored requests during that period. (Citations: Feb. 1, 2026 forwarding email to counsel in “date to meet again” chain; Feb. 14, 2026 “SPED Audit Meeting” chain.)

3. December 23, 2025: Commission initiates an early 2026 review tied to the instructional plan

The Commission informed SLVA that it would conduct a visit in early 2026 as part of ongoing monitoring of the School’s staffing and instructional support plan and other areas identified in the November 6 and 17 letters. The stated purpose was to validate whether the plan was being operationalized and to assess academic capacity. This was not framed as the annual spring site visit. (Citation: Dec. 23, 2025 Commission letter.)

4. January 6, 2026: audit materials circulated and prior questions referenced as already addressed

On January 6, Jeanne Rothermel sent materials she referenced from an earlier meeting, explained that certain questions had already been cleared up through prior conversations, and noted that some items would require looking into records systems because she did not herself have access. This communication is inconsistent with a narrative that the School simply failed to respond or provide information. It reflects an ongoing audit process in which documents had already been reviewed and questions had already been discussed. (Citation: Jan. 6, 2026 “date to meet again” email chain.)

5. January 9, 2026: consultant expands the review beyond the December notice

The consultant’s January 9 summary described a broader process across five domains, including document production, interviews, focus groups, classroom observations, and data analysis. That description exceeded the narrower framing reflected in the December 23 notice tied to instructional plan implementation. (Citation: Jan. 9–13, 2026 consultant / school email chain regarding site visit scope.)



6. January 9–13, 2026: School narrows its response to the noticed instructional review and requests compliant scope

SLVA responded that, based on prior notices and legal advice, it could provide information to conduct the January 20 site visit for instructional review purposes and listed the categories of documents it was prepared to produce. The School requested an updated scope of work reflecting only review of the instructional plan implementation before moving forward with broader production. SLVA later reiterated that it would provide items associated with the agreed-upon and board-approved instructional review, while awaiting a response from the Commission regarding the scope. (Citation: Jan. 9–13, 2026 consultant / school email chain regarding site visit scope.)

7. January 13, 2026: School identifies compliance prerequisites; consultant pauses coordination

SLVA then identified the items it believed were required to facilitate the visit lawfully and compliantly, including an agreed scope of work, background checks, activity schedule, consent forms, and a board-approved signed scope. The School stated that upon receipt of those required items, it would begin facilitation and coordination of the request. In response, the consultant stated she would pause coordination and await direction from the Commission due to differing interpretations of scope and requirements. (Citation: Jan. 13, 2026 consultant / school email chain regarding site visit scope.)

8. January 16, 2026: January visit is canceled or rescheduled amid unresolved scope issues

When the January 20–21 visit was canceled or rescheduled, SLVA again stated that the written notice reflected an instructional plan review rather than a general site visit and that the School had prepared the information required for the scope it actually received. The School reiterated that once it received an accurate account of the visit and proper scope, it would respond accordingly. (Citation: Jan. 16, 2026 “Rescheduling Site Visit Scheduled for January 20–21” email chain.)

9. February 1, 2026: School documents its understanding that the SPED audit had already been done

On February 1, Dr. Nolan forwarded the January 6 audit communication to counsel and stated that the audit was done on December 9, that the January 6 email had later been provided to school leadership on January 9, and that no same-day or same-month compliance requirement from the auditor or Commission had been noted to her. She further stated that the Commission



had required an audit by a certain date under corrective action and probation, not full same-day compliance closure. (Citation: Feb. 1, 2026 forwarding email in “date to meet again” chain.)

10. February 14, 2026: auditor states MCPSC already had the final report

On February 14, after Dr. Nolan asked about outstanding items needed to furnish the completed audit, Jeanne Rothermel replied that MCPSC had already requested her final report and that it had been supplied to them the week before. She further stated that if they wanted her to open the audit again, she would need their approval to do so. That statement directly undercuts any later claim that the audit was never completed or that the School had left it unfinished. (Citation: Feb. 14, 2026 “SPED Audit Meeting” email chain.)

11. February 17–19, 2026: Commission separates out the annual site visit and offers April dates

On February 17, the Commission stated that, pursuant to its site visit protocol, it was prepared to schedule the site visit in April with the proper 30-day notice. It also offered earlier dates as an accommodation. This is a key admission that the annual site visit was a separate process from the earlier January instructional-plan-related review. SLVA responded on February 18 that the January scope and notice had not reflected the annual spring site visit, but instead an instructional plan review later stated to be an intervention. The School requested proper notice and scope under the governing documents. (Citations: Feb. 17–18, 2026 “Site Visit Scheduling Deadlines” and “SLVA site visit planning” email chains.)

12. February 19, 2026: School notes unresolved reviews and schedules the annual site visit anyway

SLVA stated on February 19 that it was still waiting on separate compliance matters from Commission staff related to the instructional plan review and the SPED audit, and asked when those items would be completed under the last probationary notice. Later that same day, the School selected April 13–14 for the annual site visit, the Commission accepted the dates, and Dr. Nolan-Echols agreed to serve as point of contact. (Citation: Feb. 19, 2026 “SLVA site visit planning” email chain.)

Key Discrepancies in the Current Narrative

Discrepancy 1: “The School denied the opportunity for a site visit.”

The record shows no blanket denial. The School challenged the mismatch between the written notice and the broader process later proposed, while still offering to produce materials tied to the instructional review actually noticed and later affirmatively scheduling the annual site visit.



(Citations: Jan. 9–13, 2026 consultant / school site visit scope chain; Feb. 19, 2026 scheduling confirmation.)

Discrepancy 2: “The School refused oversight.”

The School did not refuse oversight. It distinguished among separate review tracks, requested compliant notice and scope, identified legal and procedural prerequisites, and continued working toward scheduling. (Citations: Jan. 13, 2026 consultant / school scope chain; Feb. 18–19, 2026 “SLVA site visit planning” chain.)

Discrepancy 3: “The School caused the delay in review.”

The record more strongly supports that the delays stemmed from Commission-side process and capacity issues. The consultant paused January coordination because scope had not been resolved. The Commission later shifted the annual site visit to April under its regular notice protocol. As to the SPED audit, the auditor’s own February 14 statement shows that MCPSC had already been given the final report, which makes later claims of noncompletion difficult to reconcile with the documented sequence. (Citations: Jan. 13, 2026 consultant pause email; Feb. 17, 2026 annual site visit scheduling email; Feb. 14, 2026 auditor final report email.)

Discrepancy 4: “The annual site visit and the instructional review were the same event.”

The documents do not support that. The December 23 letter tied the early 2026 visit to implementation of the instructional support plan and other probation-related concerns. The February 17 email separately invoked the annual site visit protocol and 30-day notice requirement for an April visit. SLVA explicitly identified these as different matters. (Citations: Dec. 23, 2025 Commission letter; Feb. 17–18, 2026 site visit scheduling chain.)

Discrepancy 5: “The SPED audit was never completed because the School failed to respond or provide information.”

The documentary record does not support that statement. The Commission initiated the audit on December 1. The School immediately coordinated with the auditor and offered access to relevant personnel. The January 6 email reflects an ongoing audit process in which documents had been reviewed and some questions had already been cleared up. By February 14, the auditor stated that MCPSC had already requested and received her final report. If the Commission later claimed the audit was not done, or that the School failed to answer questions or provide materials, that reflects an inconsistency in the Commission’s own handling or later narrative, not proof of School noncompliance. (Citations: Dec. 1, 2025 “SLVA Special Education Audit” chain; Jan. 6, 2026 “date to meet again” chain; Feb. 14, 2026 “SPED Audit Meeting” chain.)



What the Facts More Accurately Reflect

A more accurate account is this:

The Commission had multiple separate oversight matters involving SLVA: an instructional plan review arising from the probation process, a separate SPED audit, and the annual spring site visit. Rather than clearly closing out each review track, Commission communications later blurred together separate processes and, at times, contradicted one another regarding what had been completed and what remained pending.

The SPED audit record is particularly important. The Commission initiated that audit on December 1 through its designated representative. The School promptly coordinated with that representative and offered the necessary staff participation. In January, the auditor circulated audit materials and referenced questions that had already been addressed. On February 14, the auditor stated directly that MCPSC had already requested and received her final report the week before. That sequence is inconsistent with any later characterization that the audit was never completed because the School failed to cooperate. (Citations: Dec. 1, 2025 “SLVA Special Education Audit” chain; Jan. 6, 2026 “date to meet again” chain; Feb. 14, 2026 “SPED Audit Meeting” chain.)

In January, the site visit consultant advanced a broader intervention-style review that exceeded the narrower instructional-review purpose reflected in the written notice. SLVA requested proper scope, notice, and compliance materials before facilitating that broader process. The consultant then paused coordination pending Commission direction. By February, the Commission itself distinguished the annual site visit from the earlier review, acknowledged that the annual site visit could properly be scheduled in April under the 30-day protocol, and offered dates. SLVA then selected April 13–14 and designated a point of contact, while still noting that the Commission had not yet clearly closed out the separate instructional plan review and SPED audit matters. (Citations: Dec. 23, 2025 Commission letter; Jan. 9–13, 2026 scope chain; Feb. 17–19, 2026 site visit planning chain.)

The resulting narrative of school noncooperation is not supported by that sequence. The better reading of the record is not school obstruction, but Commission inconsistency, delayed execution, conflation of separate review tracks, and shifting characterizations of what had already been completed.

School Position

Based on the documentary record and the School’s communications, SLVA’s position can be stated as follows:



St. Louis Voices Academy did not refuse a site visit and did not avoid oversight. The School sought compliance with proper notice, accurate scope, and lawful procedures when Commission staff and its designee attempted to blend separate review matters into a single process. The annual site visit, instructional plan review, and SPED audit were separate matters. The record reflects that the School cooperated with the SPED audit process when it was initiated, participated in the requested communications, and that the auditor later advised that MCPSC had already received the final report. The School further maintains that later Commission statements suggesting the SPED audit was not done, or that the School failed to answer questions or provide information, are inconsistent with the documented communication timeline. Once the Commission proceeded under the proper annual site visit protocol, the School selected April 13–14, 2026 and designated its point of contact. (Citations: Dec. 1, 2025 SPED initiation chain; Feb. 14, 2026 auditor final report email; Feb. 17–19, 2026 site visit planning chain.)

Conclusion

The claim that SLVA denied, avoided, or refused oversight is not supported by the fuller record. The evidence instead reflects that separate oversight matters were conflated; that the January process concerned an instructional-plan-related review rather than the normal annual spring site visit; that the SPED audit was initiated, participated in, and later reported by the auditor as having been completed and submitted to MCPSC; and that the School ultimately scheduled the annual site visit for April 13–14, 2026. The better reading of the record is not school obstruction, but Commission inconsistency, delayed execution, and shifting characterizations of separate review processes after the fact. (Citations: Dec. 1, 2025 SPED initiation chain; Feb. 14, 2026 auditor final report email; Feb. 17–19, 2026 site visit planning chain.)