

Valtena G. Brown, Chief Operating Officer
School Operations

SUBJECT: REQUEST SCHOOL BOARD APPROVAL OF FOUR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATIONS AND DENIAL OF TWO CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATIONS

COMMITTEE: INSTRUCTIONAL EXCELLENCE AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

LINK TO STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: STUDENT, PARENT, AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

AUTHORIZATION

Section 1002.33, F.S., authorizes the establishment of charter schools in Florida. As provided in Section 1002.33(6), F.S., and School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) receives and reviews charter school applications from individuals and/or organizations in the community. On August 1, 2012 the School Board received 57 applications to operate a charter school in Miami-Dade County. Pursuant to Section 1002.33(6)(b)(3), F.S., a sponsor must approve or deny an application no later than 60 calendar days after the application is received unless the applicants have agreed in writing to extend the statutory timeline.

EVALUATION

Pursuant to School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, the District reviews all applications using an evaluation instrument developed by the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) and may include additional information or documents requested by the District. The Standard Model Application includes 19 standards of evaluation, certification and assurance declarations. The Sponsor shall deny any application that does not comply with the statutory requirements and/or Sponsor's instructions for charter school applications.

The Superintendent has appointed two committees with the responsibility to review and evaluate charter school applications: Technical Review Committee (TRC) and Application Review Committee (ARC). These committees are comprised of representatives from various District departments and are charged with identifying deficiencies in the written application and/or areas that require clarification to fully evaluate the quality of the application or the capacity of the applicant to properly implement the proposed plan.

Pursuant to Section 1002.33(6)(3)(a), F.S., if an application is denied, the District shall, within ten (10) calendar days after the denial, articulate in writing the specific reasons for the denial, based upon good cause, and provide the letter of denial and supporting documentation to the applicant and the FLDOE. An applicant may appeal the Board's denial by submitting a request in writing to the State Board of Education and the Sponsor no later than thirty (30) calendar days after receiving a notice of denial. However, if an application to replicate a high-performing charter school application is denied, the applicant may appeal the denial directly to the State Board of Education, bypassing the normal appeal process.

APPLICATIONS

Pursuant to School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, six charter school applications are being presented for final consideration by the School Board. Detailed in the chart below is a summary of each charter school application and the corresponding committee recommendation. The specific reasons for each recommendation can be found in the identified Attachment and the evaluation forms which are included and incorporated by reference in this Board item. Copies of the applications and evaluations, which are also incorporated by reference in this Board item, will be transmitted to the School Board Members under separate cover and will be available for inspection by the public in the Office of Board Recording Secretary, Room 924, and in the Citizen Information Center, Room 158, 1450 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.

| | Type of Application | Proposed Name of School | Legal Entity | Committee Recommendation | Supporting Documentation |
|----|-----------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | High Performing Replication | iMater Academy High School | Mater Academy, Inc. | Approval | Attachment A |
| 2. | High Performing Replication | iMater Academy Middle School | | | |
| 3. | Virtual | International Studies Virtual Academy | International Studies Charter High School, Inc. | Approval | |
| 4. | Virtual | Mater Virtual Academy Charter Middle High School | Mater Academy, Inc. | Approval | |

| | Type of Application | Proposed Name of School | Legal Entity | Committee Recommendation | Supporting Documentation |
|----|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | Traditional | HIVE Preparatory Middle School | Advanced Learning Charter School, Inc. | Denial | Attachment B |
| 2. | Traditional | Miami Arts Charter School at Homestead | Miami Arts, Inc. | Denial | Attachment C |

DUE PROCESS

To ensure proper notice and due process, each applicant was noticed of the Superintendent’s intent to recommend approval or denial to the School Board and provided a copy of the final evaluation prior to this School Board Meeting. The applicants were also informed of the School Board’s Instructional Excellence and Community Engagement Committee Meeting and procedures for requesting to appear before the School Board at meetings and public hearings. Additionally, a courtesy orientation for charter school applicants was noticed on the Charter School Support department’s website and facilitated by multiple district departments on May 4, 2012. Individual appointments regarding application preparation were also held throughout the year by Charter School Support staff, upon request.

NET FINANCIAL IMPACT TO THE DISTRICT

Pursuant to School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, “an application shall be automatically rescinded, without further action by the Sponsor, if the applicant does not enter into contract negotiations or open the school within: (1) the timeframe specified by law, or (2) the date of extension which has been mutually agreed upon in writing by both parties.” Currently there are 16 charter school applications from previous cohorts that have deferred opening until the 2013-14 SY and one previously approved in April 2012 from the 2012 Cohort (schools in the pipeline). Moreover, in relation to the application from the 2012 Cohort, included in this Board Item, there are four applications recommended for approval.

In the event that all the proposed schools open as anticipated, it is estimated that the net impact to the District next school year will be as follows:

| | Initial Year Loss (\$ Revenue) | Initial Year Loss (No. of Positions) |
|---|---|---|
| Schools in the Pipeline (17) | \$41,741,445 | 335 |
| 2012 Application Cohort (4) (Attachment A) | \$6,537,302 | 46 |
| Total | \$48,278,747 | 381 |

RECOMMENDED: That The School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida:

1. Approve the charter school application and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate a contract reflecting the contents of the application as approved by the School Board for:
 - a. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of iMater Academy High School;
 - b. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of iMater Academy Middle School;
 - c. International Studies Charter High School, Inc., on behalf of International Studies Virtual Academy; and
 - d. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of Mater Virtual Academy Charter Middle High School.

2. Deny the charter school application for:
 - a. Advanced Learning Charter School, Inc., on behalf of HIVE Preparatory Middle School; and
 - b. Miami Arts, Inc., on behalf of Miami Arts Charter School at Homestead.

VGB:elg
Attachments

**School Board Agenda Item C-30
ATTACHMENT A**

- APPLICANTS:**
- iMater Academy High School
 - iMater Academy Middle School
 - International Studies Virtual Academy
 - Mater Virtual Academy Charter Middle High School

The M-DCPS' Charter School Application Review Committee (ARC) met to review the four charter school applications below and recommended approval to the Superintendent.

| (1)/(2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | | (6) | (7) | (8) | (8) |
|---|---|--------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|---|---|--|
| Name of School | Legal Entity | Initial Year | Grade Levels | Enrollment | Focus/ Theme | Founding/ Gov. Board Members | Special Provisions or Requested Action(s) | Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions |
| | Educational Service Provider (ESP) | | Initial/Current Year | | | | | |
| | | | Maximum | | | | | |
| (1) iMater Academy High School <i>ARC meeting date: November 26, 2012. By a unanimous vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i> | Mater Academy, Inc. | 2013/2014 | 9-10 | 400 | None | Governing Board Members: Roberto C. Blanch, Attorney, Siegfried, Rivera, Lerner, et. al., P.A.; Shannine Sadesky, Principal, Somerset Acad., Broward County Public Schools; Juan A. Garcia, Customer Serv. Manager, Hotwire Comm.; and Cesar C. Crousillat, Asset Manager, Rialto Capital Management. | High Performing Replication | \$1,503,943 (12 Positions) |
| | | | 9-12 | 800 | | | | |
| (2) iMater Academy Middle School <i>ARC meeting date: November 26, 2012. By a unanimous vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i> | Academica Dade, LLC | 2013/2014 | 6-8 | 330 | None | Governing Board Members: Jean-Michel G. Caffin, Managing Partner, Axis Amgricas; Leonela F. Rohaidy, Vice-President Sales, S.E. Wholesale Foods; Claire Francoulon, Parent Representative, French Consulate; Patrizia Coco, Teacher, Cypress Bay HS; Giampiero de Persia, President and CEO, Poltrona Frau; and Miriam Rodriguez, Parent. | High Performing Replication | \$1,835,245 (12 Positions) |
| | | | 6-8 | 550 | | | | |
| (3) International Studies Virtual Academy <i>ARC meeting date: December 12, 2012. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i> | International Studies Charter High School, Inc. | 2013/2014 | 6-12 | 350 | Virtual | Governing Board Members: Jean-Michel G. Caffin, Managing Partner, Axis Amgricas; Leonela F. Rohaidy, Vice-President Sales, S.E. Wholesale Foods; Claire Francoulon, Parent Representative, French Consulate; Patrizia Coco, Teacher, Cypress Bay HS; Giampiero de Persia, President and CEO, Poltrona Frau; and Miriam Rodriguez, Parent. | None | \$1,599,057 (11 Positions) |
| | Academica, LLC | | 6-12 | 648 | | | | |

| (1)/(2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | | (6) | (7) | (8) | (8) |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|--|---|--|
| Name of School | Legal Entity | Initial Year | Grade Levels | Enrollment | Focus/ Theme | Founding/ Gov. Board Members | Special Provisions or Requested Action(s) | Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions |
| | Educational Service Provider (ESP) | | Initial/Current Year | | | | | |
| | | | Maximum | | | | | |
| (4) Mater Virtual Academy Charter Middle High School <i>ARC meeting date: December 12, 2012. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i> | Mater Academy, Inc. | 2013/ 2014 | 6-12 | 350 | Virtual | Governing Board Members: Roberto C. Blanch, Attorney, Siegfried, Rivera, Lerner, et. al., P.A.; Shannine Sadesky, Principal, Somerset Acad., Broward County Public Schools; Elizabeth Nuevo, Agent, U.S. Home Sec.; Juan A. Garcia, Cust. Serv. Manager, Hotwire Comm.; and Cesar C. Crousillat, Asset Manager, Rialto Capital Management. | None | \$1,599,057 (11 Positions) |
| | Academica, LLC | | 6-12 | 648 | | | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE (\$): | | | | | | | | \$6,537,302 |
| | | | | | | | | 46 |

Initial Year Loss: The revenue and teaching positions indicated as "Initial Year Loss" provide an estimate of the potential impact to the District's General Fund (\$6,537,302) and instructional staffing (46 positions). The loss of revenue describes 95% of FEFP funds per student, based on 75% of the initial year's enrollment projection that will not be realized by the District for the current fiscal year. The loss in teaching positions, based on average class size requirements, reflects the possible reduction in basic teaching positions resulting from the anticipated decrease in students.

Copies of the applications and evaluations will be transmitted to the School Board Members under separate cover and will be available for inspection by the public in the Office of Board Recording Secretary, Room 924, and in the Citizen Information Center, Room 158, 1450 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.

School Board Agenda Item C-30 ATTACHMENT B

As provided in Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) has received charter school applications from individuals and/or organizations in the community.

Proposal

Advanced Learning Charter School, Inc. proposes to establish HIVE Preparatory Middle School to serve grades six through eight with a maximum enrollment of 452 students, beginning with 350 students in the 2013-2014 school year. Currently, Advanced Learning Charter School, Inc. operates Advanced Learning Charter School that opened in 2009 and serves approximately 450 students in kindergarten through fifth grade.

Applicant

The members of the Governing Board are: Albert Perez, Chairperson of the Governing Board and Operations Manager of Facility, CVS/Caremark; Anna C. Garcia Becerra, Financial Director, St. Thomas the Apostle; Pedro L. Dedesma, President, Century/AAA, LTD; Renato Victor Giorgini, President & CEO, Equiflor Corp.; and Joaquin A. Novoa, DDS, Dentist.

The applicant did not attend the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 4, 2012. The meeting is not mandatory but attendance is strongly recommended by the Florida Department of Education and the District's Charter School Support Office to inform applicants of new statutory requirements and District policies and procedures.

Evaluation

A review of this charter school application was conducted pursuant to § 1002.33 (6), F. S., and Board Policy 9800, using the required Standard Model Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument (IEPC-M2). The Standard Model Application includes 19 evaluation and certification standards and assurances declarations. As allowed by § 1002.33(6)(a)(6), F.S. and pursuant to Board Policy 9800, the District also includes evaluation of the applicant's experience and historical performance operating charter schools.

The initial review conducted by members of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) members resulted in significant concerns and findings that were provided to the applicant and forwarded to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The ARC is responsible for a second review of the application as well as conducting an interview to assess the overall capacity of the applicant's ability to establish and implement the charter school plan, clarify any components of the written application for which reviewers have questions or require additional information, and corroborate information provided in the written application. The ARC reviewed this application on December 3, 2012.

The ARC found that the application failed to meet the minimum statutory requirements and identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicant's understanding of various conceptual issues and/or its ability to meet the statutory requirements related to 13 of the 18 applicable categories in the Model Evaluation Instrument. As summarized below, these deficiencies and serious concerns regarding the applicant's historical performance constitute good cause for denial of the application.

1. Failure to demonstrate how the school will use the guiding principles and meet the statutorily defined purpose of a charter school. The application did not:
 - include the required cash flow plan based on projected revenues and expenses, a description of controls that insures that finances will be safeguarded, or mechanisms to safeguard the financial processes; (Standards 17, 18)

- provide educational goals and objectives setting high standards for student achievement, or student performance targets or mechanisms to indicate whether students have achieved a year's worth of learning; (Standard 5)
 - provide a detailed curriculum plan that clearly illustrates how student will be provided services to attain state standards; (Standards 3, 4) or
 - use the most recent Model Application required by law.
2. Failure to provide a detailed curriculum plan that illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards. (Standards 3, 4)
 - Applicant proposes to use the outdated Competency Based Curriculum that is not aligned with the Next Generation State Standards (NGSSS) or the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). (Standards 3, 4)
 - The application lists mathematic topics that are not aligned with the NGSSS or the CCSS. (Standard 4)
 - The applicant presents a mathematics spiral curriculum that is not aligned with current standards and cannot be implemented with the CCSS; (Standard 4)
 - There is no program of study for the middle school grades (Standard 4)
 - Although the NGSSS and the CCSS are completely different, the applicant uses them interchangeably. (Standards 3, 4)
 - The application includes Major Areas of Interest which is no longer available. (Standard 4)
 - The application fails to provide a curriculum that meets the needs of all students and at all academic proficiency levels. The course offerings for Mathematics list M/J I and there is no course with their title. The applicant does not clearly state what advance courses it will offer. Applicant does not delineate the specific courses with specific benchmarks that will be addressed at each grade level. (Standard 4)
 - The application proposes "interdisciplinary themes", but does not identify the themes or show how they would be incorporated in the curriculum plan. (Standards 3, 4)
 3. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. (Standard 5)
 - Educational goals and objectives do not set high standards for student achievement, are not measurable and lack specificity. (Standard 5)
 - The application lacks meaningful details on promotion requirements for middle school credits that will ensure students progressing to high school will graduate on time. (Standard 5)
 4. Failure to provide a comprehensive plan for educating special education students (SPED). (Standard 6) The application:
 - fails to describe how students entering below grade level will engage in the curriculum; (Standards 4, 6)
 - does not appropriately describe the level of SPED services the school will provide; (Standard 6)
 - fails to describe how gifted and talented students will be served;
 - inappropriately states that consultative, collaborative, and pull-out services will be provided to SPED students. The staffing plan provided in the application does not align with the services described or the projected SPED enrollment; (Standard 6)
 - provides an unrealistic staffing plan that remains the same over five years even though the projected enrollment increases; and (Standards 6,10)
 - impermissibly states that the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) will be maintained outside of the students' cumulative folders. (Standards 6, 18)
 5. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the education of English Language Learners (ELL). (Standard 7) The application does not:

- describe the level of required parental involvement or a plan for ensuring that parents of ELL students are aware of their child's academic progress; (Standard 7)
 - demonstrate an ability to meet the curriculum needs of ELL students and there is no mention of the CELLA assessment, no progress monitoring plan for ELL students, and no plan to document student progress; (Standards 4, 7) or
 - provide a concrete plan for meeting the broad spectrum of educational needs of ELL students. No information was provided to indicate how ELL students who enter the school below grade level will be engaged in and benefit from the curriculum. (Standard 7)
6. Failure to provide a budget that is consistent with all parts of the application including budgetary projections that are realistic and ensure the financial viability of the school, and failure to provide a detailed plan to ensure adequate financial oversight, and controls that will safeguard finances. (Standards 17, 18)
- Both 100% and 50% enrollment budgets reflect negative balances. (Standard 17)
 - The budget relies on funding generated from competitive grants that the school is not guaranteed to receive. (Standard 17)
 - The monthly cash flow projection for the school's start-up period through the first year of operation does not align with the budget provided. (Standard 17)
 - Despite the fact that the applicant is an established board, the application did not clearly state the processes or policies in place to manage and safeguard the school's finances. (Standard 18)
7. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan which provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. (Standards 9,10,12)
- The application does not include the state required parent representative whose task is to facilitate parental involvement and to assist in resolving disputes. (Standard 9)
 - The by-laws impermissibly state that the principal will act as an ex-officio member of the board. (Standard 9)
 - The application fails to clearly identify the titles, roles and responsibilities for each member of the established governing board. (Standard 9)
 - The application does not mention or address how the school will implement the performance pay provisions in accordance with F.S. 1012.22. The 90 day probationary period identified by the applicant violates the teacher contracting provisions of F.S. 1012.33. (Standards 10, 12)
 - There is not a clear plan to ensure that the school will retain highly qualified teachers. Salaries for teachers are not competitive. (Standards 10, 12)
 - The staffing plan is not aligned with the course offerings found in Section 4 of the model application. (Standards 4,10)
8. Failure to establish policies that will ensure that there is an admissions and enrollment process that is open, fair and in accordance with applicable law. (Standard 13)
- The application does not provide a clear plan to ensure that families throughout Miami-Dade County will be informed about the option to apply for enrollment in this school.
 - The application states that the school will follow the District's Code of Student Conduct, yet the application indicates that the school will dismiss a student for specific infractions not consistent with the Code, demonstrating that the school (1) does not have a clear understanding of this document, (2) is not prepared to properly implement the Code, and (3) will disfranchise students and their families by dismissing them without appropriate due process.
 - The application does not explain or provide any basis for its stated policy of "withholding" or denying reenrollment to students. The application failed to provide a parent contract.
9. Failure to provide (a) transportation services and (b) a complete action plan. (Standards 15, 19)
- The application projects a 10% SPED population, but does not include the projected cost to transport students whose IEP may require it. (Standard 15)

- The application does not provide a clear plan to ensure transportation services are provided to all eligible students. (Standard 15)
- The action plan does not include necessary actions and strategies to ensure that the school will be ready to serve students on the first day of school. For example, the application does not provide (1) a clear timeline for student recruitment and enrollment; (2) a plan to purchase instructional materials and provide for technological needs; or (3) a time frame to meet employee screening requirements prior to employment and the first day of school. (Standard 19)

10. Failure to demonstrate that the applicant, who currently has an existing school, has the capacity to establish and operate the proposed school.

- The existing charter school, Advanced Learning Charter School (1014) reported a deficit of \$83,804 in its most recent audited financial statements. This, in conjunction with a negative budget balance proposed for the new school, raises serious concerns about the financial stability of the existing school and the governing board's capacity to successfully expand.
- The existing school has significant difficulty providing adequate professional development for its teachers which affects the proposed school's ability to impose the high professional standards crucial in the upper grades and in the transitioning to new accountability standards.

The applicant was notified of the Superintendent's intent to recommend denial to the School Board and provided a copy of the final evaluation. Pursuant to section 1002.33(6)(c), F.S., should the School Board approve this recommendation, the applicant may appeal to the State Board of Education no later than 30 days after receipt of the School Board's decision.

Copies of the application and evaluation, which are incorporated by reference in this Board item, will be transmitted to the School Board Members under separate cover and will be available for inspection by the public in the Office of Board Recording Secretary, Room 924, and in the Citizen Information Center, Room 158, 1450 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.

School Board Agenda Item C-30

ATTACHMENT C

As provided in School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) has received charter school applications from individuals and/or organizations in the community.

Proposal

Miami Arts, Inc. proposes to establish Miami Arts Charter School at Homestead, a performing arts charter school, to serve grades six through twelve with a maximum of 1,200 students, beginning with grades six through ten in its first year of operation. The school proposes to open in the Homestead, Florida area in the 2013-2014 school year. Currently, Miami Arts, Inc. operates a performing arts charter school that opened in 2009 in the mid-town area of Miami and serves approximately 680 students in grades six through twelve.

Applicant

The members of the Governing Board are: Dania Ramos-Infante, Chairperson of the Governing Board and CFO/COO, National Auto Lenders; Jennifer M. Kenney, Vice-President, The John Kenney Company; Pablo Canals, University of Miami; and Raymond D. Kimsey, DMD, Comfortable Dentistry.

The applicant did not attend the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 4, 2012. The meeting is not mandatory but attendance is strongly recommended by the Florida Department of Education and the District's Charter School Support Office to inform applicants of new statutory requirements and District policies and procedures.

Evaluation

A review of this charter school application was conducted pursuant to § 1002.33 (6), F. S., and Board Policy 9800, using the required Standard Model Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument (IEPC-M2). The Standard Model Application includes 19 evaluation and certification standards and assurances declarations. As allowed by § 1002.33(6)(a)(6), F.S. and pursuant to Board Policy 9800, the District also includes evaluation of the applicant's experience and historical performance operating charter schools.

The initial review conducted by members of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) members resulted in significant concerns and findings that were provided to the applicant and forwarded to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The ARC is responsible for a second review of the application as well as conducting an interview to assess the overall capacity of the applicant's ability to establish and implement the charter school plan, clarify any components of the written application for which reviewers have questions or require additional information, and corroborate information provided in the written application. The ARC met on September 6, 2012 and then again on November 27, 2012.

The ARC found that the application failed to meet the minimum statutory requirements and identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicant's understanding of various conceptual issues and its ability to meet the statutory requirements related to 12 of the 18 applicable categories in the Model Evaluation Instrument. As summarized below, these deficiencies and serious concerns regarding historical performance constitute good cause for denial of the application.

1. Failure to demonstrate how the school will use the guiding principles and meet the statutorily defined purpose of a charter school. The application does not:
 - provide an alignment between the mission and the school's philosophy and instructional approach (i.e., infusion of art throughout the curriculum, description of the "rigorous curriculum" or a curriculum environment that "sparks curiosity"); (Standards 1, 4)
 - provide a financial plan that is based on projected revenues and expenses; (Standard 17)
 - contain goals and objectives that indicate how much improvement students will show each year; (Standard 5) or

- provide a detailed curriculum plan that clearly illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards. (Standards 4, 6, 7)
2. Failure to provide a detailed curriculum plan that illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards. The application does not:
 - provide adequate information regarding how the school intends to ensure students attain mastery of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards or Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM); (Standards 4, 6, 7)
 - provide a curriculum that meets the needs of all students and at all academic proficiency levels; (Standards 4, 6, 7)
 - include an adequate student progression plan, or to demonstrate knowledge or understanding of the requirements; (Standards 4, 5)
 - provide a clear and coherent framework for teaching and learning particularly for Language Arts/Reading or evidence of research-based curriculum and instructional materials; (Standards 4, 7)
 - provide an understanding of the scope and depth of knowledge addressed by current and future Science standards; (Standard 4) or
 - address End of Course assessments or subjects with this requirement consistently throughout the application. (Standard 4, 5)
 3. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. The application does not: (Standard 5)
 - provide educational goals and objectives that set high standards for student achievement. The goals provided do not indicate student performance targets; or
 - contain a graduation rate goal as require for a high school.
 4. Failure to provide a comprehensive plan for educating special education students (SPED). The application does not: (Standard 6)
 - provide a plan for educating SPED students that reflects the full range of programs and services required to provide all students with a free and appropriate public education. In particular, the application does not provide a clear description of the services that the school intends to offer SPED students or that the school will provide adequate staffing to support its SPED population. Additionally, it fails to address how the needs of those students working towards a special diploma will be met;
 - provide consistent information relative to the statutorily required Response to Intervention (RtI) process;
 - describe the supplementary aids and services it will provide for SPED students;
 - clearly state how the school will meet the needs of students working toward a special diploma;
 - describe how the school will serve gifted and talented students. Specifically, the application does not provide a detailed plan that describes how the school will meet federal and state guidelines regarding gifted coursework, and does not identify a proper staffing plan for gifted and talented students; or
 - adequately describe how the school's effectiveness in serving SPED students will be evaluated.
 5. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the education of English Language Learners (ELL). The application does not: (Standard 7)
 - provide a clear and coherent framework for identification and placement of ELL students; Specifically, the application does not identify the required range of programs and services required for ELL students;
 - provide a concrete plan for meeting the broad spectrum of educational needs of ELL students; or

- demonstrate the capacity to meet the curriculum needs of ELL students. The application does not indicate that the school is prepared to use a research based language arts curriculum or instructional materials aligned with NGSSS or CCSS.
6. Failure to provide a budget that is consistent with all parts of the application and that includes realistic budgetary projections that ensure the financial viability of the school. The application does not: (Standard 17)
 - provide 100% and 50% enrollment budgets that correctly add up resulting in a negative balance;
 - provide a required monthly cash flow projection for the first year of operation; or
 - include a detailed narrative description of revenue and expenditure assumptions that explains how the budgetary figures were determined, (i.e. fringe benefits and payroll taxes). Without a detailed narrative, reviewers were unable to determine the viability of the projected revenues and expenses to ensure adequate financial support for the operation of the school.
 7. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan which provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. (Standards 9,10,12)
 - The governing board lacks diversity and has no educator members, resulting in a detrimental lack of objective, non-compensated educational/academic oversight. (Standard 9)
 - The application fails to clearly identify the titles, roles and responsibilities for each member of the established governing board. (Standard 9)
 - There are no minimum qualifications stated for the school principal and no basis provided to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed lead administrator. (Standard 10)
 - The 90 day probationary period identified by the applicant violates teacher contracting status per F.S. 1012.33. (Standards 10, 12)
 8. Failure to establish policies that will ensure that there is an admissions and enrollment process that is open, fair and in accordance with applicable law. (Standard 13)
 - The parent/student contract impermissibly provides that students may be involuntarily dismissed or not re-enrolled in the school if they fail to meet minimum academic criteria.(Standard 13)
 - Although the law requires that the school provide transportation, the parent contract states that the school will not provide transportation and parents must make their own arrangements. (Standard 13)
 9. Failure to provide a transportation plan that will serve all eligible students as required by law. (Standard 15)
 - The application does not provide a detailed transportation plan ensuring that the school will use properly certified and approved vendors.
 - The application fails to provide a plan to transport all students as required by law.
 10. Failure to provide a facility plan that will adequately serve the proposed programs and targeted population. (Standard 14)
 - The rent in the budget is inconsistent over the five years of the charter.
 - The proposed facility plan is unrealistic for the proposed performing arts school. The facility is significantly undersized since it allows for only 50 square feet per student and some of the classrooms appear to be less than 20 square feet per student. For a maximum enrollment of 1,200 students, the proposed building of 60,000 square feet is inadequate.

The applicant was noticed of the Superintendent's intent to recommend denial to the School Board and provided a copy of the final evaluation. Pursuant to § 1002.33(6)(c), F.S., should the School Board approve this recommendation, the applicant may appeal to the State Board of Education no later than 30 days after receipt of the School Board's decision.

Copies of the application and evaluation, which are incorporated by reference in this Board item, will be transmitted to the School Board Members under separate cover and will be available for inspection by the public in the Office of Board Recording Secretary, Room 924, and in the Citizen Information Center, Room 158, 1450 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.