

Freddie Woodson, Deputy Superintendent
District/School Operations

SUBJECT: REQUEST SCHOOL BOARD APPROVAL OF 14 CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATIONS AND DENIAL OF 2 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, 2011 the School Board received 93 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 assurances 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. Applications that exhibit significant deficiencies are not reviewed by ARC but forwarded directly to the Superintendent with a recommendation for denial.

C-30

Pursuant to Section 1002.33(6) (3a.), 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 DOE. 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.

APPLICATIONS

Pursuant to School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, 16 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.	Traditional	AcadeMir Charter School Middle (6-8) A	Academir Charter School, Inc	Approval	Attachment A
2.	Traditional	Alpha Charter of Excellence	Alpha Charter of Excellence, Inc.		
3.	High Performing Replication	Ben Gamla Charter School of Miami (K-8)	The National Ben Gamla Charter School Foundation, Inc.		
4.	Traditional	Bridgepoint Academy East	Bridgepoint Academy, Inc.		
5.	Traditional	Bridgepoint Academy South			
6.	Traditional	Mater Academy South Campus	Mater Academy, Inc.		
7.	Traditional	Mater Academy North Campus			
8.	Traditional	Mater Academy Middle North Campus			
9.	Traditional	Mater Academy High School North Campus			
10.	Traditional	RAMZ Academy North Elementary School	RAMZ Academy, Inc.		
11.	Traditional	Somerset Academy Bay	Somerset Academy, Inc.		
12.	Traditional	Somerset Academy Bay Middle School			
13.	Traditional	Somerset Academy Bay High School			
14.	Traditional	Somerset Academy Opa-Locka			

	<i>Type of Application</i>	<i>Proposed Name of School</i>	<i>Legal Entity</i>	<i>Committee Recommendation</i>	<i>Supporting Documentation</i>
15.	Traditional	Aeiresstoddle Elementary Charter School of Miami	Aeiresstoddle Community Charter School, Inc.	Denial	Attachment B
16.	Traditional	West Kendall Academy Charter School	Learning Academy School, 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.

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. Academir Charter Schools, Inc., on behalf of AcadeMir Charter School Middle (6-8) A;
 - b. Alpha Charter of Excellence, Inc., on behalf of Alpha Charter of Excellence;
 - c. The National Ben Gamla Charter School Foundation, Inc., on behalf of Ben Gamla Charter School of Miami (K-8);
 - d. Bridgepoint Academy, Inc., on behalf of Bridgepoint Academy East;
 - e. Bridgepoint Academy, Inc., on behalf of Bridgepoint Academy South;
 - f. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of Mater Academy South Campus;
 - g. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of Mater Academy North Campus;
 - h. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of Mater Academy Middle North Campus;

- i. Mater Academy, Inc., on behalf of Mater Academy High School North Campus;
 - j. RAMZ Academy, Inc., on behalf of RAMZ Academy North Elementary School;
 - k. Somerset Academy, Inc., on behalf of Somerset Academy Bay;
 - l. Somerset Academy, Inc., on behalf of Somerset Academy Bay Middle School;
 - m. Somerset Academy, Inc., on behalf of Somerset Academy Bay High School; and
 - n. Somerset Academy, Inc., on behalf of Somerset Academy Opa-Locka.
2. Deny the charter school application for:
- a. Aeiresstoddle Elementary Charter School, Inc., on behalf of Aeiresstoddle Elementary Charter School of Miami; and
 - b. Learning Academy School, Inc., on behalf of West Kendall Academy Charter School.

Attachments
FW:elg

School Board Agenda Item C-30 ATTACHMENT A

- APPLICANTS:**
- AcadeMir Charter School Middle (6-8) A
 - Alpha Charter of Excellence
 - Ben Gamla Charter School of Miami (K-8)
 - Bridgepoint Academy East
 - Bridgepoint Academy South
 - Mater Academy South Campus
 - Mater Academy North Campus
 - Mater Academy Middle North Campus
 - Mater Academy High School North Campus
 - RAMZ Academy North Elementary School
 - Somerset Academy Bay
 - Somerset Academy Bay Middle School
 - Somerset Academy Bay High School
 - Somerset Academy Opa-Locka

The M-DCPS' Charter School Application Review Committee (ARC) met to review the 14 charter school applications below and recommended approval to the Superintendent.

(1)/(2) Name of School	(3) Legal Entity Educational Service Provider (ESP)	(4) Initial Year	(5) Grade Levels Initial/Current Year Maximum	(6) Enrollment Maximum	(7) Focus/ Theme	(8) Founding/ Gov. Board Members	(9) Special Provisions or Requested Action(s)	(10) Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions
(1) AcadeMir Charter School Middle (6-8) A <i>ARC meeting date: November 2, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Academir Charter Schools, Inc.	2012/ 2013	6-8	550	Math & Science	Governing Board Members: Lissette C. Gell, Owner, Prime Management Services, Inc.; Tirso L. Alonso, Director Medical Affairs, Bausch & Lomb; and, Alexander D. Casas, Major, Miami-Dade Police. This is the same governing board for the following charter school in existence: Academir Charter School West.	1	\$2,508,019 (20 Positions)
	N/A		6-8	550				

¹ Pursuant to State Statute "A private school, parochial school, or home education program shall not be eligible for charter school status." As such, charter school applications for schools that are operating as private schools in the year the application is submitted will be deemed as a private school to charter school conversion and as such will not be considered. If an application that has been approved is subsequently deemed a conversion, as stipulated in law, it will be automatically rescinded.

(1)/(2) Name of School	(3) Legal Entity Educational Service Provider (ESP)	(4) Initial Year	(5) Grade Levels Initial/Current Year Maximum	(5) Enrollment	(6) Focus/ Theme	(7) Founding/ Gov. Board Members	(8) Special Provisions or Requested Action(s)	(8) Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions
2) Alpha Charter of Excellence <i>ARC meeting date: October 11, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Alpha Charter of Excellence, Inc.	2012/2013	K-4	296	None	Founding Board Members: Sonia S. Lopez, Ex. Vice Pres., Cuban American National Council (CANC), Inc.; Cecilia Suarez, Retiree; Mr. Andres Pazos, Jr., Ex. Vice Pres., CANC, Inc.; Judith S. Stein, Ex. Director, Fischler Grad. Sch. Of Educ. And Human Srvc., Nova Southeastern Univ.; and, Maria C. Santana, Bd. Liaison and Event Coordinator, CANC, Inc.	None	\$1,320,702 (12 Positions)
	N/A		K-5	608				
(3) Ben Gamla Charter School of Miami (K-8) <i>ARC meeting date: October 11, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	The National Ben Gamla Charter School Foundation, Inc.	2012/2013	K-8	650	Bilingual/ Hebrew	Governing Board Members: Debra Klein, Consultant; Marcus Jadotte, Vice Pres. Pub. Affairs & Multicultural Development, NASCAR; Sander Gerber, CEO & CIO, Hudson Bay Capital Management LP; Victoriano Rodriguez, Principal, Int'l Studies CS Middle/High; Howard E. Friedman, Managing Partner, Lanx Capital; and Henry M. Ellenbogen, Portfolio Manager, T. Rowe Price. This is the same governing board for the following charter school in existence: Ben Gamla CS.	None	\$2,977,686 (25 Positions)
	Academica Dade, LLC		K-8	900				

(1)/(2) Name of School	(3) Legal Entity Educational Service Provider (ESP)	(4) Initial Year	(5) Grade Levels Initial/Current Year Enrollment Maximum	(6) Focus/ Theme	(7) Founding/ Gov. Board Members	(8) Special Provisions or Requested Action(s)	(8) Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions
(4) Bridgepoint Acad. East <i>ARC meeting date: November 2, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Bridgepoint Academy, Inc.	2012/ 2013	K-8	348	Spanish & Tech.	None	\$1,556,162 (14 Positions)
	S.M.A.R.T. Management, LLC		K-8	550			
(5) Bridgepoint Acad. South <i>ARC meeting date: November 2, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Bridgepoint Academy, Inc.	2012/ 2013	K-8	348	Spanish & Tech.	None	\$1,556,162 (14 Positions)
	S.M.A.R.T. Management, LLC		K-8	550			

(1)/(2) Name of School	(3) Legal Entity Educational Service Provider (ESP)	(4) Initial Year	(5) Grade Levels Initial/Current Year Enrollment Maximum	(6) Focus/ Theme	(7) Founding/ Gov. Board Members	(8) Special Provisions or Requested Action(s)	(8) Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions		
(9) Mater Acad. South Campus <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Mater Academy, Inc.	2012/2013	K-8	650	None	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, Customer Serv. Manager, Hotwire Comm.; and Cesar C. Crousillat, Asset Manager, Rialto Capital Management.	None	\$2,977,686 (25 Positions)	
			K-8	900					
(10) Mater Acad. North Campus <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>			K-7	650			None	\$2,977,686 (25 Positions)	
			K-8	900					
(11) Mater Acad. Middle North Campus <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Academica Dade, LLC	2012/2013	6-8	374	None	None	\$1,681,406 (15 Positions)		
			6-8	525					
(12) Mater Acad. High School North Campus <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>			9-10	500				None	\$2,270,055 (15 Positions)
			9-12	800					

(1)/(2) Name of School	(3) Legal Entity Educational Service Provider (ESP)	(4) Initial Year	(5) Grade Levels Initial/Current Year Maximum	(5) Enrollment	(6) Focus/ Theme	(7) Founding/ Gov. Board Members	(8) Special Provisions or Requested Action(s)	(8) Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions																
(14) RAMZ Acad. North Elementary School <i>ARC meeting date: October 4, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	RAMZ Academy, Inc.	2012/2013	K-4	200	Spanish/ French	Governing Board Members: Olga E. Miyar; Alicia Estrada, Personal Liaison Manager, Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, LLP; Consuelo Irimia, Supervisor, U.S. Probation Officer; Alex Rizo, Partner, FELC Tutors; Noria Alloza-Sanchez, V.P. Investments, Banco Santander; and Ariel A. Fernandez, Deputy District Director, U.S. House of Representatives. This is the same governing board for the following charter schools in existence: RAMZ Acad. K-5 Miami Camp and RAMZ Acad. 6-8 Middle, Miami Camp.	None	\$892,366 (8 Positions)																
	N/A		K-5	400					(15) Somerset Acad. Bay <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Somerset Academy, Inc.	2012/2013	K-5	550	None	Governing Board Members: Andreina Figueroa, President, ADF Consulting LLC; Lourdes C. Isla-Marrero, Principal, Mater Acad., Inc.; Daniel Diaz, Senior Vice-President, Total Bank; Angie Hui Fang, Prog. Prof., Fischler Grad. Sch. of Educ. and Human Serv., Nova Southeastern Univ.; and, David Concepcion, City Clerk/Chief of Staff, City of Hialeah.	None	\$2,508,019 (22 Positions)	K-5	750	(16) Somerset Acad. Bay Middle School <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Academica Dade, LLC	2012/2013	6-8	374
(15) Somerset Acad. Bay <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Somerset Academy, Inc.	2012/2013	K-5	550	None	Governing Board Members: Andreina Figueroa, President, ADF Consulting LLC; Lourdes C. Isla-Marrero, Principal, Mater Acad., Inc.; Daniel Diaz, Senior Vice-President, Total Bank; Angie Hui Fang, Prog. Prof., Fischler Grad. Sch. of Educ. and Human Serv., Nova Southeastern Univ.; and, David Concepcion, City Clerk/Chief of Staff, City of Hialeah.	None	\$2,508,019 (22 Positions)																
			K-5	750					(16) Somerset Acad. Bay Middle School <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Academica Dade, LLC	2012/2013	6-8	374	None	Governing Board Members: Andreina Figueroa, President, ADF Consulting LLC; Lourdes C. Isla-Marrero, Principal, Mater Acad., Inc.; Daniel Diaz, Senior Vice-President, Total Bank; Angie Hui Fang, Prog. Prof., Fischler Grad. Sch. of Educ. and Human Serv., Nova Southeastern Univ.; and, David Concepcion, City Clerk/Chief of Staff, City of Hialeah.	None	\$1,681,406 (14 Positions)	6-8	525					
(16) Somerset Acad. Bay Middle School <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Academica Dade, LLC	2012/2013	6-8	374	None	Governing Board Members: Andreina Figueroa, President, ADF Consulting LLC; Lourdes C. Isla-Marrero, Principal, Mater Acad., Inc.; Daniel Diaz, Senior Vice-President, Total Bank; Angie Hui Fang, Prog. Prof., Fischler Grad. Sch. of Educ. and Human Serv., Nova Southeastern Univ.; and, David Concepcion, City Clerk/Chief of Staff, City of Hialeah.	None	\$1,681,406 (14 Positions)																
			6-8	525																				

(1)/(2) Name of School	(3) Legal Entity Educational Service Provider (ESP)	(4) Initial Year	(5) Grade Levels Initial/Current Year Enrollment Maximum	(6) Focus/ Theme	(7) Founding/ Gov. Board Members	(8) Special Provisions or Requested Action(s)	(8) Initial Year Loss Revenue (\$) & Teacher Positions
(17) Somerset Acad. Bay High School <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Somerset Academy, Inc.		9-10	500	College Prep.	None	\$2,270,055 (15 Positions)
			9-12	800			
(18) Somerset Academy Opa-Locka <i>ARC meeting date: November 18, 2011. By a majority vote, the ARC recommended approval.</i>	Academica Dade, LLC	2012/ 2013	K-5	550	None	None	\$2,508,019 (22 Positions)
			K-5	750			
TOTAL REVENUE (\$):							\$29,685,428
							246

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 (\$29,685,428) and instructional staffing (246 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

APPLICANT: Aeiresstoddle Elementary Charter School of Miami

Aeiresstoddle Community Charter School, Inc., proposes to establish Aeiresstoddle Elementary Charter School of Miami to serve a maximum of 348 students in grades kindergarten through five, with a maximum of 348 students in kindergarten through grade five in its first year of operation. The school proposes to open the 2012-2013 school year.

The members of the Founding Board are: Belinda Hope, Principal, Pine Ridge Education Center; Natasha S. Bell, Math Coach, School Board of Broward County; and Kirstie L. Daise, English I Instructor, Florida Virtual School; Kiwana S. Alexander-Prof, Assistant Principal, Carver Middle School; and Santreia Tanksley, Office Manager, Eagles' Nest Charter School.

The applicant did not attend the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 5, 2011. The meeting is not mandatory but is supplementary and is an opportunity for applicants to become aware of the District's policies and procedures governing the charter school application review process.

Evaluation

This charter application was reviewed using the required model Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument.

The first review was conducted by members of the Technical Review Committee (TRC), which resulted in a number of significant concerns and findings that were provided to the applicant and forwarded to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The ARC meeting was held on October 4, 2011. Although an invitation was sent for the members of the Aeiresstoddle Community Charter School, Inc. to attend and receipt of the invitation was confirmed, the applicant did not attend to speak for the application and to clarify any questions or concerns.

The application failed to meet the minimum statutory requirements and the TRC identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicants' understanding of various conceptual issues and/or the ability to meet the statutory requirements related to Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 in the Model Evaluation Instrument. In total, the applicant failed to meet the requirement standard in 17 of the 18 categories of the Model Evaluation Instrument. Section 11 was not applicable since the applicant does not intend to contract with an ESP.

The evaluation form is incorporated by reference in this item and is included in the basis for this recommendation for denial. The application failed to satisfactorily meet, including but not limited to, the following statutory and District requirements:

1. Failure to demonstrate how the school will use the guiding principles and meet the statutorily defined purpose of a charter school. [Sections 1002.33(2)(a), 1002.33(2)(b), 1002.33(2)(c), 1002.33(6)(a)(1), 1002.33(6)(b)(2), 1002.33(7)(a)(1), 1002.33(10)(e), 1003.03, F.S.]
 - The application did not provide a clear alignment between the mission and the school's educational plan. The application proposes a "single sex", science and technologically enriched environment but does not provide a clear implementation plan. (Standards 1, 2, 3, 4)
2. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of the students the charter school intends to serve or provide a manageable plan tied to enrollment projections that will allow the school to meet its class size obligations. [Sections 1002.33(10)(e), 1002.33(6)(b)(2), 1002.33(7)(a)(1), 1003.03, F.S.]
 - The application proposes a "same sex" environment but there is no indication of how the school will accomplish this since it is proposing to provide two sections per grade in year 1 for grades K-3 and only one session for grades 4 and 5. (Standard 2)
3. Failure to provide a detailed curriculum plan that illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)2, 1002.33(6)(a)(4), 1002.337)(a)(2), 1002.33(7)(a)(4), F.S.]
 - The application does not provide adequate information regarding how the school intends to ensure students attain mastery of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. The application does not provide any specifics other than that they anticipate that the "same-sex" environment will lead to students attaining NGSSS. No research was provided to support this assumption. (Standard 3)
 - The application does not provide a curriculum that meets the needs of all students and at all academic proficiency levels. (Standards 4, 6, 7)
 - The application does not include an adequate student progression plan and failed to demonstrate knowledge or understanding of the District's plan or any details pertaining to its implementation. (Standards 4,5)
 - The application does not provide a clear and coherent framework for teaching and learning. Specifically, the application proposes to implement the Core Knowledge Curriculum only in Social Science. This curriculum encompasses more than just Social Science, yet the application does not clearly provide evidence on how the school will effectively meet the standards and principles of this curriculum. (Standard 4)
4. Failure to demonstrate that reading will be a primary focus of the school's curriculum. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)2, 1002.33(6)(a)(4), s. 1002.337)(a)(2), s. 1002.33(7)(a)(4), s. 1002.33(16)(a)(3), Fla. Stat.] (Standard 4)
 - The application does not propose a reading curriculum that is consistent with effective teaching strategies that are grounded in scientifically based reading research. [Section 1002.33(6)(a)4., F. S., requires the District deny an application on this basis.]
 - The application does not provide adequate information on the Reading Plan, or if the school intends to follow the District's Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan. Furthermore, the application contains inconsistent evidence of the 90 minute reading block lacks specifics on how the 90 minute block would be implemented and does not explain how the school would implement intensive interventions to struggling readers.
 - The application provides inconsistent information on the statutorily required Response to Intervention (RtI) process, how the school would provide the required dedicated

uninterrupted block of time for struggling readers, or what interventions would be used to ensure the achievement of the required one year of growth.

- The application lacks information on what a reading block would entail (e.g., number of minutes, specific breakdown of the instructional time, and the specific interventions to be used.)

5. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)3., 1002.33(7)(a)(4), 1002.33(7)(a)(5), F.S.] (Standard 5)

- The application does not provide goals that are aligned, at a minimum, to AYP targets. The percentages provided for some of the accountability groups do not set high standards.
- The application does not provide an assessment plan that is included all state required assessments.
- The application does not provide a comprehensive school wide assessment plan that is standards based and does not demonstrate how the school will utilize the ongoing data collected to make decisions that impact the school's instructional program. There was no description of the required comprehensive continuous improvement model
- The application does not include an adequate student progression plan and failed to demonstrate knowledge or understanding of the District's plan. (Standards 4,5)
- The application fails to demonstrate how data will be collected and how it will be used to drive instruction.

6. Failure to provide a comprehensive plan on educating exceptional students (ESE). [Section 1002.33(16)(a)(3), F.S.] (Standard 6)

- The application fails to provide plans for educating exceptional students that reflect the full range of programs and services required to provide all students with a high quality education. In particular, it fails to reflect that a full range of services will be available to students with disabilities or even that the School will provide sufficient staffing for exceptional students.
- The application does not provide a clear description as to what services the school intends to offer exceptional students.
- The application does not clearly indicate how the school will ensure that exceptional students are provided with the least restrictive environment as required. Also, it does not clearly identify procedures for determining appropriate placement for each student with disabilities.

7. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the education of English Language Learners (ELL). [Section 1002.33(16)(a)(3), F.S.] (Standard 7)

- The application does not provide a clear and coherent framework for identification and placement of ELL students. More specifically it does not align with the requirements set forth by the Multicultural Education Training and Advocacy (META) Consent Decree. (Standard 7)
- The application did not provide or describe the policies and procedures for exiting, grading, monitoring, curriculum standards, assessments of ELL students. Furthermore,

the application uses ambiguous language when addressing programmatic participation of these students.

8. Failure to provide a budget that is consistent with all parts of the application or provide a detailed plan to ensure adequate financial oversight, and controls that will safeguard finances. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)(5), 1002.33(6)(b)(2), F.S.] (Standard 17 and 18)
 - Because there is no narrative for the start-up budget, the review committees were unable to determine the reasonableness of the projected revenues and expenses to ensure there is adequate financial support for the school. Furthermore, the application lacks support for the start up grant and the organization's ability to secure a loan. The proceeds of the loan constitute 91% of the start-up budget.
 - The statement of cash flow does not include revenue required prior to the school's opening, the start-up period. The cost of textbooks, furniture and equipment, instructional software was spread out throughout the fiscal year, but these are items that will need to be purchased prior to the school opening.
 - Revenues from fundraising and loans are inconsistent within the budget documents presented. Furthermore, the application does not provide a comprehensive plan for fundraising that includes timelines and financial objectives.
 - There is no plan to ensure that the school will have strong internal controls and policies to safeguard the school's finances. Utilization of fiscal services vendors is mentioned but these entities are not indentified.
 - The policy for submitting financial statements to the Sponsor does not clearly indicate that the applicant understands state requirements and deadlines.
9. Failure to provide evidence that a safe learning environment will be provided that will be conducive to learning. [Sections. 1002.33(7)(a)(7), 1002.33(7)(a)(11), 1002.33(9)(n), F. S.] (Standard 8)
 - The application does not provide the school's plan for classroom management and student discipline.
 - The application does not provide policies for discipline, suspension, dismissal and how it will make a recommendation for expulsion. The application states that the school will adopt the District's Code of Student Conduct but does not demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the District's Code or how it would be implemented.
10. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan which provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed and plans for meaningful involvement of parents and community. [Sections 1002.33(7)(a)(15), 1002.33(16)(5)(b), F. S.] (Standards 9, 10 and 12)
 - The application fails to clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of the governing board. The role of governing board members is not identified nor how those individuals will contribute to the overall success of the school.
 - The application does not include all of the required Governing Board Disclosure forms, as required by the Sponsor and contained in the application's instructions. There is conflicting information regarding the role of the "Contact" for the nonprofit, Ardonnis Lumpkin. Mr. Lumpkin appears as a "Director" and "registered agent" of the non-profit in the filing with the Florida Division of Corporations, yet he is not mentioned as a Director

in the application and did not provide a disclosure form and background information with the application.

- The application does not provide a clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities for the daily administration of the school.
- The application fails to provide a termination policy that complies with Chapter 1012, F.S. (formerly SB736).
- The application does not provide a plan that will assure that the school will attract and retain highly qualified teachers.
- The application does not provide an Equal Employment Opportunity policy.
- The application does not provide a comprehensive description of the school's enrollment policy and procedures.
- The application includes a sample Parent Contract that contains an illegal procedure for involuntary dismissal of students.
- The effectiveness of the conflict resolution process cannot be determined. The procedures that the governing board will follow to settle disputes between parents and the school is lengthy and convoluted. Additionally, the application states that the school will use an Advisory Grievance Committee but does not describe the committee membership or authority.
- The application did not provide any information regarding how parents would be involved in the governance of the school or how the school would comply with the statutory requirement to appoint a parent representative.

11. Failure to provide a (a) coherent plan for facilities, (b) food services, and (c) completed action plan. [Sections 1002.33(7)(a)(16), 1002.33(20)(a)(1), 1002.33(7)(a)(13), 1002.33(18), 1002.33(20)(a)(1), F. S.] (Standards 14 – 16 and 19)

- The application does not provide a realistic plan for securing a facility, including county requirements, process and timeline to occupy. The start-up budget does not account for costs associated with the construction or the opening of a planned facility. The application also does not identify the capacity of the facility to accommodate the long range requirements of the school.
- The cost estimates fail to demonstrate that the planned facility would be feasible or account for class size restrictions.
- The applicant makes assumptions about the area in which the school will be located but states it does not yet have a facility identified. So there is no basis to determine whether assumptions made regarding facility costs are reasonable.
- The application does not provide a plan to ensure food service delivery to students, a viable plan to secure a food service provider, or information regarding how the school will ensure students who are eligible for free or reduced lunch will be provided these services or how they would be properly accounted for and monitored.
- There is no clear roadmap of the needed steps and strategies that will ensure that the school will be ready to serve students on the first day of school. (Standard 19)

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., if the School Board approves 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 into 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

APPLICANT: West Kendall Academy Charter School

Learning Academy School, Inc., proposes to establish West Kendall Academy Charter School to serve a maximum of 786 students in grades Kindergarten through five, with a maximum of 286 students in Kindergarten through grade five in its first year of operation. The school proposes to open the 2012-2013 school year.

Applicant

The members of the Founding Board are: Augusto Gil, President, Gil and Associates; Alexis Gonzalez, President, Law Office of Alexis Gonzalez, P.A.; Carlos Delgado, Senior Vice President, U.S. Century Bank; Annie Marie Moreno, Owner, Circle Time Learning Center; and Antonio Delgado, President, Delgado Property Corporation.

The applicant did not attend the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 5, 2011. The meeting is not mandatory but is supplementary and it is conducted to make applicants aware of the District's policies and procedures governing the charter school application review process.

Evaluation

Review of this charter application was conducted pursuant to sections 1002.33 (6) and 1002.45(7), F. S., and School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, using the required model Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument. The Standard Model Application includes 19 standards of evaluation and certification and assurances declarations. As allowed by Section 1002.33(6)(a)6., F.S., District specific standards and requirements are also included in the evaluation.

The first review was conducted by members of the Technical Review Committee (TRC), which found a number of significant concerns that were provided to the applicant and forwarded to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The ARC meeting was held on November 28, 2011.

The application failed to meet the minimum statutory requirements and the committee identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicant's understanding of various conceptual issues and/or the ability to meet the statutory requirements related to Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 19 in the Model Evaluation Instrument. In total, the applicant failed to meet the requirement standard in 18 of the 19 categories of the Model Evaluation Instrument. The ARC made a unanimous recommendation to the Superintendent for denial. Section 11 is not applicable since the applicant does not intend to contract with an ESP.

The evaluation form is incorporated by reference in this item and is included in the basis for this recommendation for denial. The application failed to satisfactorily meet, including but not limited to, the following statutory and District requirements:

1. Failure to submit an application that follows the standards delineated in the required state's model application. Pursuant to state statute, a person or entity wishing to open a charter school must prepare and submit an application on the form prepared by the Department of Education.
 - The applicant did not use the most current and required state approved model application form for the 2011 Application Cycle. As a result, crucial information was omitted or difficult to locate. [Section 1002.33(6)(a), F.S.]
 - Throughout a significant portion of the application, the responses are incomplete or lack sufficient detail to fully evaluate the applicant's intent, particularly Section 3, in which the responses reference an item in the appendix which provides only a general overview of the Paideia concept, but did not satisfactorily respond to the required standard.
 - The application fails to describe how Paideia would be implemented and how it would impact teaching and learning.
2. Failure to demonstrate how the school will use the guiding principles and meet the statutorily defined purpose of a charter school. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)1., 1002.33(2)(b), 1002.33(2)(c), 1002.33(6)(a)(1), 1002.33(7)(a)(1), F. S.]
 - The mission statement was not compelling and did not clearly define the purpose and values of the school. The application cover sheet indicates that West Kendall Academy will be "a Paideia School", but it was not part of the school's mission, vision, or guiding principles. The mission fails to define the purpose of the school. (Standard 1)
 - The application does not provide specifics regarding how the school intends to focus on improving student outcomes and academic achievement. Missing from the application are key elements and details regarding what innovative measurements tools would be implemented, how the school would measure learning outcomes, and how it would encourage the use of innovative learning methods. (Standard 1)
 - The application does not propose a target population that includes all students. It failed to mention that it will serve exceptional students and English language learners.
3. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of the students the charter school intends to serve or provide a manageable plan tied to enrollment projections that will allow the school to meet its class size obligations.
 - The Application does not provide a projection for student enrollment by grade level and how many sections are proposed for each grade level. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)(1), 1002.33(6)(a)(2), 1002.33(10)(e), 1002.33(6)(b)(2), 1002.33(7)(a)(1), 1003.03, F. S.) (Standard 2)]
 - Contradictory information is provided as to the anticipated target population to be served and the school's willingness to serve all students. The application states that the school will be "open to all students that reside" in the county and that the school will "accommodate all students independent of their native language" but, it also states that only "Spanish and English language programs" will be offered to "accommodate Spanish speaking and non-Spanish speaking students." The top three languages spoken by students in Miami-Dade County are English, Spanish and Haitian Creole.
4. Failure to clearly demonstrate a clear and coherent educational program design to ensure the appropriate teaching and learning strategies will be employed. [Section 1002.33(7)(a)(2), F.S.] (Standard 3)

- The application does not provide a daily schedule that complies with required instructional minutes for subject areas being offered.
 - The applicant does not demonstrate an understanding of the statutory requirements for minimum instructional minutes and instructional days. The application states that the school will follow the District's schedule "in terms of length of school day, and number of days in the school year" but it does not demonstrate knowledge of the District's policy.
 - The application does not provide comprehensive information regarding the educational plan the school will implement. Evidence of how the Paideia methodology would be implemented was not provided. All of the information on Paideia was provided only in an Appendix.
 - The application does not provide a clear alignment between the mission and the educational plan. Information on Paideia was provided in the Appendix of the application but, the applicant fails to demonstrate how this program would be implemented and/or incorporated in the school.
 - The application does not provide professional development to teachers specifically related to the Paideia program.
 - The application does not provide information on materials that may be needed in the implementation of the Paideia program and how it would directly impact the instructional program at the school.
5. Failure to provide a detailed curriculum plan that illustrates how student will be provided services to attain state standards. This includes a plan that includes provisions for exceptional students and English language learners. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)2, 1002.33(6)(a)(4), 1002.33(7)(a)(2), 1002.33(7)(a)(4), F.S.] (Standard 4)
- The application does not provide adequate information regarding how the school intends to ensure students attain mastery of the Next Generation Sunshine States Standards and the Common Core Standards. It does not provide a clear and coherent framework for teaching and learning. Also, the application does not provide a description of the research base and foundation materials that were used to develop the curriculum.
 - The application does not demonstrate that the curriculum framework as described is aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine States Standards and the Common Core Standards. A comprehensive curriculum is not provided. Missing are key elements and curriculum for subjects the school intends to implement. For instance, there is no curriculum for Art, Music, Physical Education, and Foreign Languages.
 - The application does not demonstrate that the curriculum will meet the needs of all students and at all levels. There is no evidence that student data would drive instructional decisions. Specific strategies for teaching students at all levels are not provided.
6. Failure to demonstrate that reading will be a primary focus of the school's curriculum. [Sections 1002.33(6)(a)2, 1002.33(6)(a)(4), s. 1002.33(7)(a)(2), s. 1002.33(7)(a)(4)*, s. 1002.33(16)(a)(3), F. S.] (Standard 4)
- The application fails to demonstrate that reading would be a primary focus of the school and did not propose a reading curriculum that is consistent with effective teaching strategies that are grounded in scientifically based reading research. Pursuant to Section 1002.33(6)(a)4., F. S., the District shall deny an application on this basis. The application does not provide information on what Reading Plan the school would implement.

- The application does not provide a curriculum for teaching Writing.
 - The application does not describe the Reading block in terms of number of minutes, specific breakdown of the instructional time, and materials.
 - The application does not specify how the intervention programs would be implemented, how students will be identified and monitored and how much time on task will be provided.
7. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. [Section 1002.33(6)(a)3., F.S.] (Standard 5)
- The application does not provide goals and objectives that set high standards or meet the state's accountability requirements.
 - The application does not identify all of the state required assessments and fails to provide a comprehensive school wide assessment plan that ensures students will be prepared to attain state standards. Additionally, no information is provided regarding the frequency of assessments the school would use to measure growth, how and if these assessments will be aligned to state standards, what role these assessments will play in monitoring student progress and how they will impact learning and teaching.
8. Failure to provide a comprehensive plan on educating exceptional students (ESE). [Section 1002.33(16)(a)(3), F.S.] (Standard 6)
- The application fails to demonstrate sound plans for educating exceptional students that reflect the full range of programs and services required to provide all students with a high quality education. In particular, it fails to reflect that a full range of services will be available to students with disabilities.
 - The application fails to demonstrate sufficient staffing for exceptional students.
9. Failure to provide a detailed plan that provides financial projections for the school over the term of the charter. [Section 1002.33(6)(a)5., F. S. (Standard 17)]
- The application does not support the grants and donations projected in the budget.
 - The budget provided does not align with the student enrollment or the staffing plan provided within the application.
 - The budget includes transportation revenue, but there are no associated expenditures.
 - Expenditures associated with the enrollment timeline provided are not accurately reported in the start-up projected cash flows.
 - The budget does not include the costs of all of the programs the school intends to implement. For instance, the school indicates that it will use Successmaker to assist struggling students, but there is no provision for this program in the budget. (Standards 3, 4, 17)
10. Failure to provide evidence that a safe learning environment would be provided and would be conducive to learning. [Section 1002.33, F. S. (Standards 8, 13)]
- The application indicates that the school will simply dismiss students from the school for behavioral problems, which statutorily it cannot do.
 - The application does not indicate how the school would work with families to ensure that the appropriate level of support is provided to students with behavioral problems.

- The application does not provide a clear policy regarding expulsion. There are many inconsistencies regarding this policy.
11. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan which provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed and plans for meaningful involvement of parents and community. [Sections 1002.33(7)(a)(15), 1002.33(16)(5)(b), F. S.] (Standards 9 -12)
- The application does not provide a clear, sensible delineation of roles and responsibilities in relation to governance and school management. No education service provider (ESP) is identified and no details are provided as to how services will be provided to operate the school. Additionally, the Budget indicates the school will use an ESP, but this indication contradicts the response in Section 11, Education Service Providers.
 - The application does not provide a comprehensive staffing plan and does not provide job descriptions and minimum requirements for all key staff members the school intends to hire.
 - The application does not provide information on how the school will meet the requirements of Chapter 1012, F.S, (formerly SB736) regarding evaluation tools, termination policy, contracts and performance pay.
 - The staffing plan provided is not aligned with the personnel expenditures in the budget.
 - The application does not provide a comprehensive description of the school's conflict resolution policy and procedures.
 - The application does not provide any information regarding how parents would be involved in the governance of the school or how the school would comply with the statutory requirement to appoint a parent representative.
12. Failure to provide a (a) coherent plan for facilities, (b) transportation plan, and (c) completed action plan. (Standards 14 – 16 and 19)
- Although the application identifies a location for the facility, it does not provide information to ensure the facility meets the needs of the proposed academic program including facility size, number and type of rooms, floor plan or layout. The application also fails to identify a backup facility.
 - Application does not ensure that the selected facility will meet the requirements related to class size restrictions.
 - The application does not provide a comprehensive plan for providing transportation to all eligible students. The transportation plan lacks crucial information regarding how the school would contract with approved vendors to provide this service.
 - The application does not provide a clear roadmap of the needed steps and strategies to ensure that the school will be ready to serve students on the first day of school.

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., if the School Board approves 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 into 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.