

Valtena G. Brown, Deputy Superintendent/Chief Operating Officer
School Operations

SUBJECT: REQUEST SCHOOL BOARD APPROVAL OF THREE CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATIONS, DENIAL OF FOUR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF ONE AMENDED CHARTER CONTRACT

COMMITTEE: INSTRUCTIONAL EXCELLENCE AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

LINK TO STRATEGIC

FRAMEWORK: STUDENT, PARENT, AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

APPLICATIONS

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. As of today, thirty-six (36) applications have been received for the 2014 cycle, 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*, (School Board Policy) 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 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 the Application Review Committee (ARC) with the responsibility to review and evaluate charter school applications after an initial technical review conducted by staff. The ARC is comprised of representatives from various District departments and is 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.

Pursuant to School Board Policy, seven (7) charter school applications are being presented for final consideration by the School Board. Detailed in the following chart is a summary of the charter school applications. Additional details can be found in Attachments A-D which are provided under separate cover but are included and incorporated by references in this Board item.

Table 1: Charter Applications					
Type of Application	Proposed Name of School	Legal Entity	Committee Recommendation	Supporting Documentation	
Approvals					
1.	High Performing Replication*	Somerset Academy High School at Sunset	Somerset Academy, Inc.	Approval	Attachment A
2.	High Performing Replication*	Somerset Preparatory Academy Sunset			
3.	Traditional	We Rise Academy			
Denials					
1.	Traditional	Excelsior Charter Academy High School	Excelsior Charter Academies, Inc.	Denial	Attachment B
2.	At-risk/Alternative	The Leadership Academy for the Arts & Advanced Academics	SVG Leadership Academies, Inc.		Attachment C
3.		The Leadership Academy for Academic & Personal Achievement			Attachment D
4.		Performing Arts			The Leadership Academy for Academic & Personal Achievement, North

*Pursuant to s.1002.33, "high performing" is a designation made by the Commission of Education for certain charter schools that allows that school to replicate an existing program.

AMENDED CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT

Section 1002.33(7), F. S., states that the major issues involved in the operation of charter schools be considered in advance and written into a charter school contract between the charter school and the School Board following a public meeting. Pursuant to School Board Policy 9800, *Charter Schools*, the amended contract presented on this agenda, was not required to be negotiated by the M-DCPS' Contract Review Committee (CRC) prior to submission to the Superintendent of Schools' final decision.

Table 2: Charter Contract Amendments					
Type of Amendment	Name of School	Legal Entity	Committee Recommendation	Supporting Documentation	
1.	Enrollment Increase	Lincoln-Marti Charter School (International Campus)	Lincoln-Marti Charter School, Inc.	N/A	Attachment A

Any significant increase in charter school student enrollment (Charter FTE) directly impacts the District's operating budget as well as instructional and non-instructional staffing levels. The charter school contract in this Board item represent an increase in overall charter school enrollment. To ensure that the District's financial position remained positive, Board authorization is requested to allow a Reduction-in-Force/Layoff only if it becomes necessary. Any such Reduction-in-Force/Layoff affecting instructional and non-instructional staff would be implemented in accordance with School Board policies and applicable collective bargaining agreements. The number of position reductions will not exceed the stated Initial Loss included in this item and will be re-evaluated and adjusted in subsequent years to reflect changes in FTE. The impact caused by the contract is provided in Attachment A.

Table 3: Total Loss						
	Revenue	Direct Costs	Core	Non-Core	Salaries	Total
Amendment (1)	\$157,690	26	2	0	1	3
TOTAL INITIAL LOSS:	\$157,690	26	2	0	1	3

Copies of the applications, evaluations and amendment have been 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.

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

1. Approve three charter school applications and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate a contract reflecting the contents of the applications as approved by the School Board for:
 - a. Somerset Academy, Inc., on behalf of Somerset Academy High School at Sunset;
 - b. Somerset Academy, Inc., on behalf of Somerset Preparatory Academy Sunset; and
 - c. We Rise, Inc., on behalf of We Rise Academy.
2. Deny four charter school applications for:
 - a. Excelsior Academies, Inc., on behalf of Excelsior Charter Academy High School;
 - b. SVG Leadership Academies, Inc., on behalf of The Leadership Academy for Academic & Personal Achievement;
 - c. SVG Leadership Academies, Inc., on behalf of The Leadership Academy for Academic & Personal Achievement, North; and
 - d. SVG Leadership Academies, Inc., on behalf of The Leadership Academy for the Arts & Advanced Academics.
3. Approve one amended charter school contract with Lincoln-Marti Charter Schools, Inc., on behalf of Lincoln-Marti Charter School (International Campus) to increase enrollment from 315 students to 350 students, effective immediately and ending on June 30, 2015.

VGB:elg
Attachments

¹ Core includes: elementary education, language arts/reading, mathematics, science, and social science.
² Non-Core includes: electives and all other subject areas and programs.

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

APPLICATIONS:

- Somerset Academy High School at Sunset
- Somerset Preparatory Academy Sunset
- We Rise Academy

AMENDMENT:

- Lincoln-Marti Charter School (International Campus)

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

(1)/(2)(3)	(4)(5)	(6)	(7)	(9)	
Name of School	Legal Entity	Term	Grade Levels Current or Initial Year	Enrollment	Focus/ Theme
		Initial/ Exp.	Maximum Capacity		
APPLICATIONS					
Somerset Academy High School at Sunset ESP: Academica Dade LLC <i>ARC recommended approval on September 22, 2014.</i>	Somerset Academy, Inc.	5 years	9-10	500	None
		2015/2020	9-12	1,000	
Somerset Preparatory Academy Sunset ESP: Academica Dade LLC <i>ARC recommended approval on September 22, 2014.</i>	Somerset Academy, Inc.	5 years	K-6	450	None
		2015/2020	K-8	900	
We Rise Academy ESP: Charter Schools USA <i>ARC recommended approval on September 5, 2014.</i>	We Rise, Inc.	5 years	K-8	661	None
		2015/2020	K-8	1,145	

(1)(2)(3)	(4)(5)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(10)		
Name of School	Legal Entity	Term	Grade Levels	Enrollment	Special Provisions and/or Requested Action(s)	DISTRICT IMPACT 2014-15 SY Revenue (\$)/ Positions	
		Initial/ Exp.				Instr.	Non-Instr.
AMENDMENT							
Lincoln-Marti Charter School (International Campus) ESP: Lincoln-Marti Management Services, Inc. <i>Pursuant to School Board Policy 9800, Charter Schools, no CRC was required.</i>	Lincoln-Marti Charter School, Inc.	5 years	K-8	315	Approval of the first amendment to the charter school contract to increase enrollment from 315 students to 350 students, effective immediately and ending on June 30, 2015.	\$157,690	
		2015/ 2020				2	1
TOTAL REVENUE (\$):						\$157,690	
Total Instructional Positions:						2	
Total Non-Instructional Positions:						1	
TOTAL POSITIONS:						3	

Initial Year Loss: The revenue and positions indicated as "Initial Year Loss" provide an estimate of the potential impact on the District's General Fund (\$157,690) instructional staffing (1 positions), and non-instructional staffing (1 positions). The loss of revenue is based on 95% of FEFP funds per student and 75% of the initial year enrollment projection that the District will not realize for the current fiscal year.

Copies of the applications and amendment 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 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

Excelsior Charter Academies, Inc. proposes to establish a high school, Excelsior Charter Academy High School, with a proposed enrolment of 325 students. The application for this charter school proposes to open in the 2015-2016 school year. Currently, Excelsior Charter Academies, Inc., operates two charter schools, Excelsior Language Academy of Hialeah (serving students in grades K-8), that opened in 2008, and Excelsior Charter Academy (serving students in grades K-9), that opened in 2009.

Applicant

The members of the Governing Board are: Ms. Claudia Trilles, Director, Kids Corner, LLC; Dulce M. More, currently not employed; and Ariel Edwards, Breakthrough Miami.

A representative for the applicant attended the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 8, 2014 and did receive the most current information regarding the submittal of a charter application. The meeting is not mandatory but attendance is strongly recommended by the Florida Department of Education and the District's Charter School Support Office (CSS) to inform applicants of new statutory requirements and District policies and procedures. This applicant submitted a draft charter application on May 1 and feedback was provided by July 1 as required by law. The applicant did not contact CSS for any further assistance.

Evaluation

A review of this charter school application was conducted pursuant to § 1002.33 (6), F. S., and School 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 an assurance declaration. As allowed by § 1002.33(6)(a)(6), F.S. and pursuant to Board Policy 9800, the District also includes an evaluation of the applicant's experience and historical performance operating charter schools.

The initial technical review 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. With the exception of technical or nonsubstantive corrections and clarifications, such as grammatical, typographical, and missing signatures, the application cannot be amended prior to submission to the School Board for consideration. The ARC reviewed the application with the applicant on September 5, 2014.

The ARC found that the application failed to meet minimum statutory requirements and identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicant's understanding of various conceptual issues and/or its ability to meet statutory requirements. The historical performance of the two existing schools does not outweigh the significant deficiencies in this application.

Specifically, the application did not meet the required standards in 15 of the 18 applicable categories in the Model Evaluation Instrument. As summarized below, these deficiencies constitute good cause for denial of the application.

1. Failure to provide a mission and vision that defines the purpose of the school. (Standard 1)

- The application is very general and generic, not innovative. It lists instructional methods that are best practices implemented by most schools at all grade levels.
 - The application states that teachers will "enjoy a new sense of ownership of the learning program", yet this is not demonstrated.
 - The application also states that the purpose of the charter school is to expand the district's capacity and to relieve the district's "pressure to build new schools as a result of the ever increasing number of new students arriving annually." This is not an issue facing the District at this time.
2. Failure to provide a detailed educational and curriculum plan that illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards and that is aligned to the mission and vision established in Section 1. (Standard 3 and 4)
- The application lacks an educational plan that is clear and comprehensive and is designed for the grades it intends to serve. Although the application is for a high school, the plan references several programs and instructional methods that are appropriate for elementary grades. (Standard 3)
 - The application proposes to serve seniors during the first year of the school's operations, but does not provide a path for seeking accreditation in the initial year or any year thereafter. Additionally, the application lacked any reference to how the lack of accreditation would be relayed to parents and students analyzing this educational choice option. (Standard 3)
 - The educational plan states that there will be an extended day but the extension is not evidenced in the application. (Standard 3)
 - The application states that the school's educational program will be driven by the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM); however, the application identifies practices that are not aligned with or supportive of this model. (Standard 3)
 - The sample schedule provided for review is missing portions of the instructional day. The application states that the school will operate a seven period day but the schedule provided is missing two periods and it is not clear how much time will be allocated for lunch. Additionally, the schedule did not consistently allow for equal minutes of instruction for each period; therefore, it cannot be determined if there are adequate instructional minutes to meet minimum requirements for the award of a full FTE. (Standard 3)
 - The application does not clearly indicate what reading plan the school will implement. The application states that the school will follow the State's Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan but also references the District's approved reading plan as well as a school approved reading plan. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - Although the application lists a plethora of course offerings for students, the proposed high school will have a maximum enrollment of only 325 students. There is no clear delineation of exactly what courses will be provided. This issue raises serious concerns that the programs and offerings, as described will not materialize because of limited resources. (Standard 4)
 - Dual enrollment program is mentioned but the program did not provide details regarding how the school will deliver this option, what post-secondary institutions will partner with the school in this venture, or a budget to support this offering. (Standard 4)
 - The application states that teachers will develop lesson plans that are aligned to the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program curriculum framework, but does not provide evidence of the inclusion of this program in the instructional framework. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - The application inconsistently and inaccurately cites curriculum and academic standards. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - The application states that the students will be provided with infused technology and assisted instructional programs across core academic disciplines, but does not provide details regarding how this will be accomplished. (Standard 4)
 - The curriculum plan mentions that the school will implement thematic unit plans but does not provide details as to what these thematic units will encompass and how they will impact the instructional program. (Standard 4)

- The curriculum section includes the four graduation paths identified in the District's Student Progression Plan, but does not explain which of these paths will be made available to the students attending the school. As written, all four tracks will be offered, but the application lacks a comprehensive curriculum plan to support each track. Additionally, the application provides outdated graduation requirements. (Standard 4)
 - The application does not provide a clear plan to ensure that students are exposed to complex texts and analytical writing instruction. This would directly impact the schools' ability to implement the new state standard for Language Arts. (Standard 4)
 - Within the curriculum plan section there seems to be quite a bit of "cut and paste" information. As a result, it lacks evidence that there is a viable plan to ensure students will graduate on time. Further, the curriculum plan is inconsistent with the course offerings. (Standard 4)
 - Instructional materials for mathematics that were identified within the application are not all aligned to the new Florida Standards. (Standard 4)
3. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. (Standard 5)
- The application lists the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) Writing which is not a state accountability assessment.
 - Objectives for learning gains were not included.
 - An objective that would specify the expected graduation rate was not provided even though this is a high school that plans to serve seniors during the initial year of operation.
 - Although the application stated that the school would provide an "innovative and rigorous" academic education, the objectives provided did not include an objective for acceleration. The curriculum section states that students would have access to the full range of academic courses and included opportunities for Accelerated Placement (AP) courses, Dual enrollment and access to virtual courses, yet no objective was included that addressed the percentage of students that would be expected to successfully complete these courses and/or pass appropriate exams.
 - The application does not provide any details to explain how the school would be prepared to meet the requirements for mandatory computerized testing.
4. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the Education of Exceptional Students (ESE). (Standard 6)
- The application does not clearly indicate how exceptional students will be serviced. (Standard 6)
 - The plan of service is broad in its scope and some of the services outlined are misleading and raises questions as to the ability of the applicant to effectively serve exceptional students.
 - The application provided a list of exceptionalities and a generic response as to how services would be provided. (Standard 6)
 - The application states that the ESE teacher would provide counseling services. Teachers do not typically hold the certification necessary to provide counseling services. (Standard 6)
 - The application misstates the names of exceptionalities (instead of Autism Spectrum Disorder it is listed as Spectrum Disorder) and refers to related services as exceptionalities (Occupational Therapy Disability and Physical Therapy Disability). (Standard 6)
 - The services listed for students with Intellectual Disabilities are generic and do not take into consideration the uniqueness of the disability. (Standard 6)
 - It is unclear if the school will be providing a modified curriculum for students with Intellectual Disabilities. (Standard 6)
 - Reference is made to the administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment in Section 5 of the application but is not referenced in Section 6 with regard to students with Intellectual Disabilities. (Standard 5 and 6)
 - The application is for a high school yet the applicant states it would service students with Developmental Delays. This is an age specific exceptionality that is valid up to only students that are 6 years of age in the state of Florida. (Standard 6)

5. Failure to provide a realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school and a clear description of how the school's finances will be managed. (Standard 17 and 18)
 - The applicant claims that it will obtain a \$30,000 (\$70,000 at 50% enrollment) start-up loan but does not provide any documentary support. (Standard 17)
 - The facility cost is underestimated. Even though no facility has been identified, the narrative indicated that the cost of the facility would be based on \$900 per student, but the budget is underestimated because it accounts for facility cost at \$600 per student. (Standard 17)
 - The information provided in the budget does not align with the anticipated staffing costs indicated within the staffing plan. The presented budget does not ensure that enough funds were set aside to cover proposed salaries in years 2 to 5. (Standard 17)
 - Transportation costs were under estimated. The applicant stated in the Revenue Worksheet that it expected to transport 55% of the students but only set aside funds to transport 37% to 40% if the student population. (Standard 17)
 - The cost of the insurance property is underestimated at 50% enrollment. The budget indicates that for year 1 the school is projected to pay \$9,000, but for years 2 to 5 the cost of the insurance is budgeted at \$1,000. (Standard 17)
 - The budget reflected no contingency or reserve to absorb any of the stated shortfalls and/or any unplanned circumstances which are to be expected in such a small secondary school setting.
 - The projected cash flow inappropriately reflected revenues for food service for the months of July and August in their first year of operation. In the normal course of a start-up school, there are no food service revenues for the months of July and August. (Standard 17)
 - The application does not provide a clear description as to how the school will manage its finances. Other than stating that the governing board will hire an accounting firm, the application does not provide sufficient detail as to who will develop the school budget, how the board will be kept informed, and who will manage daily finances. Additionally, there is no information regarding the management of the payroll process, monthly finances, who is authorized to sign checks, etc. (Standard 18)
 - A clear description of strong internal controls was not provided. Although there is an existing governing board, the application lacked a description of existing processes and policies. (Standard 18)
6. Failure to describe sound practices and 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)
 - A description of the lottery process, as required through state statute, was not provided. (Standard 13)
 - The application states that a Student and Parent Contract will be in place but no description of expectations and consequences was provided as required. (Standard 13)
 - Enrollment timelines provided in Sections 13 and 19 are contradictory. (Standard 13 and 19)
 - The application does not describe the efforts the school will make to foster community involvement. Although the application mentions that the viability of the school hinges on community partnerships, there is no evidence of these partnerships. (Standard 13)
 - The sample handbook provided is for a K-8 school and does not reflect the grades and policies that would be appropriate for the high school population the school intends to serve.
7. Failure to provide a clear description of the targeted population the school will serve. (Standard 2)
 - The application did not provide a valid explanation as to how the ELL projection was determined. The application indicated that the demographics will mirror those of Miami-Dade County which is 20% ELL, yet the Revenue Worksheet only anticipates a 10% ELL population. (Standard 2 and 7)
 - The five year enrollment projection shows sudden increases and decreases that are not explained within the Target Population and Student Body section. For example, the school anticipates that for years 2 and 3 the school will serve approximately 100 - 9th grade students and then in year 4 and 5 there is a decrease of 50 students. (Standard 2)

8. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan which provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. (Standard 9, 10, and 12)
 - Although in Section 11, the applicant indicated an ESP would not be used, the governance section includes an ESP. (Standard 9)
 - This school will be governed by an existing governing board that currently operates two schools, yet parts of the governance section read as if this is a governing board that will be newly established. (Standard 9)
 - The governance section has within its narrative the identification of a Finance Manager that will work with the governing board to safeguard the finances of the school but the position was not found in the staffing plan or supported in the budget. (Standard 9)
 - The office that each governing board member holds was not included, even though this is an existing and established organization. (Standard 9)
 - The Bylaws reference a parent member, but none of the board members listed indicated that they are a parent of one the schools of this existing board. (Standard 9)
 - The applicant does not provide an adequate plan to manage parent complaints. The applicant provides a complaint policy that dictates how the Sponsor will handle complaints for the school. The Sponsor's responsibilities and duties are not within the school's jurisdiction. (Standard 9)
 - The Bylaws indicate that any trustee of the corporation can receive compensation from the corporation for other services rendered. This is a nonprofit governing board and compensation is not allowed by law, except under very particular circumstances. (Standard 9)
 - The staffing plan identified only enough teachers to meet class size requirements. There is no additional instructional staff included that would be necessary to implement the curriculum program as described in Section 4. (Standard 10)
 - The application failed to provide comprehensive job descriptions and qualifications for key staff. For example, the Curriculum Leader/Dean position provides a job description that is operational in nature, and there is no reference of how this individual will act as a curriculum leader in the school. (Standard 10)
 - The Management Section states that the ESP will be involved in the hiring process, yet the application stated in Section 11 that the school would not be hiring an ESP. The application even refers to an ESP agreement as an attachment, but no such attachment was found. Additionally, the name of an ESP was actually identified within the application. (Standard 10)
 - The school intends to hire up to 6 paraprofessionals who will develop lesson plans and have other instructional duties but development of lesson plans is the express responsibility of the teacher of record. Additionally, the application does not detail the highly qualified requirements for these positions. (Standard 10)
 - The employee benefits and compensation plan was not clearly delineated. It is not clear what type or degree of benefits would be provided to employees. This is an existing corporation that operates two schools within Miami-Dade County and it could have easily provided details of its current benefit package offerings. (Standard 12 and 17)
 - It is not clear if the school will be able to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. Notwithstanding the lack of understanding of the importance of an employee benefits package, the application states that the school will provide teachers with salaries that are comparable to that of the local district but the budget reflects salaries that are approximately \$3,000 below starting salaries for the District. Further, in year 5, the expected salaries for teachers at the school are well below the District's starting salary. (Standard 12 and 17)
9. Failure to provide a realistic plan for securing an adequate facility. (Standard 14)
 - The application did not adequately describe the desired size, layout or specific facility needs of the school. There is no indication of how the desired facility will meet the needs of the high school curriculum program described in Section 4. The need for classroom space is described as 6 or more classrooms, yet the school intends to hire 7 teachers the first year of the charter. The description indicates a media center will be provided for student use, but there is no reference to a media center elsewhere in the application. (Standard 4 and 14)

- The facility section indicates that the facility must meet the needs of 100 students with a possible expansion of at least 200 students. These numbers do not adequately reflect the anticipated projections of 175 students in year 1 and a maximum enrollment of 325 students by year 3 of the charter. (Standard 2 and 14)
 - The facility cost reported in Section 14 is not to the same as the cost provided in the budget. (Standard 14 and 17)
 - The applicant does not provide an adequate back up plan to ensure an appropriate facility will be available and acquired. (Standard 14)
10. Failure to provide a thoughtful and realistic implementation plan that covers major operational items and ensures the school will be ready to serve its students on the first day of school. (Standard 19)
- The enrollment and facility timelines are not aligned with the timeline provided with the action plan. (Standard 13, 14, and 19)
 - The action plan is incomplete and omits the month of February even though it is part of the timeline provided in the facility section. (Standard 14 and 19)
 - It is not clear when staff will initially report to the school at the beginning of the year. (Standard 19)
 - The action plan includes finalizing of the contract with an ESP but the applicant indicates it is not going to contract with an ESP. (Standard 11 and 19)
 - The following key elements were not included in the timeline: principal hire date, assessment and acquisition of adequate technology, and/or staff development. (Standard 19)

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 Section 1002.33(6) (c), F.S., if the School Board approves this recommendation to deny the application, 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 applications 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

SVG Leadership Academies, Inc. proposes to establish two charter schools that will serve grades 6-9, The Leadership Academy for Academic and Personal Achievement and The Leadership Academy for Academic and Personal Achievement North, with a proposed enrollment of 364 students for each school to open in the 2015-2016 school year. The applicant simultaneously also submitted an application for a grade 6-12 charter school, The Leadership Academy for the Arts and Advanced Academics.

Applicant

The members of the Founding Governing Board are: Dorothy Davis, retired; Ildiko Matchus, retired; Jerry Sutherland, City of Miami Police Officer.

A representative for the applicant attended the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 8, 2014 and did receive the most current information regarding the submittal of a charter application. The meeting is not mandatory but attendance is strongly recommended by the Florida Department of Education and the District's Charter School Support Office (CSS) to inform applicants of new statutory requirements and District policies and procedures. This applicant submitted draft charter applications on May 1 and feedback was provided by July 1 as required by law. The applicant did not contact CSS for any further assistance.

Evaluation

A review of these charter school applications were conducted pursuant to § 1002.33 (6), F. S., and School 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 an assurance declaration. As allowed by § 1002.33(6)(a)(6), F.S. and pursuant to Board Policy 9800, the District also includes an evaluation of the applicant's experience and historical performance operating charter schools.

The initial technical review resulted in significant concerns and findings that were provided to the applicant and forwarded to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The ARC conducts a second review of the application with the applicant in a public meeting 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. With the exception of technical or nonsubstantive corrections and clarifications, such as grammatical, typographical, and missing signatures, an application cannot be amended prior to submission to the School Board for consideration. The ARC reviewed the two applications with the applicant on September 11, 2014. Because these applications were so similar the applicant agreed to allow the Sponsor to consolidate the interview and review into one evaluation. The ARC found that the applications failed to meet minimum statutory requirements and identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicant's understanding of various conceptual issues and/or its ability to meet statutory requirements.

Specifically, the applications did not meet the required standards in 15 of the 18 applicable categories in the Model Evaluation Instrument. As summarized below, these deficiencies constitute good cause for denial of the applications.

1. Failure to provide a detailed educational and curriculum plan that illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards and that is aligned to the mission and vision established in Section 1. (Standard 1, 3 and 4)
 - Although the applications made references to serving an "at risk"/alternative student population many of the sections within the application lacked evidence of how this theme/focus would be implemented. (Standard 1, 3, and 4)
 - Both applications fail to provide a clear picture of the educational program that will be provided to students attending the school. The program design provides limited, if any insight of how "at risk" students will benefit from the proposed curriculum. (Standard 1, 3 and 4)
 - The educational designs are missing critical details of an innovative curriculum design and/or program. In fact, it is unclear if there is any difference in the curriculum platform from the existing traditional schools in the targeted area. Additionally, research reveals, which is also evident in the District's alternative schools, that the school with this focus normally have a robust student services support and a credit recovery component, neither of which were evident in these applications. The only student services mentioned is a counselor. The applications proposed one counselor to serve up to 374 "at risk" / alternative education students. (Standard 3, 4, and 10)
 - The sample schedules provided for review are confusing at best. The schedules do not consistently allow for equal minutes of instruction for each block so it cannot be determined whether there are adequate instructional minutes to meet minimum requirements for the award of a full FTE. (Standard 3)
 - The applications state that the school's educational program will be driven by the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) but the application identifies practices that are not aligned with or supportive of this model. (Standard 3)
 - The educational plans state that the schools will implement "thematic units" but does not identify the thematic units, how they will be provided or how they will impact the instructional program. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - The applications do not clearly indicate what reading plan the schools will implement. The applications state that they will follow the State's Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan, the District's approved reading plan, and a "school approved" reading plan. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - The applications do list a plethora of course offerings for students but it is far more than the school possibly actually offer since the schools will have a maximum enrollment of only 364 students each. The applications do not provide any plan or description of what courses the schools will actually offer. This issue raises serious concerns that the programs and offerings, as described, will never materialize because of limited resources. (Standard 4)
 - A Dual Enrollment program is mentioned but the applications do not provide details regarding how the school will deliver this option, what post-secondary institutions will partner with the school in this venture, or a budget to support this offering. (Standard 4)
 - The applications state that the school will adhere to the standards outlined by the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program curriculum framework, but provides no evidence of the inclusion of this program in the instructional framework. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - The applications inconsistently and often cite inaccurate curriculum and academic standards. (Standard 3 and 4)
 - The applications state that students will be provided with infused technology and assisted instructional programs across core academic disciplines, but does not provide details regarding how this will be accomplished. (Standard 4)
 - The curriculum plan appears to have been cut and pasted from other sources. As a result, it lacks coherence and evidence that students will be provided a curriculum program that will guarantee on-time graduation. (Standard 4)
 - The applications do not provide a clear plan to ensure that students are exposed to complex texts and analytical writing instruction. This would directly impact the schools' ability to implement the new state standard for Language Arts. (Standard 4)

- The curriculum section does not adequately describe how students who may need credit recovery in order to graduate on time will be provided these opportunities. (Standard 4)
2. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. (Standard 5)
 - The applications do not provide an achievement goal for Social Studies (Civics).
 - The applications do not include objectives for learning gains.
 - The applications do not address the middle or high school accelerated success performance goal.
 - Although the applications stated that the schools will follow the District's Student Progression Plan they do not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements regarding the calculation of EOC scores into final grades.
 - The applications do not provide any details to explain how the school would be prepared to meet the requirements for computerized testing.
 - The graduation assessment requirement indicates successful passage of the FCAT 2.0 assessments; but state accountability requirement has changed to Florida Standards Assessment.
 - Portions of the applications appear to be cut and pasted and demonstrate a lack of preparation on the part of the applicant.
 3. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the Education of Exceptional Students (ESE). (Standard 6)
 - The applications do not clearly indicate how exceptional students will be serviced. (Standard 6)
 - The plan of service is general and broad in its scope; some of the services outlined are misleading and raises questions as to the ability of the applicant to effectively serve exceptional students. (Standard 6)
 - The applications provided a generic list of exceptionalities and statements regarding how services will be provided. (Standard 6)
 - The applications state that the ESE teacher will provide counseling services. Teachers do not typically hold the certification necessary to provide counseling services. (Standard 6)
 - The applications misstate the names of exceptionalities (instead of Autism Spectrum Disorder it is listed as Spectrum Disorder) and refers to related services as exceptionalities (Occupational Therapy Disability and Physical Therapy Disability). (Standard 6)
 - The services listed for students with Intellectual Disabilities are generic and do not take into consideration the uniqueness of the disability. (Standard 6)
 - It is unclear if the schools will be providing a modified curriculum for students with Intellectual Disabilities. (Standard 6)
 - Reference is made to the administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment in Section 5 of the application but is not referenced in Section 6 with regard to students with Intellectual Disabilities. (Standard 5 and 6)
 - The applications are for a school that will have middle school grades and ninth grade [high school] yet the applicant states it would serve students with Developmental Delays. This is an age specific exceptionality that is valid up to only students 6 years of age in the state of Florida. (Standard 6)
 - The level of services outlined for gifted students are for high school students only. No services for middle school students are outlined within the applications even though these schools will serve primarily middle grades. (Standard 6)
 4. Failure to provide a realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school. (Standard 17)
 - The applicant did not provide a budget at all for The Leadership Academy for Academic and Personal Achievement North. Since the two designs were identical, the review was conducted using the budget submitted for the other application. (Standard 17)

- The facility cost is underestimated. Even though no facility has been identified, the narrative indicated that the cost of the facility would be based on \$900 per student, but the budget is underestimated because it accounts for facility cost at \$600 per student. (Standard 17)
 - The budget provided does not align with the anticipated staffing costs to implement the identified educational program. The budget only reflects enough teachers to meet class size. (Standard 17)
 - In the budget provided the transportation costs were underestimated. The applicant stated in the Revenue Worksheet that it expected to transport 57% of the students but only set aside funds to transport 37% of the student population. (Standard 17)
 - In the budget provided the cost of insurance property is underestimated at 50% enrollment. The budget indicates that for year 1 the school is projected to pay \$9,000, but for years 2 to 5 the cost of the insurance is budgeted at \$1,000. (Standard 17)
 - The budget provided does not reflect a sufficient contingency or reserve to absorb the stated shortfalls and/or any unplanned circumstances that are to be expected in such a small secondary school setting. (Standard 17)
 - The projected cash flow incorrectly reflects revenues for food service for the months of July and August in their first year of operation. In the normal course of a start-up school, there are no food service revenues for the months of July and August. (Standard 17)
5. Failure to describe sound practices and 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)
- A description of the lottery process, as required through state statute, was not provided. (Standard 13)
 - The application states that a Student and Parent Contract will be in place but no description of expectations and consequences was provided as required. (Standard 13)
 - The Student handbook provided for our review has a provision for involuntary withdrawal of students due to excessive absences. This is in direct violation of both state statute and School Board Policy. (Standard 13)
 - Enrollment timelines provided in sections 13 and 19 are contradictory. (Standard 13 and 19)
6. Failure to provide a clear description of the targeted population the school will serve. (Standard 2)
- The applications state that the schools will exclude the very same student population they intend to attract. Although the applications indicate that the school will provide a "well-disciplined alternative education setting" and that it will identify its population through District and school referrals, it also states it will "exclude students who have received referrals to participate in an alternative education program." (Standard 1 and 2)
 - The applications indicate that they are targeting "at risk students", but within the enrollment preferences, there is no discussion of whether the schools intend to target only this population. (Standard 2)
 - The applicant indicates within the applications that the enrollment of students is conditional based on the parent's acceptance of the conditions of the Parental Involvement Contract. This is inappropriate, not allowed by law and contradictory to enrollment requirements. (Standard 2)
 - Although the applications state that the schools will offer small class sizes, the budget and the staffing plan provide just enough teachers to meet the class size amendment, which for charter schools is higher than the classroom level required by traditional public school. (Standard 2)
 - The applications indicated that the schools' ELL demographics will mirror those of Miami-Dade County. The Revenue Worksheet only anticipates a 7% ELL population even though the District's ELL average is approximately 20%. (Standard 2 and 7)
 - The applications did not provide justification for the SPED enrollment projections. The projections provided are not similar to most at-risk/alternative school programs. (Standard 2 and 6)
7. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan which provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. (Standard 9, 10, and 12)
- The applications state that the schools will have a Finance Manager who will work with the governing board to develop grants, develop the annual budget and safeguard the finances of the

- school, but the position was not found either in the staffing plan or supported in the budget provided. (Standard 9 and 10)
- The office that governing board members of each school will hold is not included. (Standard 9)
 - The applicant does not provide an adequate plan to manage parent complaints. The applicant provides a complaint policy that dictates how the Sponsor will handle complaints for the school. The Sponsor's responsibilities and duties are not within the school's jurisdiction. (Standard 9)
 - The corporate bylaws provided indicate that any trustee of the corporation can receive compensation from the corporation for other services rendered, but this is a nonprofit board and compensation for the Board of Trustees is not allowed by law except under very particular circumstances. (Standard 9)
 - The staffing plan provided identified only enough teachers to meet class size. There are no additional instructional staff identified that would be required in order to implement the curriculum program as described in the educational plans and provide needed services to the proposed student population. (Standard 10)
 - The applications failed to provide comprehensive job descriptions and qualifications for key staff. For example, a description for the "Curriculum Leader/Dean" position states that the person will handle school operations and student discipline and there is no reference to how this individual will act as a curriculum leader in the school. (Standard 10)
 - The Management Section states that an ESP would be involved in the hiring process, yet the applications state in Section 11 that the schools would not hire an ESP. (Standard 10)
 - The schools intend to hire up to 6 paraprofessionals who will develop lesson plans and have other instructional duties but the development of lesson plans is the responsibility of an appropriately certified teacher of record. Additionally, there is no mention in the applications of the required highly qualified status for these positions. (Standard 10)
 - The employee benefits and compensation plan was not provided. (Standard 12 and 17)
 - It is not clear if the schools will be able to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. Notwithstanding the lack of understanding of the importance of an employee benefits package, the applications state that the schools will provide teachers with salaries that are comparable to that of the local district but the only budget provided reflects salaries that are approximately \$3,000 below starting salaries for the District. Further, in year 5, the expected salaries for teachers at the school are well below the District's starting salary. (Standard 10, 12, and 17)
 - The professional development plan within the application only addresses training offerings that are appropriate for any traditional school; they do not address the demanding teaching environment that instructional staff will be faced with given the student population. (Standard 10 and 12)
8. Failure to describe a learning environment and provide evidence that the school will ensure a safe environment conducive to learning.
- The applications did not provide a plan that would adequately serve the targeted student population. In fact, the narrative only indicated a discipline plan that contained elements found in any traditional school. This is of concern given that the population these schools intend to serve is at-risk. There was no plan to address student needs such as: absenteeism, self-esteem issues, repeated behavior issues, issues with their home life. The only student service position found in the staffing plan was for one counselor and this position would not be filled until year two of the charter. (Standard 8)
 - The staffing plan did not include a security monitor or discuss how the schools would manage security or monitoring. (Standard 8 and 10)
9. Failure to provide a realistic plan for securing an adequate facility. (Standard 14)
- The applications do not adequately describe the desired size, layout or specific facility needs of the schools. The description indicates that a media center will be provided for student use, but there is no reference to a media center elsewhere in the application. Additionally, there are no allocations in the budget to support the purchase of furniture, fixtures, and equipment for a media center. (Standard 4, 14, and 17)

- The facility section indicates that the facility will meet the needs of the schools for the first three years of the charter. It is not clear where the students will be housed during the last 2 years of the charter. The applications state that the facility will expand to "at least 339 students during the first three years" which does not adequately reflect the anticipated projection of 364 students by year 5 of the charter. (Standard 2 and 14)
 - The facility cost reported in section 14 is not aligned to the cost provided in the budget received, \$900 and \$600 per student, respectively. (Standard 14 and 17)
 - The applicant does not provide an adequate back up plan to ensure that appropriate alternative facilities will be available or acquired. (Standard 14)
 - The timeline for the facility plan does not align with the Action Plan provided. (Standard 14 and 19)
10. Failure to provide a thoughtful and realistic implementation plan that covers major operational items and ensures the school will be ready to serve its student on the first day of school. (Standard 19)
- The enrollment and facility timelines are not aligned with the timeline provided with the action plan.
 - The action plans provided are incomplete. February is completely missing even though there are activities in February detailed in the facility timelines.
 - It is not clear when staff will initially report.
 - The action plan includes finalizing the contracts with an ESP but Section 11 states that the applicant will not contract with an ESP.
 - The following key elements were not included in the action plan: principal hire date, assessment and acquisition of adequate technology and/or staff development.
 - The timelines provided do not address the required training of the members of this new governing board. It is not clear when the governing board members will undergo the clearance process or when it will meet to establish policies and procedures. This demonstrates the applicant's lack of awareness about the importance of allowing sufficient planning to ensure that all school operations are ready prior to the opening of school.
 - The timetables provided also do not address processing all potential employees (fingerprinting and background checks). A complete understanding of this process is important to ensure that the school will be fully staffed the first day of school.

The applicant was notified of the Superintendent's intent to recommend denial of the applications 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 to deny these applications, 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 applications 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 D

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

SVG Leadership Academies, Inc., on behalf of The Leadership Academy for the Arts and Advanced Academics, proposes to establish a charter school that will serve grades 6-12 with a proposed enrollment of 376 students. The application for this charter school proposes to open in the 2015-2016 school year. The applicant also submitted two other applications for two schools that would serve students in grades 6-9, The Leadership Academy for Academic and Personal Achievement, and The Leadership Academy for Academic and Personal Achievement North.

Applicant

The members of the founding Governing Board include: Dorothy Davis, retired; Ildiko Matchus, retired; Jerry Sutherland, City of Miami Police Officer.

A representative for the applicant attended the District's charter school application orientation conducted on May 8, 2014, and did receive the most current information regarding the submittal of a charter application. The meeting is not mandatory but attendance is strongly recommended by the Florida Department of Education and the District's Charter School Support Office (CSS) to inform applicants of new statutory requirements and District policies and procedures. This applicant submitted a draft charter application on May 1 and feedback was provided by July 1 as required by law. The applicant did not contact CSS for any further assistance.

Evaluation

A review of this charter school application was conducted pursuant to § 1002.33 (6), F. S., and School 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 an assurance declaration. As allowed by § 1002.33(6)(a)(6), F.S. and pursuant to Board Policy 9800, the District also includes an evaluation of the applicant's experience and historical performance operating charter schools.

The initial technical review resulted in significant concerns and findings that were provided to the applicant and forwarded to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The ARC conducts a second review of the application with the applicant in a public meeting 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. With the exception of technical or nonsubstantive corrections and clarifications, such as grammatical, typographical, and missing signatures, the application cannot be amended prior to submission to the School Board for consideration. On September 8, 2014, the applicant received an invitation to attend the ARC and confirmed attendance on September 9, 2014. The applicant participated in an earlier ARC meeting to review their other two applications, which were both recommended for denial, but chose not to stay for or participate in the subsequent ARC meeting to review of this application.

The ARC found that the application failed to meet minimum statutory requirements and identified substantial concerns/deficiencies regarding the applicant's understanding of various conceptual issues and/or its ability to meet statutory requirements.

Specifically, the application did not meet the required standards in 13 of the 18 applicable categories in the Model Evaluation Instrument. As summarized below, these deficiencies constitute good cause for denial of the application.

1. Failure to provide a detailed educational and curriculum plan that illustrates how students will be provided services to attain state standards and that is aligned to the mission and vision established in Section 1 of the application. (Standard 1, 3, and 4)
 - The application does not include a compelling mission that defines the guiding purpose of the school. (Standard 1)
 - The application fails to provide a clear picture of the educational program that the school intends to provide students. The program design provides no Arts program that would distinguish this school from any other public school. In fact, it does not identify the focus of the Arts program and does not provide any detail about the various arts disciplines that will be offered to students. (Standard 1 and 3)
 - The application does not describe entrance, participation or audition requirements. In fact, it appears that the program will be open to all students regardless of their artistic ability or competence. (Standard 1, 2, and 3)
 - The educational design fails to provide critical details of how a comprehensive arts program will be implemented. (Standard 1, 3, and 4)
 - The educational plan states that it will implement "thematic units" but does not identify what these thematic units will be or how they will impact the instructional program. (Standard 3, and 4)
 - The sample schedule included with the application is missing significant portions of the instructional day. The application states that the school will operate a seven period day but the schedule provided is missing two periods and does not define the allocation of a lunch period. Additionally, the schedule does not consistently allocate the same number of minutes of instruction for each period and it cannot be determined if the instructional periods will provide adequate instructional minutes to meet minimum requirements for the award of a full FTE. (Standard 3)
 - The application does not clearly indicate what reading plan the school will implement. The application states that the school will follow the State's Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan but also references the District's approved reading plan as well as a school approved reading plan. (Standard 3, and 4)
 - The educational plan references an extended day but there is no provision for an extended day in the application. (Standard 3)
 - The application compares the proposed school to various District magnet programs where the educational program is driven by their focus on the Arts. There is no evidence within this application that this school is focused on an Arts theme or implementation of an Arts program. While the application states that "the school will integrate the arts and technology courses into core academics" how this integration will be accomplished is not provided. (Standard 3, and 4)
 - The application states that the school's educational program will be driven by the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) but identifies practices that are not aligned with or supportive of this model. (Standard 3)
 - The application does not clearly indicate what reading plan the school will implement and provides contradictory indications of an identified Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan (CRRP). The application variously refers to the State's CRRP, the District's CRRP, and an "approved school reading plan" as the plan that will be implemented. (Standard 3, and 4)
 - The application does list a plethora of course offerings for students that, with a maximum enrollment of only 376 students, cannot possibly be provided. This issue raises serious concerns that the programs and offerings, as described, will never materialize because of limited resources. (Standard 4)

- A dual enrollment program is mentioned but the application does not provide details regarding how the school will deliver this option, what post-secondary institutions will partner with the school in this venture, or a budget to support this offering. (Standard 4)
 - The application states the school will adhere to the standards outlined by the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program curriculum framework, but provides no evidence of the inclusion of this program in the instructional framework. (Standard 3, and 4)
 - The application cites inconsistent and inaccurate curriculum and academic standards. (Standard 3, and 4)
 - The application states that students will be provided with infused technology and assisted instructional programs across core academic disciplines, but does not provide details regarding how this will be accomplished. (Standard 4)
 - The application does not provide a clear plan to ensure that students are exposed to complex texts and analytical writing instruction. This would directly impact the schools' ability to implement the new state standard for Language Arts. (Standard 4)
 - The curriculum plan appears to be have been cut and pasted from other sources and lacks evidence that there is a viable plan to ensure students will graduate on time. (Standard 4)
2. Failure to provide measureable goals and objectives that set high standards for student performance. (Standard 5)
- The application lists the Florida Standards Writing Assessment which is not a state accountability assessment.
 - The applications do not include objectives for learning gains.
 - Middle school and high school accelerated success performance goals were not addressed.
 - The writing goal, as presented, is outdated.
 - There was no goal to address the specific focus/theme of the school.
 - No graduation objective was provided even though this is a high school.
 - Although the application stated that the school will follow all state requirements, the application does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements regarding the calculation of EOC scores into final grades.
 - The application does not demonstrate how the school would be prepared to meet the requirements for computerized testing.
3. Failure to demonstrate an understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the Education of Exceptional Students (ESE). (Standard 6)
- The application does not clearly indicate how exceptional students will be serviced. (Standard 6)
 - The plan of service is broad in its scope, some of the services outlined are misleading, and it is not clear that the applicant has the ability to effectively serve exceptional students. (Standard 6)
 - The application provided a list of exceptionalities and generic responses as to how services would be provided. (Standard 6)
 - The application states that the ESE teacher would provide counseling services. Teachers do not typically hold the certification necessary to provide counseling services. (Standard 6)
 - The applicant incorrectly identifies exceptionalities (instead of Autism Spectrum Disorder it is listed as Spectrum Disorder) and refers to related services as exceptionalities (Occupational Therapy Disability and Physical Therapy Disability). (Standard 6)
 - The services listed for students with Intellectual Disabilities are generic and do not take into consideration the uniqueness of the disability and the unique services that might be required. (Standard 6)
 - It is unclear if the school will be providing a modified curriculum for students with Intellectual Disabilities. (Standard 6)
 - Reference is made to the administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment in Section 5 of the application but is not referenced in Section 6 with regard to students with Intellectual Disabilities. (Standard 5, and 6)

- This application proposes to serve middle and high school grades yet the applicant states it would service students with Developmental Delays. This is an age specific exceptionality that is only valid up to only students 6 years of age in the state of Florida. (Standard 6)
 - The level of services outlined in the applications for Gifted is for high school students only; no services for middle school students are outlined. (Standard 6)
4. Failure to provide a realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school. (Standard 17)
 - The application does not provide a detailed narrative description of the expenditure assumptions on which the operating and start-up budget are based. (Standard 17)
 - The facility cost is underestimated. Even though no facility has been identified, the narrative indicated that the cost of the facility would be based on \$900 per student, but the budget is underestimated because it accounts for facility cost at \$600 per student. (Standard 17)
 - The information provided in the budget does not align with the proposed staffing plan. (Standard 10, and 17)
 - Transportation costs were underestimated. The applicant stated in the Revenue Worksheet that it expected to transport 57% of the students but only set aside funds to transport 37% of the student population. (Standard 17)
 - The cost of the insurance property is underestimated at 50% enrollment. The budget indicates that for year 1 the school is projected to pay \$9,000, but for years 2 to 5 the cost of the insurance is budgeted at \$1,000. (Standard 17)
 - The budget reflected does not reflect an adequate contingency or reserve to absorb the stated shortfalls and/or any unplanned circumstances that are to be expected in such a small secondary school setting. (Standard 17)
 - The projected cash flow inappropriately reflected revenues for food service for the months of July and August in their first year of operation. In the normal course of a start-up school, there are no food service revenues for the months of July and August. (Standard 17)
 5. Failure to describe sound practices and 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)
 - A description of the lottery process, as required through state statute, was not provided. Furthermore, this section did not address any admissions policy for students who wish to attend this Arts focused school. (Standard 13)
 - The application states that a Student and Parent Contract will be in place but no description of expectations and consequences was provided as required. (Standard 13)
 - The Student handbook provided for our review has a provision for involuntary withdrawal of students due to excessive absences. This is in direct violation of both state statute and School Board Policy. (Standard 13)
 - Enrollment timelines provided in Sections 13 and 19 are contradictory. (Standards 13 and 19)
 6. Failure to provide a clear description of the targeted population the school will serve. (Standard 2)
 - There is no alignment between the proposed targeted population and the school's vision and mission. There is no information regarding auditions, portfolios, or entrance requirements. (Standard 2)
 - The applicant indicates within the applications that the enrollment of students is conditional based on the parent's acceptance of the conditions of the Parental Involvement Contract. This is inappropriate, not allowed by law and contradictory to enrollment requirements. (Standard 2)
 - Although, the application states that the school will offer small class sizes, the budget and the staffing plan provide only enough teachers to meet the class size amendment, which for charter schools is higher than the classroom level required by traditional public school. (Standard 2)
 - The application indicated that the school's ELL demographics will mirror those of Miami-Dade County. The Revenue Worksheet only anticipates a 10% ELL population even though the District's ELL average is approximately 20%. (Standard 2 and 7)
 7. Failure to provide evidence of an organizational plan that provides a clear understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. (Standard 9, 10, and 12)

- The governance section identifies a Finance Manager that will work with the governing board to develop grants, develop the annual budget and safeguard the finances of the school. This is a position was not found either in the staffing plan or supported in the budget. (Standard 9)
 - The office that each governing board member holds was not included. (Standard 9)
 - The applicant does not provide an adequate plan to manage parent complaints. The applicant provides a complaint policy that dictates how the Sponsor will handle complaints for the school. The Sponsor's responsibilities and duties are not within the school's jurisdiction. (Standard 9)
 - The corporate bylaws provided indicate that any trustee of the corporation can receive compensation from the corporation for other services rendered, but this is a nonprofit board and compensation for the Board of Trustees is not allowed by law except under very particular circumstances. (Standard 9)
 - The staffing plan provided identified only enough teachers to meet class size requirements. There are no additional instructional staff included that would be needed in order to implement the curriculum program as described in the educational plan. (Standard 3, 4, and 10)
 - The application failed to provide comprehensive job descriptions and qualifications for key staff. For example the Curriculum Leader/Dean position provides a job description that is operational in nature, and there is no description of how this individual will act as a curriculum leader in the school. (Standard 10)
 - The Management Section states that an ESP would be involved in the hiring process, yet the application states in Section 11 that the school would not hire an ESP. (Standard 10)
 - The school intends to hire up to 6 paraprofessionals who will develop lesson plans and have other instructional duties but development of lesson plans is the express responsibility of the teacher of record. Additionally, the application does not detail the highly qualified requirements for these positions. (Standard 10)
 - The employee benefits and compensation plan was not provided. (Standard 12, and 17)
 - It is not clear if the school will be able to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. Notwithstanding the lack of understanding of the importance of an employee benefits package, the application states that the school will provide teachers with salaries that are comparable to that of the District but the budget reflects salaries that are approximately \$3,000 below starting salaries for the District. Further, in year 5, the expected salaries for teachers at the school are well below the District's starting salary. (Standard 12, and 17)
8. Failure to provide a realistic plan for securing an adequate facility. (Standard 14)
- The application did not adequately describe the desired size, layout or specific facility needs of the school. There is no indication of how the desired facility will meet the needs of the Arts focused curriculum program described in the educational plan. The description indicates a media center will be provided for student use, but there is no reference to a media center elsewhere in the application. (Standard 4, 14, and 17)
 - The facility section indicates that the facility will meet the needs of the school for the first three years of the charter. It is not clear where the students will be housed during the last 2 years of the charter. The application states that the facility will expand to "at least 332 students during the first three years". This plan does not adequately reflect the anticipated projection of 376 students by year 5 of the charter. (Standard 2, and 4)
 - The facility cost reported in Section 14 is not aligned with the allocations provided in the budget, \$900 and \$600 per student, respectively. (Standard 14, and 17)
 - The applicant does not provide an adequate back up plan to ensure an appropriate facility for the duration of the anticipated contract. (Standard 14)
 - The timeline for the facility plan does not align with the Action Plan provided. (Standard 14, and 19)
9. Failure to provide a thoughtful and realistic implementation plan that covers major operational items and ensures the school will be ready to serve its student on the first day of school. (Standard 19)
- The enrollment and facility timelines are not aligned with the timeline provided with the action plan. (Standard 13, 14, and 19)

- The action plan provided is incomplete. February is completely missing, even though it is part of the timeline provided in the facility section. (Standard 14, and 19)
- It is not clear when staff will report initially report. (Standard 19)
- The action plan includes finalizing a contract with an ESP but Section 11 indicates that the school does not intend to contract with an ESP. (Standard 11, and 19)
- The following key elements were not included in the action plan: principal hire date, assessment and acquisition of adequate technology, and/or staff development. (Standard 19)
- The timeline provided does not address the required training of the members of this new governing board. It is not clear when the governing board members will undergo the clearance process or when it will meet to establish policies and procedures. This demonstrates the applicant's lack of awareness about the importance of allowing sufficient planning to ensure that all school operations are ready prior to the opening of school. (Standard 19)
- The timetable provided also does not address processing all potential employees (fingerprinting and background checks). A complete understanding of this process is important to ensure that the school will be fully staffed 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 to deny the application, 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.