

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION – TOPIC SUMMARY

Topic: Request for Board Sponsorship: Cascade Locks Community Public Charter School

Date: April 14-15, 2011

Staff/Office: Susan Inman, Margaret Bates/Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation

Action Requested: Informational Only Adoption Later Adoption Adoption/Consent Agenda

ISSUE BEFORE THE BOARD:

State Board Sponsorship of the Cascade Locks Community Charter School

BACKGROUND:

The Cascade Locks Community Charter School (CLCCS) is a proposed comprehensive K-12 charter school located in the Hood River County School District. The Hood River County School District has an enrollment of approximately 4,000 students and currently sponsors no charter schools. CLCCS plans to provide a K-12 education defined by small community school environment, service learning, place/project/proficiency-based learning. The school seeks to enroll 150 students.

The Cascade Locks Community Charter School developers received a federal Public Charter School Program Incentive Grant December 14, 2009.

ORS 338.075 states “If a school district board does not approve a proposal to start a public charter school pursuant to ORS 338.055, the applicant may request that the State Board of Education review the decision of the school district board.”

The Cascade Locks Community Charter School made initial application to the Hood River County School District Board for sponsorship March 8, 2010. The Hood River County School District Board denied the application on May 26, 2010. The Cascade Locks Community Charter School developers submitted a remediated proposal on September 7, 2010 and were denied sponsorship again by the Hood River County School District Board on September 27, 2010.

The following is the basis for the Hood River County School District denial:

- ORS 338.055(2)(c) – *capability to provide comprehensive instructional programs*
- ORS 338.055(2)(d) – *capability to provide comprehensive instructional programs to academically low achieving*
- ORS 338.055(2)(f) – *adverse impact*

Following are the steps required upon the receipt of a request for review:

1. An attempt at mediation between the applicant and the school district board; and
2. Consideration by the State Board of Education to sponsor the public charter school.

On December 7, 2010, ODE received notification mediation was unsuccessful. Cascade Locks Community Charter School requested consideration for sponsorship by the State Board of Education on December 10, 2010. Following the established appeal and sponsorship process, Department staff conducted a substantive review of the proposal using criteria set forth in ORS 338.045 and 338.055. A review panel consisted of internal and external reviews with expertise in curriculum, school finance, governance and innovative learning models.

The review panel indicated the proposal **did not meet** the criteria established in ORS 338.055(2). The following list identifies criteria not met:

- ORS 338.055(2)(c) – *capability to provide comprehensive instructional programs*
- ORS 338.055(2)(d) – *capability to provide comprehensive instructional programs to academically low achieving*

At the March 2011 State Board of Education meeting, both the Hood River County School District staff and the Cascade Locks Community Charter School developers were given the opportunity to address the Board.

POLICY QUESTIONS:

None at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Superintendent and ODE Staff recommend the State Board of Education deny the proposed sponsorship of the Cascade Locks Community Charter School. This was brought forward for first reading at the March 2011 State Board of Education Meeting. It is before the State Board now for final decision.

ATTACHMENTS:

A – Official Memo to Susan Castillo, Superintendent of Public Instruction

B – Combined Report: Oregon State Board of Education Charter School Proposal Review and Analysis Rubric

TO: Susan Castillo, Superintendent of Public Instruction
FROM: Colleen Mileham, Assistant Superintendent
RE: Cascade Locks Community Charter School Request for State Board Sponsorship

Cascade Locks Community Charter School received a procedural and substantive review according to State Board established procedures. A procedural review of the Hood River County School District charter school evaluation process found the district was in compliance with charter school law and charter school application timelines.

A substantive review of the charter proposal was conducted in January and February by a review team consisting of ODE staff, charter school developers and sponsors, individuals with expertise in curriculum, school finance, governance and alternative learning environments. Attached is a copy of the summary of that review.

The review indicated the proposal did not meet the criteria established by the State Board of Education for sponsorship in the following areas:

- ORS 338.055(2)(c) – capability to provide comprehensive instructional programs
- ORS 338.055(2)(d) – capability to provide comprehensive instructional programs to academically low achieving

Both the applicant and the School District staff will be given the opportunity to address the State Board of Education during the March 2011 meeting.

The staff recommends the Cascade Locks Community Charter School's request for State Board sponsorship be denied.

Cc: Cindy Hunt
Margaret Bates

**Oregon State Board of Education
Charter School Proposal Review and Analysis Rubric**

<p align="center">Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p align="center">Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>(a) The identification of the applicant</p>	<p>Applicant identification is evidenced by a listing of the names of key school founders.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>specification of each person’s role with the proposed school and relevant experience/expertise.</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six key school founders were identified. There was some mention of relevant experience and/or expertise amongst the founders. Additionally, Appendix F provided short biographies for each of the founders. While the founders are well-described, it is somewhat hard to determine how they would be involved beyond the first stages of launching the school. Application identifies the school founders including the specific roles and relevant training and experience of each. A list of founders as well as their qualifications and the roles they will play in the school is provided. A complete listing of key school founders with specific role of each member and experience/expertise detailed in proposal.
<p>(b) The name of the proposed public charter school</p>	<p>The proposed public charter school name is evidenced by a clear indication of the name.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a consistent use of the name throughout the proposal.</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school, if sponsored, plans to be called, “Cascade Locks Community School (CLCS).” The school’s name is clearly stated. The proposed name is provided and used throughout the application. Consistent reference to Cascade Locks Community School (CLCS) throughout proposal.
<p>(c) A description of the philosophy and mission of</p>	<p>The philosophy is evidenced by a clear description of the proposed school’s approach to education. The mission is</p>

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>the public charter school</p>	<p>evidenced by clear statements that convey the school’s vision for the education of its students.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>clear, focused and compelling</i> • <i>likely to improve education outcomes</i> • <i>expresses a clear guiding purpose</i> • <i>identifies priorities that are consistent with the intent of ORS 338.015</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school’s vision works toward providing an academic program that is aligned to ODE standards. The school plans to provide a small school environment, hands-on learning and local partnerships. • The school proposes serving up to 150 K-12 students within the Hood River County School District. Efforts will be made to recruit homeschoolers and students from neighboring school districts. • The proposal asserts that students will meet or surpass state benchmarks and the school will result in an increased graduation rate. • The mission of improving academic achievement, promoting citizenship & stewardship, and ensuring individualized learning is apparent. • The mission is clearly stated and reflects the spirit of the charter school legislation. • The school’s mission and philosophy are clearly stated and driven by sound and innovative practices in the field of education. It is likely to improve the outcome of the students it serves and provide a great alternative traditional public schooling in the area • Clear descriptions of research based programs included with detailed impact on student academic growth tied to charter’s goals and mission/vision statements.
<p>(d) A description of the curriculum of the public charter school</p>	<p>The curriculum description is evidenced by an explanation of the instructional approach/methodology and an outline of each content area addressed within the public charter school. <i>The description includes how the school’s comprehensive education program will meet the needs of ALL students, particularly academically low-achieving students</i></p>

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>curriculum framework is clearly presented, aligned with the school’s mission, and provides an appropriate level of detail for objectives, content, and skills for each subject and for all grades the school will serve</i> • <i>curriculum is supported by research and/or by applicant experience</i> • <i>educational program is a good match for the target student population</i> • <i>a clear outline of how the school will monitor the implementation of the curriculum</i> • <i>a cohesive and coherent description of all components</i> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Meets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school plans to emphasize a hands-on experiential leaning model. It also plans to use (mainly) curriculum that has already been adopted by the district. Teacher time (this would be critical) would be provided once the materials are in hand to allow development of lessons, units and projects- assuring that the curriculum is “served up” using the hands-on experiential model. • Appendix A included a detailed curriculum map for the Saxon Math curriculum. • Although the proposal listed materials (again- many already adopted and in use by the district) for mathematics, languages arts, social studies and science @ each level (K-6, 7-8 and 9-12) what was lacking was any specifics regarding the language arts materials. Basically, the proposal offered that the school would (in language arts) rely on teacher-selected novels. This lack of specificity as to how this would actually be implemented is too big of a hole for this reader to mark a “meets” in the area of description of curriculum. Said another way- the description of curriculum used in language arts at the school was insufficient. • The proposal did provide a middle school and high school course schedule. • There was little mention of how the curriculum would meet the needs of low-academically achieving students. • The curriculum is well-described, but does not include detail or examples of how the district curriculum will be integrated into the teacher-developed units & assessments. This is a HUGE amount of work and it is not clear the founders have a credible plan for training teachers, mapping curriculum, creating rigorous and relevant projects, service-learning units,

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>assessments for proficiency and/or place-based activities. It is hard to tell how the small middle / high school program would be able to offer the variety of courses to students and how scheduling would work (the group seemed to shift to on-line only in response to district’s questions, which really doesn’t make sense in the context of place-based or project-based learning w/ out a LOT of work customizing and overseeing the on-line curriculum).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proficiency-based, service learning model is described. This application could be improved by including the curriculum alignment for additional subjects. • Proposal states that staff will use most of the existing Hood River SD text adoptions for core classes, except in the area of math and reading instruction – they intend to use *Saxon Math exclusively and HM’s *A Legacy of Literature (2002) K-5. • In addition to core text books, they propose that a multi-age (1st – 8th) classroom will provide interventions that may be needed to support individual student needs rather than a specialized curriculum. Students will be able to focus on what is important to them and build relationships with other students and staff. • *Note* This reviewer has reservations about the charter’s use of Saxon Elementary Math as a core math program for the K-5 & 9-12 students as well as the HM Legacy of Literature core reading for K-3 students . <p style="text-align: center;">Mathematics K-5 & 9-12 Exclusive use of Saxon Math Concerns</p> <p>The ED Gov. -What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) concluded that there is no evidence of growth in mathematics for this age group using Saxon Elementary School Math.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The WWC considers the extent of evidence for <i>Saxon Elementary School Math</i> to be small for math achievement. <i>Saxon Elementary School Math</i> was found to have no discernible effects on math achievement.”</p> <p>http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/WWC_Saxon_Math_043007.pdf</p> <p>Saxon Math does seem to have promise as an <i>intervention</i> math program for grades 6-8 based on WWC findings.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“One study of <i>Saxon Math</i> meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards, and four studies meet WWC evidence standards with reservations. The five studies included over 6,500 students from grades 6 to 8 in 52 schools in four states.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Based on these five studies, the WWC considers the extent of evidence for <i>Saxon Math</i> to be medium to large for math achievement.”</p> <p>http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_saxonmath_042010.pdf</p> <p>There is no study that meets WWC standards showing that Saxon Math increased math achievement at the high school</p>

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>level. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/Topicarea.aspx?tid=05 Reading Instruction using HM Legacy of Literature Exclusively at grades K-3 Concerns Because fewer than 35 % of fourth graders are proficient readers, No Child Left Behind requires schools to use research-based reading programs: A primary focus of this law is the requirement that school districts and individual schools use effective research-based reading remediation programs so all children are reading at grade level by the end of third grade. The law authorizes funds 'to provide assistance to State educational agencies and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs for students in kindergarten through grade 3 that are based on scientifically based reading research, to ensure that every student can read at grade level or above no later than the end of grade 3.' (20 U.S.C.§ 6361)" This charter proposal states that the K-8 students will be taught to read using HM Legacy of Literature. This program is not a research based reading program for K-3 students, and no mention of a research based intervention reading program is included for struggling readers in this grade range. Swartz, J & Johnston, K. (2003). <i>Efficacy study of Houghton Mifflin Reading: A legacy of literacy, final report</i>. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.</p>
<p>(e) A description of expected results of the curriculum and the verified methods of measuring and reporting objective results that will show the growth of knowledge of students attending the public charter school and allow comparisons with public schools</p>	<p>Proposal outlines in detail the expected results of the curriculum, such as student and school outcomes and goals. Plans to measure outcomes with verified methods and objective reporting are evidenced by a well- developed and comprehensive plan for assessing student and school goals. Oregon State Assessments and other means of yielding data allowing comparisons with other public schools are clearly described.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>alignment with school's mission</i> • <i>goals are clear, specific, measureable, ambitious and attainable</i> • <i>objectives follow clearly from the goals</i> • <i>a clear plan for the school to meet AYP</i> • <i>clear realistic strategies for improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps</i> • <i>understanding of and strategy for complying with state achievement and reporting requirements</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school offers to partner with the district to develop and

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>act as a pilot partner for new measurement tools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals (although not SMART goals) were listed in the following areas: 1) OAKS- English, language arts and math goals were listed. 2) MAP- Annual growth was expected in reading, mathematics and writing. 3) Surveys- the assessments for non-academic goals. • Basically, regarding OAKS achievement, a student who had not met the state benchmark was “goaled” to increase their scores by @ least 5% during the year. Additionally, the school’s scores @ each grade level (assumed) would be higher than the HRCSD’s scores in each OAKS area. However, the timeline for this latter goal set was not specific-reading, “within three years.” • Additionally, each student in the school would meet goals in public speaking and each student’s cultural experience would be “widened.” K-8 students would have a goal in place-based learning and high school students would have requirements in the area of community service projects. • Whereas the goals appeared to be valid goals and included not only academic attainment (OAKS), growth (MAP) and non-academic areas (surveys), the format of the goals would be greatly improved by converting them to a SMART goal format. • No mention of plan for meeting AYP or of complying with state achievement and reporting requirements. Benchmarks are based solely on outperforming the sponsor district without providing any information about the current performance of district. No plan for how often testing will be reported to district. No plan for accountability to charter’s own board, or to families attending. • There is a basic description of the assessment plan and outcome goals. This application could be improved by having the academic & service goals articulated in SMART format • The schools learning outcomes and goals are provided and are definitely ambitious. There could be a bit more explanation for what exactly the applicant means regarding expected OAKS test score results but the use of both OAKS testing and MAPS testing will certainly provide a good picture of student learning when combined with the more authentic learning exhibitions that the school is planning. • The founders have done an extensive job of researching 7 distinctive learning and teaching techniques that align well with the vision and mission for the proposed charter school. • They will employ a Proficiency Based Grading model using common core standards and Student Plan of Achievement

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>(SPA) to track academic and social progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CLCS will provide a comparison of data with Hood River SD state assessment scores in comparable sub-groups as well as chart progress using MAP testing to show annual student growth in reading, math and writing. • Proposal allows for State Assessment and MAP testing to be conducted electronically several times a year with teacher review after each session. • Teachers are expected to customize remediation for students not meeting standards in each content area measured.
<p>(f) The governance structure of the public charter school</p>	<p>The governance structure is evidenced by assurances of non-profit and tax-exempt status and description of key features of the school's governance model.</p> <p>Preferable factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>proposed board members will contribute a wide range of experience and expertise needed to oversee a successful charter school such as education, management, financial planning and community outreach</i> • <i>comprehensive plan for providing board training</i> • <i>clear description of selection and removal procedures, term limits, meeting schedules, and powers and roles of board members</i> • <i>clear distinction between the roles and responsibilities of the board members and school administrators</i> • <i>plan for meaningful involvement of parents and community members in the governance of the school</i> • <i>sufficient time, money and personnel allocated for planning and start-up prior to the school's opening</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirteen members (and their qualification/expertise) of the charter school board were listed. • Board duties were also described in the proposal. • Finally, the proposal also included Board procedures in the following areas: Selection of Board and Board training • Board contains much support and many areas of expertise. Excellent description of board duties and plans for board training. • The governance board is clearly described, along with the planned training. The policy board model of governance provides a clear distinction between board and administrative

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>personnel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This application could be improved by a more detailed explanation of parent involvement. • The governance structure of the school is already in place. The school has formed a board and the board has plenty of experience in many fields to guide the school. Additionally, the applicant provided a comprehensive plan for board member terms, training and selection and plans to involve two parents on the their board as well. The community is well engaged in the governance and formation of the school. • Duties are clearly defined with specific details for each key group. • Extensive training for Charter Board is planned with specific content and date range of trainings included. • Specific selection procedures for board selection, parent and community membership is outlined in proposal. • Several parent survey data will be collected annually with a report of the findings shared with staff, charter board and included in the school’s annual report to the public.
<p>(g) The projected enrollment to be maintained and the ages or grades to be served</p>	<p>Enrollment and ages/grades served is evidenced by a clear description of anticipated enrollment (by age/grade) for at least three years (and for the duration of the desired charter term, if longer than three years).</p> <p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a complete description of the student population the school intends to serve</i> • <i>evidence of strong support from an adequate number of parents, or community members, or any combination thereof</i> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1 Meets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The narrative had one sentence regarding projected enrollment. Basically, it said the school’s projected enrollment would grow to 150 students. As a reader, my district would expect more in this area. For example: 1) What projected beginning enrollment is anticipated? 2) What grade level caps or enrollments are expected? 3) By what date would the school reach 150 students? • The enrollment projection does not contain description of the model of growth being employed, the number of students in each grade, the target population or any information about the community interest (though that is present in other sections) and numbers of prospective students to get them to the

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school’s projected enrollment is not clearly articulated. It is unclear whether the projection is 150 total student or 150 additional students in the term of the incentive grant (or after). • This application could be improved by describing the number of student projected to enroll for each of years 1, 2 & 3. • The student population the school intends to serve is well described and several possible scenarios are provided for the gradual enrollment of the student body. There is a very strong showing of community and parent support for the school and it should easily be able to reach its target population. • The charter had a great number of responses from families and community members supporting the existence of such a charter. It is difficult to tell if all of the families have school age children who will attend the charter, if granted. • The charter proposal projects start-up of 100+ students in the first year, with projected 150 students in grades K-12 by the end of 3 years of operation. • Students will be taught in multi-age classrooms with a projection of: 1 teacher @ grades K-3, 1 teacher @ grades 4-6 and 3 teachers @ grades 7-12. • Students will be recruited from Hood River SD, homeschooling families, and students from neighboring districts.
<p>(h) The target population of students the public charter school will be designed to serve</p>	<p>The target population to be served is evidenced by a description of student demographics and characteristics.</p> <p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>evidence that founders understand key student populations and demographics within the district which are likely to influence the proposed school’s student body and needs</i> • <i>evidence of targeted student’s current levels of achievement and instructional needs</i> • <i>evidence of a need in the community to serve the target student population</i> • <i>evidence of sufficient interest in the school to fill the proposed number of student openings</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal minimally met the requirement pertaining to target population. Basically, the proposal says that it’s open to all (state law) and that there would be an effort to recruit

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>area homeschoolers and students in neighboring districts. No specific target population was noted that could be tied back to why the vision/mission/instructional model would be “good for them” compared to “regular school.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No explanation of the demographics of students within the district, no evidence of current achievement levels of targeted students, no evidence of need / interest presented here • The characteristics of the students (except for homeschooled students) are not clearly described. • The student population of the area is well described and there is a clear need for the charter school in the area since the local school district no longer serves all grades in the area and the provided support letters demonstrate a clear interest in a K-12 school with the applicant’s educational philosophy for the area. • Charter proposal has responses regarding serving ELL students, SPED students if the need arises, but I found no evidence of demographics of community to be served in the plan. There is no mention of SES or race-ethnicity, special needs, English Language Learners or any reference to the demographic makeup of population to be served.
<p>(i) A description of any distinctive learning or teaching techniques to be used in the public charter school</p>	<p>Distinctive learning and teaching techniques are evidenced by a detailed description of educational model(s), activities, and/or delivery strategies that will characterize the school.</p> <p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>clear, focused and compelling</i> • <i>likely to improve educational outcomes</i> • <i>expresses a clear, guiding purpose aligned with the mission and vision</i> • <i>supported by research, applicant experience, and/or sound reasoning behind techniques</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal identified eight (although the proposal said seven) distinctive learning and/or teaching techniques: Place based learning, Project based learning, Service learning, High quality internships, Credit by proficiency, Advisory classes, Multi-aged classrooms (blends), Use of instructional elements from the Coalition of Essential Skills • Narratives were provided for each element- generally describing the concept. Additionally, where possible, the proposal referred to relevant research with which to support

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>the use of the techniques.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the exception of project-based learning, the techniques were well-described and made sense within the context of the school’s vision. Some question whether a school so small would do better focusing in a little tighter rather than putting forth so many different initiatives. • The small school environment, service/place-based learning plan and the state content standard accountability are present in the curriculum section of the application. • The learning and teaching techniques are clearly described and are very likely to improve the educational outcomes of the students the school plans to serve. The vision and mission of the school is clear and compelling. The applicant has provided a lot of documented research for to back up how their vision will improve educational outcomes. • The founders have done an extensive job of researching 7 distinctive learning and teaching techniques that align well with the charter’s vision and mission for the charter. They have included details and research studies that are tied to each of the models. • However, some of these models are outdated and may not be “best practices” for teaching. • It is difficult to believe that all 7 of these models can be implemented to fidelity by a collection of staff that equal approx. 5 FTE working together for the first time and implement successfully in the first few years. • It takes at least 3 years of training and trial to implement a teaching model to fidelity. • I see no Professional Development funding in the budget until year 3 by design. The founders have decided to use the federal funding to support this effort, but have not provided a budget or a plan for how this funding will actually be spent. • Will all staff come to the school prepared to use all 7 teaching models without any training? The plan is ambitious –is this really in the best interest of the students? • The proposal follows the letter of the law for charter requirements.
<p>(j) The legal address, facilities and physical location of the public charter school, if known</p>	<p>School’s address, if known, and legal/ mailing address.</p> <p>Preferable factors If a facility has been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>designation of the proposed facility</i> • <i>evidence the facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected</i>

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p><i>student enrollment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>adequate reflection of the costs associated with the proposed facility in the budget, including rent, utilities, and maintenance</i> • <i>assurance the proposed facility will be in compliance with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)</i> • <i>sound plan to identify needed renovation as well as the funds and timeline for the completion of those renovations</i> <p><i>If a facility has not yet been identified:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>description of anticipated facilities needs including evidence the facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment</i> • <i>inclusion of costs associated with the anticipated facilities needs in the budget, including permits, rent, utilities, and maintenance</i> • <i>evidence to indicate facilities-related budget assumptions are realistic based on anticipated location, size, etc</i> • <i>assurance the proposed location will be in compliance with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)</i> • <i>plan for finding a location, including a proposed schedule for doing so</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although no solid site has been secured (waiting until sponsorship has been determined) the school commits to having a facility within the HRCSD attendance area. The school would like to partner with the district in renting space at the Cascade Locks School site. • The school also is committed to providing a safe and secure learning environment. Toward that end, the school will secure all necessary permits and approvals. The proposal also suggested that the school is committed to providing funds to remodel should such renovation be necessary or desired. • Credible plan for locating facility has been presented. • An explanation and a timeline for acquiring a facility and meeting all applicable codes and requirements is provided. The budget includes adequate funds for leasing a facility and the applicant has identified some suitable sites for their school.

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan includes extensive ideas for school location, including budget and policies for safety and ADA requirements.
<p>(k) A description of admission policies and application procedures</p>	<p>The admission policies and application procedures, including lottery procedures are evidenced by specific descriptions aligned with ORS Chapter 338.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>clear description of the enrollment policy, including lottery procedures consistent with the requirements of ORS 338.125</i> <i>clear procedures for withdrawals and transfers from the school that will support an orderly transition for exiting students or a clear plan for developing such procedures</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admissions policy and procedures were included in the proposal as were lottery details. These processes coincided with state charter school law in these areas. This application could be improved by a clear transition of records procedure for entering and withdrawing students. Admissions policies and how the school will handle withdrawals and transfers in clearly provided. Clearly meets the requirement for Policy admissions and procedures. The lottery policy mirrors Oregon’s Charter School law lottery scheme.
<p>(L) The statutes and rules that shall apply to the public charter school</p>	<p>Statutes and Rules that apply to the school are evidenced through an encompassing written statement of compliance with all laws listed as applicable to charter schools in ORS 338.115(1).</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>citation of any statutes or rules in addition to those listed in ORS 338.115 (1) and copies of policies or a timeline for policy development</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate statutes and rules were identified that would apply to the charter school. There is evidence of extensive research regarding potential facilities available for use by the school. The applicant provides a complete list of all necessary

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>statutes and rules that the school will comply with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal contains a paragraph that states the charter will comply with all statutes, rules and regulations. It also states that it will comply with ORS 338.115 (4) and ORS 338.035(7).
<p>(m) The proposed budget and financial plan for the public charter school and evidence that the proposed budget and financial plan for the public charter school are financially sound</p>	<p>Demonstration of a sound budget and financial plan is evidenced by documentation of a detailed three-five year budget, accurate projection of revenues and expenditures based on prevailing costs and other factors that contribute to solvency.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>budget assumptions and financial planning based on realistic revenue and expenditure projections for the term of the contract, including based on minimum enrollment needed for solvency</i> • <i>spending priorities aligned with the school’s mission, curriculum, and plans for management, professional development, and growth</i> • <i>realistic cash flow projection for the first year of operation, including a plan for funding cash flow shortfalls</i> • <i>sound financial management systems</i> • <i>plan for making required school and employee contributions to PERS</i> • <i>adequate and reasonable plan to manage start-up costs</i> • <i>description of how the school will conduct an annual audit of the financial operations</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal provided three budget scenarios: 1) A proposal with the school starting with 130 students and increasing to 150 students. 2) A proposal that had the school fully attending @ 150 students from day one. 3) A worst-case scenario-providing a budget for 57 students. • The proposal included five-year budgets for the first two scenarios and a one-year budget for the worst-case scenario. • The budgets only included income received from ADMw. The budgets did not include (by design) any federal grant funds. Also, the budgets did not include any soft money- such as fund-raised monies. • Salary and benefit data was provided for all five years of the first two scenarios and for the first year of the worst-case scenario. • Regarding most of the budgets, a healthy ending fund

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p>balance (or carryover) was budgeted beginning at the end of year one. However, the scenario that projected the school being full (150 students) from day one had ending fund balances that some would consider excessive. Said another way, some patrons, might want to know why the available funds weren't being spent on educating the students. However, the proposal noted that it would be considered to use some of these funds to, eventually, purchase a facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems likely worst case scenario of enrollment is most likely ... does not offer ability to align with the group's priorities and multitude of hoped for educational initiatives. Unsustainable w/out major changes to program design. • The budget information is clear and complete. There is adequate evidence of multiple scenarios for budget options. • The budget is very complete and conservative and includes three different sample budgets to reflect varying enrollment levels. It does not rely on fundraising or other soft funds and includes ample reserve funds. The applicant has relied upon the knowledge of another charter school with a sound financial record and plans to involve this school in the formation of their financial management plan. • This section meets the letter of the law, but rater has reservations about school / student success based on low budget projections for instructional needs. • Very detailed budget. Budget includes realistic expenditure projections without figuring in federal soft grant funds to show sustainability of the charter school. However important aspects of school success (e.g. student materials and textbooks, technology and professional development for staff) are not included in the submitted budget due to the decision to not reflect federal grant funding. • PERS and medical insurance costs are figured in to the staff budget for full time personnel, start-up costs seem low for student needs. • I see no budget allowance for staff development (mentioned in narrative only as a way to use federal grant funds if needed), minimal amounts of funding is allocated for student textbooks and student software, hardware purchases for the first 3 years. These line items are important to the success of student outcomes and would be expected to be included in a current and forward thinking "sustainable" school budget. • Consumable and other purchased services in year 1 – year 5 seem high for Administration, Support Services, Janitorial Services and Building Improvements - compared to funds allocated for instruction, almost 5 X the cost of instruction

Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)	Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale												
	<p>(without payroll costs included).</p> <p>Year 1</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>K-3 = \$3,552</td> <td>6 – 8 = \$4,224</td> <td>School Board \$17,430</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/5 = \$1,220</td> <td>9-12 = \$11,423</td> <td>Administration \$ 25,850</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Support Svs. \$48,342</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Janitorial Svs + Building Imp. \$ 7,940</td> </tr> </table> <p>Instruction Costs = \$ 20,419 Operational Costs = \$ 99,562</p>	K-3 = \$3,552	6 – 8 = \$4,224	School Board \$17,430	4/5 = \$1,220	9-12 = \$11,423	Administration \$ 25,850			Support Svs. \$48,342			Janitorial Svs + Building Imp. \$ 7,940
K-3 = \$3,552	6 – 8 = \$4,224	School Board \$17,430											
4/5 = \$1,220	9-12 = \$11,423	Administration \$ 25,850											
		Support Svs. \$48,342											
		Janitorial Svs + Building Imp. \$ 7,940											
<p>(n) A description of the financial management systems for the public charter school and a plan for having the financial management systems in place at the time the school begins operating</p>	<p>The financial management systems are evidenced by documentation of board and staff management responsibilities, fiscal policies, budget development and oversight system, creating and using budgets, balance sheets reflecting assets, expenditures and liabilities, accounting systems, payroll, insurance and benefits, financial reporting, internal controls (staffing policies and procedures), the audit (understanding, conducting and preparing for an audit and using 990s.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>clear description of the financial responsibilities of the charter board as it compares to the staff responsibilities</i> • <i>a check and balance system described for budget development and the oversight system during the budget year</i> • <i>board policies describing the internal controls for receiving revenue and paying bills</i> • <i>clear operating standards for financial management with a consistent foundation, institutionalized practice in the event of leadership or staff turnover</i> • <i>processes reflecting annual review of such systems by both the public charter school and sponsor</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal included an Appendix C which described the school’s financial management system plan. The plan describes elements such as: routine reporting, cash management, record-keeping procedures, segregation of financial duties, annual financial review • Included in Appendix C were examples of documents and policies being used by Kings Valley Charter School. CLCS plans (if sponsored) to pattern its documents and policies after Kings Valley. • The proposal’s description of a financial management system was very thorough. 												

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good description of how small organization will perform duties of fiscal operation. Same concern as district raised, though ... how will all this be accomplished with a .1 FTE administrator? • The applicant has already established an accounting system and created budget sheets aligned with the ODE account codes. The responsibilities and necessary checks and balances between board and staff are clearly described. The audit and bookkeeping are described and included in the budget. • On page 33 of the charter it states clearly the financial responsibilities of the charter board – including; financial requirements, fund raising, annual budget, and maintenance of financial records. The school administrator will advise charter board on budgetary issues. • Appendix C: Financial Management Plan is modeled after a successful charter school, Kings Valley in Philomath, Oregon and contains many of their documents as examples. • The charter proposes to use “Quickbooks” for financial management record keeping and checks and balances. • There is clear evidence that the staff policies and procedures are planned according to Generally Accepted Accounting Procedures and that internal control measures are in place for tracking expenses in a responsible manner.
<p>(o) The standards for behavior and the procedures for the discipline, suspension or expulsion of students</p>	<p>Clear description of standards for student behavior and accompanying discipline procedures, which include suspension and expulsion procedures.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>policies for addressing expulsion, suspension and education of expelled or suspended students providing adequate safety of students and staff; provide due process for students; serve the best interest of the school’s students; create a positive environment for learning</i> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a description of student standards for behavior</i> • <i>a clear plan for developing such policies including a schedule for doing so</i> • <i>an explanation of how the proposed school will conduct appeals for students facing expulsion</i> • <i>a description of how students will be expelled, for what offenses and which schools they will be expelled from if the expulsion hearing is conducted by the proposed charter school</i>

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school plans to implement PBS within the school. The proposal also stated that the school WOULD develop procedures and policies pertaining to standards of behavior and a description of discipline, suspensions and expulsions. • This reader did not rate the proposal’s attention to this element as “meets” due to the expectation that there should be (at proposal time) a “clear description of standards for student behavior and accompanying discipline procedures- which include suspension and expulsion procedures.” Simply said, the proposal did not include the specificity required to meet the standard. • The applicant plans to create a student handbook prior to opening and has provided guidelines for student suspension and expulsion. • On page 40 of the charter application, clear research based guidelines are included in procedures outline. The charter intends to follow a Positive Behavior Support (PBS) model for the school.
<p>(p) The proposed school calendar for the public charter school including length of school day and school year</p>	<p>The school calendar is evidenced by a description or calendaring of school days; the length of the school year and the length of a school day that meet the instructional time requirements in OAR 581-022-1620.</p> <p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>school day and school calendar are structured in ways that align with the educational program</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal informed the reader that the school calendar would be a four-day week- and “generally follow HRCSD’s calendar.” Unfortunately, the proposal did not include information regarding the length of a school day or any assurance that the calendar would meet the OAR requirements regarding instructional time. • Not sure if the charter is proposing a 4-day or 5-day week ... if 4-day, more information on the schedule would be useful. • The applicant plans to follow their district’s calendar. • Charter is planning on following the Hood River School District academic calendar. There was some confusion regarding a 4 or 5 day school week, but this was cleared up

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>(q) A description of the proposed staff members and required qualifications of teachers at the public charter school</p>	<p>by following the HRSD calendar.</p> <p>All proposed staff positions and qualifications are described.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>explanation of the relationship that will exist between the charter school and its employees</i> • <i>employment policies of the school OR clear plan for timely development of such policies</i> • <i>plans for ensuring all staff meet ESEA Highly Qualified Teachers requirements</i> • <i>staffing plan that clearly describes qualification, roles and responsibilities of each staff member, including school administrator</i> • <i>description of ongoing professional development for staff, aligned to school's mission</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal assured that the school would require background checks on all employees. All teachers will be highly qualified and 1/2 of the teachers/administrator will be licensed. • The proposal included a list of school positions with a brief description of each position's role and licensing expectation. • The qualifications do not go beyond licensing requirements ... no description of skills, etc. the applicants should possess. No description of the development plan for employment policies, who will employ the employees (charter or district), no professional development plan. • Staff positions and qualifications are provided and the school plans to meet all necessary licensing, registering and ESEA Highly Qualified Teacher requirements and provides a plan for providing this documentation to their district. I was somewhat concerned at the number of responsibilities that are to be given to a half-time administrator, including the maintenance of student records, but the school does have sufficient reserve funds to fund a full-time administrator should the need arise. • The proposal meets the letter of the law in that they have an extensive list of qualifications for instructional staff and will hire only "highly qualified" instructional staff as required by federal and state law for charter schools (eg, TSPC charter school registry certificate, bachelors degree or passing scores on PRAXIS) at least 1/2 of the instructional staff is licensed by the state of Oregon.

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *No professional development activities listed in proposal submitted.
<p>(r) The date upon which the public charter school would begin operating</p>	<p>The operational date is evidenced by a clear statement of projected start date.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a description of the process for opening the school on the projected start date</i> <i>a timeline outlining the significant items needed to open the school by the projected date.</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school proposes starting school the first Monday after Labor Day. Since the proposal listed 2010 as the desired start date, it's assumed the school would work with the eventual sponsor to solidify the date. A date is listed ... a timeline for completion of the items needed to be completed prior to opening would be useful. The operational date of the school was provided. Start date is listed as the same as HRSD for 2010.
<p>(s) The arrangements for any necessary special education and related services provided pursuant to ORS 338.165 for children with disabilities who may attend the public charter school</p>	<p>The arrangements for special education and related services are evidenced in a comprehensive description which aligns with ORS 338.165.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>realistic plan to identify and meet the general education learning needs of, resident and non-resident students with disabilities</i> <i>timeline, lead contact, and intervention process with specific action steps for meeting learning needs of students with suspected special needs</i> <i>plans for serving special populations align with the overall curriculum, instructional approaches, and the school mission</i> <i>plan for contracting with resident districts for providing Identification and IEP services for students with suspected or special needs.</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school plans to work with the HRCSD to assure that students on IEPs receive appropriate special education services.

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school will also work with other school districts of IEP students who are “non-resident” students. • Finally, the school plans to participate in Child Find activities. • Realistic & adequate plan for identifying and working w/ district to serve sped. Students. • The school has provided and special education plan for students both within and outside of their district and plans use Child Find to identify children who may be eligible for services. • Charter proposal identifies HRSD as providing SPED services for SPED students at CLCS. If students attend from a neighboring district, then that district will work with CLCS to provide SPED services for the student. The proposal will participate in SPED <i>child find</i> to make sure the SPED student needs are met and that the charter school is the most appropriate placement for the child.
<p>(t) Information on the manner in which community groups may be involved in the planning and development process of the public charter school</p>	<p>Plans to involve the community in the planning and development of the public charter school are described in detail (e.g., identification of key community groups or members the developers will access given the school’s mission and target population, tactics to engage key community constituents, the process of how community input will be sought, etc.).</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>sound outreach plan to inform parent and members of the community about the operations of the school, including providing information about the school to students of all races, languages, and abilities, a timeline for implementation, a lead contact, and specific action steps</i> • <i>evidence the proposed school is welcomed by the larger community, has formed partnerships with community organizations, and is viewed as an attractive educational alternative that reflects the community’s needs and interests</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal included thirteen community groups that would be potential partners in the school. Additionally, information was provided regarding how each group might be involved. • Clear community involvement and support for charter school from multitude of community partners, families and citizens. Not sure the demographics so more emphasis on how outreach will be conducted with the population (in what languages, by what modes, etc.) would be useful.

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a substantial number of letters of support from a variety of community members exhibiting support of the proposed school. • This is a major strength for the applicant. The community seems very supportive of the school. Many letters have been provided by the applicant that represents a large number of community members, both parents and businesses, who support the school. The community has been involved thus far in the planning and development of the school and the governing board represents many strong community members as well. A community liaison position has even been created and funded by the school. • The charter is based on community involvement and contributions from the local community. This section of the proposal is strong and detailed with many community supports built into student success.
<p>(u) The term of the charter</p>	<p>The term of the charter is evidenced by a proposed beginning and ending date for the charter contract; proposed term must be a minimum of one year and maximum of five years.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school is proposing a five-year charter which is allowable by law. Obviously, if sponsored, the school would need to negotiate the initial term length with the sponsor. • The term of the charter is proved and meets appropriate guidelines. • Requesting a 5 year charter.
<p>(v) The plan for performance bonding or insuring the public charter school, including buildings and liabilities</p>	<p>The insurance plan is evidenced through a description of the types and levels of insurance coverage the school plans to purchase or a description of the plan to secure performance bonding.</p> <p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>budget reflects insurance costs</i> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal listed insurance coverage that would be carried and amounts. The school assured that the types and amounts are required by law and/or district policy. • The necessary insurance is provided and budgeted for by the applicant.

<p>Proposal Requirements ORS 338.045(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>(w) A proposed plan for the placement of public charter school teachers, other school employees and students of the public charter school upon termination or non-renewal of a charter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evident throughout budgeting process and details. <p>The plan for placement of staff and students (in the event of non-renewal or termination) is evidenced through a written description of the process to be used; student plans should include collaboration with the local school district.</p> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District employees would return to the HRCSD would be governed by ORS 338.135 and by any negotiated agreement within the HRCSD bargaining unit. All other employees will be “at will” employees. The CLCS would help staff identify appropriate and available employment opportunities. • Students would return to their resident district or another charter school. • Still not clear if some of the employees will be district employees. • A plan is provided for the placement of both students and staff in the event of school closure and the applicant even plans to aid staff for up to six months in their job searches. • On page 50 of proposal, details of how teachers and other employees will be terminated if the charter is not renewed. • On page 51 of proposal, details of how students will be placed back into the school district that they reside in - if the charter is not renewed. Plan included collaboration with parents and school districts in the event the charter is no longer renewed.
<p>(x) The manner in which the program review and fiscal audit will be conducted</p>	<p>The plans for annual review of educational program and operations, and municipal fiscal audits will be evidenced in a detailed description of how both will be accomplished</p> <p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the process and timeline for arranging the annual fiscal audit</i> • <i>the process and timeline for a sponsor site visit</i> • <i>the manner in which fiscal audit and program review results will be incorporated into school improvement planning</i> • <i>the plan and timeline to submit audit and annual program review to ODE</i> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school will create and submit an Annual Report to the sponsoring district. The contents of the Annual Report would be agreed upon between the sponsoring district and school.

**Oregon State Board of Education
Charter School Proposal Review and Analysis Rubric**

<p align="center">Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)</p>	<p align="center">Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>(a) The demonstrated, sustainable support for the public charter school by teachers, parents, students and other community members, including comments received at the public hearing held under subsection (1) of this section</p>	<p>Demonstration of sustainable support is evidenced by substantial documentation, e.g., market research, marketing plans, results of community meetings/presentations, community partnerships, and/or survey results, as well as documentation of community testimony provided during the public hearing conducted by the school district.</p> <p align="center"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal included quite a bit of evidence that the charter school is supported by parents, students, educators and community members. Toward that end, the proposal included: many letters of support from businesses, churches, educators and other entities. For example, letters were included from the Lions Club, Best Western, Port of Cascade Locks, Cascade Locks Alumni Association, Confederated Tribe of Warm Springs, Fire and EMS and the local Tourism Committee. • A petition signed by many (although it's assumed that some of these signers also submitted letters) in support of the charter school. • A survey and results which indicated support for the charter school. • The applicant has very strong support of community members and has presented this evidence very strongly in the form of letters, signatures and attendance at the public hearing. Many community members are interested in forming partnerships with the school and play an integral role in the planning and governance of the school. • Extensive public and community input and an outline of a marketing plan is included in proposal. The charter included survey results as well as testimonials regarding support for this charter.
<p>(b) The demonstrated financial stability of the public charter school, including the demonstrated ability of the school to have a sound financial management system in place at the time</p>	<p>Demonstration of a fiscal stability is evidenced by documentation of a detailed three-five year budget, balance sheets reflecting assets, expenditures and liabilities, accurate projections of revenues and expenditures based on prevailing costs and other factors that contribute to solvency, as well as GAAP and other sound fiscal management practices.</p>

Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)	Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale
the school begins operating	<p><i>Preferable factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • annual reserve, minimal reliance on soft funds • sound financial management policies and strategies including but not limited to cash management, investment practices, financial reporting, segregation of duties, and processes reflecting annual review of such systems. <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal included “conservative-estimate” budgets relating to three enrollment scenarios. Ending fund balances were healthy. • The proposal’s documentation regarding sound financial management systems was extensive and impressive. • The worst scenario, which seems to be the most likely scenario given the conflicting district school and the lack of ability to attract or retain high school students under the model, is not sustainable. Substantial outside support would be necessary to provide the array of programs the founders would like to provide. • The budget is very detailed and reflects a lot of thought and understanding on the part of the applicant. Several budget scenarios are provided for different enrollment levels and each one is conservative and detailed. The school has already set-up their accounting codes and balance sheets and is working closely to set up a financial management plan mirroring that of a fiscally solvent charter school. • The plan has minimal reliance on soft funds, in fact the founders have chosen to ignore federal grant fund to the detriment of the plan. The plan should have included the federal grant money to be able to reflect professional development and long range planning for success. • The proposal included a 5 year detailed plan with balance sheets, and accurate projections of proposed revenues and expenditures based on researched costs and other factors. The founders have done their homework and have modeled their budgeting on a very successful 9 year charter located in the Philomath area. • There is a very clear projected budget. There is a statement indicating the adherence to Generally Accepted Accounting Procedures. The operating costs are projected to cover all operating expenses.
(c) The capability of the	Evidence of the applicant’s capacity to support, plan and provide

<p>Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>applicant, in terms of support and planning, to provide comprehensive instructional programs to students pursuant to an approved proposal</p>	<p>comprehensive instructional programs, including relevant expertise and experience of the applicant, a proposed comprehensive curriculum aligned with state standards and based on research-based instructional practices, adaptable for all achievement levels.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effective staffing, professional development • assessment plans that support effective delivery and measurement of the instructional program. <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0 Meets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This reader is not able to mark this area as “meet” until questions were addressed in the area of curriculum and instruction. Some descriptions of the curriculum (not math) were vague- especially language arts. Also, the proposal did not provide a very good description of what a day would look like for students and teachers. It’s hard to imagine, from the information provided, how all the distinctive elements would be manifested in the daily instruction that occurs. Again, not enough specificity. • No description of how staff, without much oversight or professional development, will convert district’s and packaged curriculum into a project-based, place-based, CFP model. Not sure founding group contains expertise to understand and/or pull off this very difficult task. • The proposal states that they will employ 7 researched models of instruction; however, some of these models are <i>outdated</i> and may not be “best practices” in 2011. • It is difficult to believe that all 7 of these models can be implemented to fidelity in the first or even 3rd year of implementation. Training of staff and implementation takes time and effort – without this the school will have a one shot effort that will not be effective nor successful. • The proposal outlines a collection of partial FTE staff (collectively equaling approximately 5 FTE) working together with no provision for staff teaming, or professional development training for any of the teaching models described in the plan. It takes at least 3 years of training and implementation to use a “best practice” research based teaching model to fidelity. Without fidelity, the model is not research based.

<p>Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I see no Professional Development funding in the budget until year 3, how can that be true? Will all staff come to the school prepared to use all 7 teaching models without any training? The plan is ambitious – but is it reality based and in the best interest of the students served?
<p>(d) The capability of the applicant, in terms of support and planning, to specifically provide, pursuant to an approved proposal, comprehensive instructional programs to students identified by the applicant as academically low achieving</p>	<p>Evidence of the applicant’s capability to support, plan, and provide comprehensive instructional programs that will meet the needs of academically low achieving students is evidenced by a plan for identifying low achieving students, specific program planning/ implementation to close anticipated achievement gaps and assessment plans to measure individual progress.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0 Meets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the proposal’s special education responsibilities and program were adequately addressed, there was an absence of much mention of other instructional programs that would be targeted toward assisting other (including special ed students but not only special ed students) the students most in need of intervention and additional assistance. While there is discussion about assessment (MAP & OAKS), the educational plan (because of what is stated above) does not seem sound enough to address the needs of academically low-achieving students. I applaud the charter’s assessment plan, using NWEA’s Map assessment to track academic progress of students, however the plan never details what teachers might provide as interventions to assist students to reach grade level state benchmarks. This is a huge endeavor and requires planning and teacher supports along the way. Again, no professional development time is included for this important individualized student intervention planning time. The founders assume that if students are “read to” and are surrounded by quality reading material, they will learn to read. The authors need to research new findings from the 1990s that document “some” children may learn to read in this manner, however “most” children will need to be explicitly taught to read using scientifically based reading practices. The text and material the founders are proposing to use to teach K-3 student to read is neither research based nor explicit teaching. Without proper tools, teacher will not be successful at teaching all students to read in the primary grades.
<p>(e) The extent to which the</p>	<p>Evidence that the proposal addresses the information required in</p>

<p>Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
<p>proposal addresses the information required in ORS 338.045</p>	<p>ORS 338.045 to a satisfactory extent.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the proposal was complete and addressed these areas. • The proposal is very thorough and detailed and addresses all of the requirements of ORS 338.045. • The proposal designers have worked diligently to meet the letter of the law in this proposal. • It seems that the charter designers may not have an experienced educator on their team to help guide them with current <i>research based</i> teaching practices and systems that are in place for academic success. • The proficiency based credit and grading system is excellent for the upper grades, however our young children in K-3 need the best teaching possible to excel. Perhaps the school might reconsider beginning the first 3 years with a <i>middle / high school program only</i> – then adding the early years after they have had success with the secondary system.
<p>(f) Whether the value of the public charter school is outweighed by any directly identifiable, significant and adverse impact on the quality of the public education of students residing in the school district in which the public charter school will be located</p>	<p>Evidence from the proposal demonstrates the value of the public charter school.</p> <p>Evidence from the school district response demonstrates an explicitly identifiable, significant and adverse impact on the quality of education of students within the district.</p> <p>(A “Meets” score signifies there is NO adverse impact)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Does Not Meet</p> <p><u>Explain rationale of rating:</u></p> <p>Value-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The charter strives to keep students in the community, learning firsthand about strong community values and workforce opportunities it has to offer. This seems very applicable to middle/high school students. • Although the district has expresses concerns regarding the impact the school will have on the current public school the value of this school greatly outweighs this impact and will allow students to attend an innovative school from K-12th grade which is not currently an option in this area. • The Administration and Business arm of this proposal are strong and financially supported. <p>Adverse Impact-</p>

<p>Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)</p>	<p>Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The early K-3 students are expected to learn by osmosis from their older peers, or left to struggle on their own trying to decode text and learn to read through “exposure” to literature. • Research has shown that this may work for some children, children that come to school already reading, but for most children, reading will need to be explicitly taught. The charter does not address how these children will learn to read, nor does it give the primary teacher the tools to teach them to read. The proposal relies on workbooks instead of textbooks and uses programs that are outdated and have not shown to impact student learning. • Saxon Math at the elementary level and high school level has not proven to be a successful core program. It has shown success at the middle level - as an intervention program. • Teaching staff are not supported with any professional development plan, and are expected to implement – to fidelity – 7 models of teaching with success. • The instructional arm of the proposal is weak and unsubstantiated with funding, research or best practice findings. • Teachers will not be able to sustain <i>all 7</i> of the charter teaching models within a reasonable time frame. Choose one or two models to adhere to, provide training and let staff a great job with a few models - slowly, rather than spread everything too thin and miss the mark for the charter’s children. • This is a difficult item for this reader to address. The proposal does a good job of identifying the value (and desire of) to the community. However, the school district also makes a compelling case regarding the effect that the school would have on the remaining students/school currently at Cascade Locks.
<p>(g) Whether there are arrangements for any necessary special education and related services for children with disabilities pursuant to ORS 338.165</p>	<p>Evidence of arrangements for necessary special education and related services for children with disabilities include detailed plans aligned with ORS 338.165, i.e., recognition that student resident districts to retain responsibility for providing all special education and related services, plans for charter school to contract with sponsor district and other districts for payment of ADMw for special education students and specifying respective responsibilities related to the provision of special education and related services to the student.</p> <p>Preferable factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • professional development for charter school staff related to

Evaluation Criteria ORS 338.055(2)	Evidence, Preferable Factors, Rating and Rationale
	<p>identification and referral, modifications and accommodations, discipline, attendance reporting, communication with parents, and charter school’s role on IEP team.</p> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Meets <input type="checkbox"/> 0 Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal’s narrative regarding special education services was adequate. • The school has provided and special education plan for students both within and outside of their district and plans use Child Find to identify children who may be eligible for services. The applicant seems capable and willing to provide services for children and to work with their district in managing special education services. • The school is relying on the “home” school district to provide IEP for SPED students. I see no provision of professional development for regular education teachers on implementation of accommodations or modifications of lessons for our special population students.
<p>(h) Whether there are alternative arrangements for students and for teachers and other school employees who choose not to attend or who choose not to be employed by the public charter school</p>	<p><i>Applicable to conversion schools only</i></p> <p><i>Alternative arrangements for staff or students who choose not to be in the public charter school is evidenced by a detailed plan that addresses the needs of each group and does not create an adverse impact or violate the rights of an individual.</i></p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Meets <input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet </p> <p><u>Explain rationale for rating:</u></p> <p>NA</p>