

<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outdated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