

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

<u>Section</u>	<u>Possible Points</u>	<u>Actual Points</u>
Part I: Mission, Purpose and Needs, and Marketing Data:		
a) mission statement	18	<u>8</u>
b) purpose and needs	18	<u>5</u>
c) marketing data	18	<u>4</u>

Notes:

1. The proposed plan included a mission statement that is somewhat associated with the preliminary assessment and rationale.
2. The Applicant provided an assessment of the needs but not the strengths of the students and the community. The Applicant did not provide demographics for the community in which the charter school will be located.
3. The Applicant described why there is a need for the school, but the rationale could be more thorough and better connected to the needs assessment data. The rationale did not reference details of current education opportunities.
4. The Applicant did not explain why the charter school model is an appropriate vehicle to address the need. The Applicant only cited the District's PSSA scores and surveys conducted which the Applicant stated resulted in the need to "improve curriculum and counseling."
5. The Applicant attempted to explain how its proposed charter school will provide expanded education opportunities beyond those currently provided by Pittsburgh Public Schools (PPS) but also did not reference details of the current education opportunities available to students. The Applicant stated 11 educational programs and curriculum choices. First, PACS states "each student will have a full time academic advisor providing individual attention to the student and the advisors will be selected from the teaching staff" (pg. 10). This is different than PPS. However, the implementation is vague. Second, PACS plans to have active parental involvement. "PACS will establish a teacher-student-parent triad to maximize the benefits. Furthermore, parents will be able to monitor the progress of their children using interactive web applications" (pg. 11). PPS has parental involvement in all schools and already uses interactive web applications. Third, "the personalized education plan is one the most important instructional strategies of PACS and the program is based on academic monitoring and counseling from an academic advisor" (pg. 11). Although this is recognized as important, the implementation, format, process and timeline are vague. Fourth, "PACS will have a special program dedicated to math and science competitions, both statewide and nationwide" (pg. 12). Currently, PPS participates in many math and science competitions, statewide and nationwide. Fifth, "PACS will offer expanded choices in language instruction and offer two foreign languages as part of the curriculum" (pg. 12). PPS offers language as part of its curriculum as well and it enables graduates to communicate fluently. PPS' has a very comprehensive foreign language programs. Sixth, PACS plans to have a mandatory tutoring program which will be customized according to the academic progress of the students (pg. 13). PPS has many tutoring programs and they are tailored to fit the students. PPS tutoring programs are available for all grades, all schools, everyday. Seventh, "PACS requires each student to complete a graduation project" (pg. 13). This is not unique. The completion of a high school graduation project is a State requirement for all students under Chapter 4 § 4.24 High School Graduation Requirements. Therefore, PPS must and already requires that all students complete a graduation project. Eighth, "PACS will have an allocated office room in the school building called the Resource Room, to serve students from 2:30 PM to 6:00 PM. The proposed Resource Room will have at least one teacher available at any given time to help the students." (pg. 14). This was addressed at the site visit and the Applicant stated that they would in fact have one person in the room to assist the students. This is unrealistic to have one person available at any given time to help the students from grades 6-12 with any subject.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

Ninth, "PACS aims to educate not only goal-oriented pupils but also value driven individuals for society." (pg. 14) The Applicant's description of value-driven education is consistent with PPS character education program. Examples of this can be found in the student code of conduct and school wide positive behavior plans. Tenth, PACS intends to provide opportunities for the underserved students. However, PPS commits excellence for all students which is a requirement for all public schools. Eleventh, PACS program will be "learning by design and robotics." (pg. 15) This is a strategy that PPS already offers.

6. The Applicant included a somewhat clear statement of purpose. The Applicant articulated the school's target audience and grade levels.

7. The Applicant conveyed the scope of backing for the proposed Charter School, its founding coalition and included a brief description of each founding member's background, expertise and their current role with the charter planning team.

8. The Applicant did not describe the breadth of community support extending beyond the core group of founders and provided evidence (via letters of support, signed petitions, and testimony given at the public hearing) that the school has support from stakeholders (parents, teachers, businesses/corporations).

9. The Applicant failed to demonstrate strong support from community members and businesses/corporations in the community where the proposed charter wishes to locate. Out of the 30 letters of support that were submitted under Appendix G of the application, only one was from an organization located in the Carrick area. Most of the organization/business/university support is from outside of the city (i.e. McKeesport, Mon Valley and Penn State). The support letters from parents were not expressing their support because they thought the Charter was an expanded education opportunity. Their support was based on the fact that they would like to have a neighborhood school.

10. The Applicant described its short-term marketing plan for the school but failed to describe the long-term marketing plan.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

<u>Section</u>	<u>Possible Points</u>	<u>Actual Points</u>
Part II: Strategic Planning:		
a) measurable goals and objectives	18	<u>2</u>
b) best practices and habits of practice	18	<u>4</u>
c) school improvement planning	18	<u>4</u>

Notes:

1. The proposed planning plan included three goals (1) "to lead every student to continuous accomplishments essential to future success in life as a responsible individual in the society, (2) to fulfill the responsibilities of citizenship and (3) to exceed the base scores on the PSSA. (pg. 23) These goals are not measurable.
2. The plan did not include how data is to be collected or provide measurable goals and objectives for the planning process. There is no indication of benchmarks or how the school plans to monitor student achievement.
3. The Applicant failed to describe NCLB targets. The Applicant stated they will only test grades 8 and 11 for the PSSA. (pg. 6) This is not consistent with NCLB.
4. The plan does not include a goal for SAT and ACT improvement which is critical to the success of high school students.
5. The proposed plan did not include the listed best practices and habits of practice identified by the Commonwealth of PA. The best practices are not clearly defined and the Applicant did not demonstrate how they will be implemented within the curriculum. In addition these practices are not unique to and can be found in most Pittsburgh Public Schools.
6. The Applicant vaguely described and demonstrated knowledge (within the application and during the interview) of the improvement process the school will use and how it will serve as the basis for the development of the school's strategic plan. No action plan exists that describes implementation. There is a very limited understanding of the school's improvement planning and processes.
7. The Applicant failed to describe and demonstrate knowledge of the high school graduation requirements. According to Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's high school graduation requirements, Chapter 4 § 4.24 (a) states, "Each school district, including charter schools, shall specify requirements for graduation in the strategic plan under § 4.13 (relating to strategic plans). Requirements shall include course completion and grades, completion of a culminating project and results of local assessments aligned with academic standards," Chapter 4 § 4.24 (d) states, "Each school district, including charter schools, shall describe in its strategic plan under § 4.13 how its planned instruction is designed to prepare students to meet requirements of subsection (a)." The Applicant did not provide the graduation requirements.
8. The Applicant failed to identify the how it will involve community/business members in its planning process.
9. The plan mentioned parental involvement in a generic sense but didn't contain specific activities or programs of how parents can be involved in the school other than participation on the sub-committees.
10. The Applicant provided letters from individuals who are employed and/or who attend institutes of higher learning. The letters imply connections to institutes of higher learning. However, there are no written agreements for involvement or provision of services.
11. The Applicant provided the necessary assurances if the charter falls into School Improvement II status and its intent to comply with grounds for non-renewal or immediate revocation of the charter.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

<u>Section</u>	<u>Possible Points</u>	<u>Actual Points</u>
Part III: Management Plan		
a) admissions policy and criteria	18	<u>10</u>
b) student discipline and expulsion criteria	18	<u>7</u>
c) governance (board)	18	<u>8</u>
d) plan for involvement of the community and the general public life of the school	18	<u>6</u>
e) description of how the charter will manage and administer the school	18	<u>7</u>
f) description of staff conditions, work, and professional development	18	<u>7</u>

Notes:

1. The admissions policy and criteria are somewhat defined. The Applicant failed to include truancy in its attendance policy.
2. The Applicant provided the maximum student capacity and number of students by grade level but failed to provide the minimum numbers for each year. Minimum numbers were only provided for year 1.
3. The Applicant anticipates the teacher/student ratio to be 1/15.
4. The Applicant provided a vague timetable for admissions. Open houses will be held in March. Completed applications are due by May 31st. The Applicant did not provide a timeline in case a lottery is necessary but did include a plan for its admission lottery.
5. The Applicant did not provide a plan for maintaining non-discriminatory admissions but rather an assurance.
6. The Applicant could not demonstrate a working knowledge of Chapter 711 or disability categories during the site visit and could not articulate how it will deliver appropriate services to accommodate students with special needs. Within the application only Part A (pg. 32; 3rd paragraph) of the charter law is addressed. Section 711.7 also states that "a charter school may not discriminate in its admission policies or practices on the basis of intellectual ability. Admission criteria may not include measures of achievement or aptitude." The applicants do not plan to provide a full continuum for students with special needs. During the interview, the applicants stated that they had "no plans for a resource room unless at least 10 special education students required it." Legally, if a student arrives with an IEP which includes service delivery in a resource room, that requirement must be met. An IEP is a legal document in which services cannot be eliminated because of miscellaneous reasons, such as not having a group size of 10.
7. The Applicant provided a description of how the school will publicize and elicit student enrollment.
8. The Applicant described its application procedure and provided a copy of the application. However, the application provided did not include a due date.
9. The Applicant stated they will "comply with the Pittsburgh Public Schools Attendance Standards. Their standards are not congruent with PPS and therefore, the Applicant failed to demonstrate an understanding and knowledge of the District's standards.
10. The Applicant's student discipline and expulsion criteria based on Chapter 711 are vague. The special needs disciplinary actions are not explicitly described. Also, the suspension policy submitted in Appendix J is not in compliance with PPS' suspension policy. The disciplinary actions for students with special needs are not explicitly described.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

11. The Applicant failed to describe its compulsory attendance policy.
12. The Applicant failed to demonstrate an understanding of Safe Schools' legislation in regards to drug and alcohol, weapons, and criminal violations occurring on school grounds.
13. The Applicant failed to provide an assurance that students and parents will not be counseled out of the school without having received appropriate due process.
14. The Applicant did not provide a proactive policy for addressing parents whose children may be in danger of suspension or failure.
15. The Applicant's working knowledge of the alternative placement procedures for students with special needs students is very vague.
16. The Applicant described due process procedures and defined its intent to provide due process.
17. The Applicant provided a description of the governance structure, including how board members will be appointed/elected, how parents and community members will be involved in governance, what the policy setting role will be for the board.
18. The Applicant failed to explain how the board will supply direction for the CEO in general but did explain specifically in terms of NCLB requirements. The process is an open democratic process involving cross-stakeholders in the school community.
19. There are deficiencies within the Applicant's governance structure. First, "the daily operations of the school will be carried out by the Director together with the Dean of Academics, Dean of Students and Operations Manager" (pg. 37). However, for year 1, the Applicant failed to include a position/salary for the Dean of Academics in its budget (pg. 95) nor did the Applicant identify who would be responsible for the Dean of Academics' duties if this position is not being filled until year 2. This was addressed during the interview and the Applicant stated that Director would serve as the Dean of Academics for year 1 due to budget constraints. The second issue is in regards to the Academic Policy and Personnel Committee. This committee which consists of parents and staff, is chaired by the Dean of Academics and will review curriculum, recommend policy changes, participate in program development, be responsible for job descriptions to the board, reviewing Director's recommendations for hiring and firing employees, making recommendations to the board and provided advice on personnel matters to the board and the Director (pg. 42). Parents and staff will have influence over personnel matters. This was addressed at the interview and the Applicant stated that it was a good idea and the parents and staff didn't have the ability to hire/fire and could only make recommendations. The third concern is in regards to the Finance, Facilities and Equipment Committee. Parents and staff will be encouraged to participate through this committee which is chaired by the Dean of Students. One of the responsibilities of this committee is to prepare the annual operating and capital budgets for approval by the board. This is the same responsibility listed under the duties of the Operations Manager (pg. 40) and the Operations Manager is not a member of this committee. During the interview the Applicant stated the Operations Manager would oversee this function.
20. The Applicant failed to state how and who will evaluate the CEO. The criteria for the CEO's evaluation, including student achievement data was not provided.
21. The Applicant failed to provide the board's meeting schedule.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

22. The Applicant provided the board's policies and procedures and included a description of how they will be made visible to students, staff and parents. A statement on ethics and conflict of interest is provided within the bylaws.
23. The Applicant described the board's policy for accepting gifts and gratuities by staff and board members.
24. The Applicant provided a complete description of the bylaws, including financial oversight and administrative and staff supervision.
25. The Applicant described the founding group membership's individual personal and professional skills, including parents of potential students in the school.
26. The Applicant failed to describe how the management organization and governance structure will be consistent with the mission, purpose, aims and goals of the school. Also not evident is a shared decision-making process among parents, students, staff and the principal.
27. The Applicant failed to describe its process for ensuring productive relationships between administrators and teachers.
28. The Applicant did not include a plan for the surrounding community and the general public life of the school.
29. The Applicant failed to provide a written policy for parental participation but provided an assurance that it would be developed. This is mandatory under No Child Left Behind (NCLB).
30. Throughout the proposal there is a lack of knowledge and understanding regarding the social, emotional and cognitive stages of middle and high school students and how they relate to effective parental involvement.
31. The Applicant described the parent complaint review process.
32. The Applicant described how performance results will be disseminated to parents.
33. Teachers, staff, parents and the community-at-large are afforded meaningful opportunities in school making there will be two subcommittees that contain teacher and staff making recommendations to the board.
34. The Applicant failed to provide a volunteerism policy. However, there are provisions for obtaining the necessary clearances.
35. The Applicant failed to describe the process for ensuring teachers, staff, parents of the children and community members are afforded meaningful opportunities to have voices in school governance and decision making.
36. The Applicant described how the school will be managed and by whom. An organization chart was provided and defined the lines of authority to deliver services effectively and efficiently. Responsibilities for each unit were described. However, again the same concern exists in #19 above.
37. The Applicant failed to describe how it will periodically assess the effectiveness of the organizational structure, involve stakeholders and how it will consider compliance requirements.
38. The criminal clearance procedures for staff were described.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

39. The applicant states highly qualified teachers will be however this shows lack of knowledge of federal legislation for teachers to be highly qualified.

40. Although there is a description for personalized professional growth to each staff member, there is no plan. There is a lack of understanding regarding the need for on-going systematic professional development that coincides with federal legislation to ensure that teachers are highly qualified. Additionally no calendar exists for professional development or schedule before during the school year or at the end.

41. A system for evaluating employee performance and who will have oversight of the human resource function was not evident.

42. The Applicant provided the assurance that the charter will maintain personnel and confidential records in accordance with applicable statues, regulations and standards.

43. The Applicant failed to describe its employment/labor/relations program.

44. The Applicant submitted job descriptions but failed to require certifications in the math and science fields, especially since this is the focus of the charter.

Part IV: Education Plan

a) education program	18	<u>6</u>
b) accountability, student assessment, and evaluation	18	<u>6</u>
c) meeting the needs of at-risk students, bilingual students, and students with disabilities	18	<u>6</u>

Notes:

1. Applicant does not include a description of its Math and Science curriculum, nor does it include an appropriate Math and Science scope and sequence (i.e. a concise identification of the skills and content to be mastered at each grade level and seamless sequence of how each grade level builds upon the knowledge and skills mastered at the previous level). The Applicant states its innovative aspect is its Math and Science focus and curriculum. This could not be attested to without the existence of the actual curriculum.

2. The applicant does not demonstrate an alignment between the proposed Math and Science curriculum and the PA and School District Math Science and Standards. The Review Team views curriculum materials as a basic tool that allows teachers to do their best work with students. Accordingly, the Review Team's analysis of the charter's educational plan focused on an essential requirement.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

3. In Appendix A, the description of the curriculum indicates striking inadequacies. There is a paragraph describing the topics to be covered. However, the content to be mastered each month at each grade level is missing. On page 109 of the Charter Application, the charter explains; "The sixth grade mathematics curriculum is designed to make math relevant and in grade 7 will provide math skills needed to be successful in life." A standards-based curriculum, with standards spiraled from one year to the next could not be found.

4. Under Section A.1, Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 on Page 110 in Appendix A, the application states that "PAC will focus on creating a developmentally appropriate math curriculum where children are encouraged to understand the conceptual basis and the quantitative analysis of mathematical relations." This developmentally appropriate math curriculum is included as a listing of topics to be covered at each grade level. The review team does not see evidence that the applicant understands the difference between "developmentally appropriate math programs" and the textbook that will be used at each grade level.

5. The Science Curriculum A.2, Appendix A, described on pages 114-119 is a listing of topics to be taught at each grade level, similar what is provided with regard to the discussion of the proposed math curriculum. Again, this does not show that a standards-based curriculum, similar to the one offered in PPS, that is seamless and continual from grades 7-12, will be offered.

6. The application does not indicate provision for students to take the PSSA in all grades, an update from previous requirements of testing only in grades 8 and 11.

7. Benchmark assessments were not included in the Application. There was mention of using the 4Sight assessments at the site visit. Neither the plan for implementation or budget provide for this testing. The application indicates that the TerraNova test will be used at the beginning of the school year. However, the "teacher-made" tests, discussed at the site visit, were not included in the application. There is no evidence that these would be based on standards aligned with the Foresight test, the textbook, or the curriculum

8. The review team recommends that if a model curriculum is to be developed then recent recommendations from research be included as part of the plan. These recommendations are from "How People Learn: Bridging Research and Practice", National Resource Council.

(A) Curriculum development teams should be composed of discipline-specific experts, researchers in pedagogy and cognitive scientists, curriculum developers and expert teachers.

(B) Curriculum and their companion instructional techniques and assessments should be in alignment with the Principles of Learning outlined in "How People Learn".

(C) Curriculum developers need to consider the extent to which the curriculum emphasizes depth over breadth of coverage, the effectiveness of the opportunities provided to grasp key concepts related to the subject matter; the extent to which the curriculum provides opportunities to explore preconceptions about the subject matter; the adequacy of the factual knowledge base provided by the curriculum; the extent to which formative assessment procedures are built into the curriculum; and the extent to which accompanying summative assessment procedures measure understanding and ability to transfer rather than memory of fact.

(D) Curriculum should include companion teacher materials that explains links to the principles of learning, reflects pedagogical content knowledge concerning the curriculum, and promotes flexible use of the curriculum by teachers.

The references above are basic premises of current research-based curriculum development and yet no reference to these basic ideas can be found in the application. The application indicates that PACS educational program will be directed toward math and science competence. However, the Application does not provide a "unique" curriculum nor does it provide comfort that the developers designed the curriculum with the understanding of current research.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

9. The PA Mathematics and Science Assessment Anchors were not discussed. The purpose of the Assessment Anchors is to articulate essential and assessable elements, and to provide clarity for instructions. Measures of student achievement must coincide with curriculum goals aligned with state standards. Student achievement should take center stage to provide continual feedback as to whether goals/standards are being met. The Application does not include a schedule of periodic benchmark assessments to provide this feedback. At the site visit, Polaris Board members stated that the Foresight test and "teacher-made tests" will be administered. However, the review team has yet to read/hear the curricular goals/standards that are to be used as the focus for these benchmark tests.

10. The application does not include a detailed plan for professional development. During the site visit, mention was made of topics such as classroom management, parent engagement, and socially appropriate life skills. The absence of a well developed professional development plan does not indicate knowledge of current research regarding best practices for professional development in that it should be content specific, on-going, intimately attached to the curriculum and learning outcomes, and be followed up with in-class coaching support. In addition, since the scope and sequence is missing from the Application, the review team has no indication that targeted professional development sessions will be aligned to state standards to assist teachers in delivering instruction that results in students' mastering required skills and content at each grade level.

11. Differentiated instruction is not mentioned in the Application nor was it mentioned at the site visit. When the review team asked about engaging instructional strategies that will vary from teacher to teacher as described on page 60 of the Education Plan, "to bring students to a mastery level", Smart boards and "hand-held" devices were described. "Global Themes" are stated on page 58, section 4.3, "Curriculum Overview" as the organizational structure of the program, to "ensure that each student will acquire and apply core concepts and principles of math, science, technology, social studies, language arts, communication, creative arts, vocational, and practical living skills to situations similar to what they will experience in life." When asked at the site visit to explain these "global themes" and relationship to state/curricular standards, the board members said these are the teaching of critical languages, specifically Chinese, which they admitted to omitting in the Application.

12. The applicant could not demonstrate a working knowledge of Chapter 711 or disability categories during the site visit. In addition, there is no mention of Child Find to identify children with special needs. When asked about the referral process for special education, the Board members passed off the responsibility for this knowledge to the person they plan to hire to administer the special education program.

13. The applicant fails to mention EAP, SES, or Classroom Plus. Extra-curricular activities are described in 4.5, pages 70-72 as a listing of clubs that are sports, arts and academically related. At the site visit, the Board members stated that teachers will be paid to staff the clubs. There is no provision for this allocation in the budget.

14. The educational program of the Proposed Charter is flawed. Based on the lack of curriculum materials, the Charter cannot provide the School District of Pittsburgh with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities currently being offered by the school system, nor can it serve as a model to other schools in the system.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

<u>Section</u>	<u>Possible Points</u>	<u>Actual Points</u>
Part V: Operations		
a) budget and fiscal operations	18	<u>6</u>
b) facilities, transportation, and food services	18	<u>6</u>
c) liabilities, insurance, and risk management	18	<u>12</u>
d) legal issues	18	<u>12</u>

Notes:

1. The Applicant included its PDE – 2028 General Fund Budget and a detailed line item budget for five years. The five year financial plan is based on realistic information and provides for all items required in the charter school legislation.
2. The Applicant failed to include in its financial plan: (1) an equity position, (2) a cash flow for non-essential operations for year one and (3) a cash flow for essential operations for year one.
3. The Applicant failed to include a board policy which requires a long-term financial plan to be put into place to assure that non-essential expenditures are not incurred until funds are secure. Although the Applicant provided an assurance that they would invest any excess funds subject to the standards set forth in PA 24 PS 4-440.1, the Applicant failed to demonstrate a working knowledge of this standard and therefore did not provide the requested financial documents.
4. The Applicant provided a financial management history/record template and the financial plan articulates how costs were set in terms of operating efficiency.
5. The Applicant failed to provide a contract to revenue alignment assurance that all contracts with personnel, property owners, service firms and other individuals/organizations will be evaluated to determine alignment between contractual obligations for the school and the level of secured revenue streams.
6. The Applicant describes how financial staff will be selected and their required qualifications. However, the Applicant fails to state how the financial staff will receive their appropriate training and professional development.
7. The Applicant stated it would use QuickBooks in order to support its financial accounting system.
8. The Applicant failed to describe its budgeting planning process and timeline. The Applicant only states that a budget will be approved.
9. The Applicant failed to state how the process will tie to the goals and objects in its strategic plan.
10. The Applicant described its process for amending its budget.
11. The Applicant failed to describe its plan for maintaining an appropriate level of unreserved fund balance. This was addressed during the interview and the Applicant stated they plan is to spend all of the money every year and not have a reserve.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

12. The Applicant described its policies and procedures for cash management, investment of public funds, effective management of capital assets, competitive bidding, volume discounts, and special agreements and effective management of inventories.

13. The Applicant failed to describe its policies and procedures for student activity accounts, effective debt management and accounting for grants.

14. The Applicant provided evidence that provisions are in place for annual auditing of the school by a certified public accounting firm.

15. The Applicant failed to describe how its annual operations and maintenance budget and capital expenditures budget will be planned.

16. The Applicant failed to describe any plans it has for implementing energy management strategies to contain energy costs. Since these plans were not provided, it is assumed that the School will not attempt to save money.

17. The Applicant described its transportation plan. However, the Applicant failed to describe how it will review and update its transportation information. The Applicant also failed to describe its policies and procedures for: (1) ensuring appropriate student behavior is maintained on buses and students being held accountable for misbehavior during transportation and (2) responding to parent complaints and its procedure for how it will communicate its policies and procedures to its drivers.

18. The Applicant described its plan for implementing extended day or extended school year programs. It states that "PACS will work with a transportation provider." (pg. 105) However, there is a contradiction because the Applicant also states that "on the other hand, for extended days including the after school program, parent are responsible. Similarly, the parents of students living outside the local district will be responsible for their child's transportation to and from school." (pg. 105) The first statement goes against some of the activities that the Applicant is proposing and stating is unique. Some of the activities are the mandatory tutoring and the resource room. If parents are not able to provide transportation home after regular school hours, and the child must use the transportation provided, then he/she will not be able to participate in any of the activities. The latter statement is not within the Charter Law which states that the student's home district is responsible for their transportation to and from school. This statement shows the lack of knowledge about the Charter Law in regards to transportation.

19. An on-site inspection of the proposed facility was conducted on January 12 2007, and the following deficiencies were noted:

- Modifications will be required to the building's ventilation system.
- ADA accessibility improvements must be made.
- The building's fire tower doors do not seal or engage properly and will require, along with other exit way doors, complete hardware replacement to comply with current code.

The use of this building as a charter school cannot be endorsed without some specific plan for addressing the ventilation, accessibility, and fire door issues. If appropriate renovations are undertaken and completed, this building could serve as a quality educational facility.

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

Part VI: Personnel/Leaders

a) information on key personnel 18 6

Notes:

TOTAL 360 132

What the score means:

- components scoring at 18 meet the full requirements of the application
- components scoring at 12 meet some of requirements of the application
- components scoring at 6 fail to meet the requirements of the application

Scoring Sheet: Pittsburgh Public Schools Charter Application Review Process (cont.)

Name of Charter Applicant: Polaris Academy Charter School (PACS)

Name of Review Team Reviewer: Rhonda Taliaferro (chair), Noel Huswit, Tracey Gilliard, Tracy Burke, Jack Garrow, Robin Ittigson and Gina Reichert

Date of Score Submission: January 19, 2007

FINAL CHECKLIST FOR COMPLIANCE UNDER ACT 22

Charter schools must meet the following criteria under this Act. Please indicate whether or not each individual criterion has been met.

Is the charter school nonsectarian and nonprofit?

Yes No

Does it have sustained support from teachers, parents, students, and the community?

Yes No

Does it agree to enroll all students who wish to attend, conduct a lottery if the school is oversubscribed, and only give preference to students whose parents have been involved in the process to plan the school?

Yes No

Does the charter provide the School District of Pittsburgh with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities currently being offered by the school system, and is it able to serve as a model to other schools in the system?

Yes No

Does the charter have plans to meet the needs of students with disabilities, bilingual students, and at-risk students?

Yes No

Does the charter comply with all federal state and local regulations pertaining to the health, safety, civil rights, and education of students?

Yes No

Use the space below for any additional comments concerning the application:

Do you think this application should be approved? Yes No

Use the space provided below to state your reasons. Why do you think that this application should or should not be approved. Use additional space if necessary.

- ✓ Charter does not have sustained support from teachers, parents, students, or the community.
- ✓ Charter Applicant does not provide expanded choice and cannot serve as a model for Pittsburgh Public Schools.
- ✓ Charter Applicant does not have plans to meet the needs of students with disabilities or bilingual students.
- ✓ Charter does not comply with all federal state and local regulations pertaining to the health, safety, civil rights, and education of students.
- ✓ Charter Applicant failed to complete the requirements of the application as required by PA Charter School Law, sections 1717-A and 1719-A.