

**Sarasota County Public Schools
Fall 2018 Charter School Application Process**

**Dreamers Academy Charter Application -Amended and Submitted August 14, 2018
Charter Review Committee Final Evaluation – October 30, 2018**

The founding board for the Dreamers Academy charter school submitted the revised and amended application on August 14, 2018. Earlier this year, the Superintendent and the School Board of Sarasota County advised the applicant to withdraw the February 1, 2018 application and resubmit an amended application in the fall, with the understanding that the revised application would address the deficiencies, weakness and concerns identified by the Charter Review Committee (CRC) in the May 8, 2018 final evaluation report. The revised application submitted on August 14th is referred to as the “amended” application throughout this report.

The proposed Dreamers Academy charter school will open in 2019-20 with 288 students in K-5 with a projected enrollment of 576 students by year 5 of operation. The Dreamers Academy will offer a Dual Language Two-Way Immersion (DL-TWI) educational program, a research-based and well-established model using Spanish and English for literacy and academic content, aligned to Florida’s standards. The mission is for students to become bilingual and biliterate in English and Spanish, learn cross-cultural skills, and attain high levels of academic success. To start, the school will implement a “hybrid” DL-TWI model: the entering Kindergarten cohort in 2019-20 will be in the full DL-TWI program as they progress through the grade levels. Grades 1-5 students will receive a traditional program and continue through grade 5. By year 6 the school will be fully DL-TWI. The Dreamers Academy charter school will be governed by a board of local community members.

The district’s CRC evaluation findings presented in this report are based on the extent to which the amended charter school application addressed the evaluation criteria required to meet each of the 22 standards, as specified in the Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument. During this process, the CRC did not re-evaluate those standards which were rated as “Meets the Standard” on the initial February 2018 application. However, the CRC reviewed and compared the content of the “original” February and the amended August application to ensure that the essential elements of the school were the same and that the additional information provided or any programmatic changes did not impact other aspects of the school, such as operations or finances. Ratings from the May 8, 2018 Evaluation Final Report of the February 2018 charter application are provided as a point of reference.

On October 9, 2018 the CRC issued its preliminary findings and initial ratings based on the analysis of the charter school’s amended application submitted on August 14, 2018. The applicant was provided an opportunity to review the CRC report and respond to the CRC’s questions and requests for clarification. The applicant was not permitted to make any further changes or add information not requested by the CRC. The applicant submitted their responses to the CRC’s request for clarification on October 18, 2018, one day after the due date. In fairness, the CRC cancelled and re-scheduled their meeting in order to allow CRC members sufficient time to review the applicant’s written responses prior to the final evaluation. Considering all information presented in the amended application and in the written responses to the CRC’s questions, the CRC arrived at the final ratings for each standard by majority vote.

Note: Page numbers throughout this document refer to the Dreamers Academy charter application document, which is available upon request.

Charter Review Committee Final Ratings Summary for Dreamers Academy Charter Application – Amended 8/14/18

I. Educational Plan Standards 1 – 9	II. Organizational Plan Standards 10 – 15	III. Business Plan Standards 16 – 22	Addenda Addenda A, A1 & B	Final Total
67% Meets 33% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	100% Meets 0% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	100% Meets 0% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	Not Applicable	86% Meets 14% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet

Charter School Application Section	February Initial Application Final CRC Ratings 5/8/18	Amended Application Preliminary Ratings 10/9/18	Amended Application Final Ratings 10/30/18
I. Educational Plan	33% Meets 33% Partially Meets 33% Does Not Meet	56% Meets 44% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	67% Meets 33% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet
1. Mission, Guiding Principles and Purpose	Meets	Meets	Meets
2. Target Population and Student Body	Partially Meets	Partially Meets	Partially Meets
3. Educational Program Design	Partially Meets	Partially Meets	Partially Meets
4. Curriculum Plan	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Partially Meets
5. Student Performance, Assessment & Evaluation	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets
6. Exceptional Students	Partially Meets	Meets	Meets
7. English Language Learners	Does Not Meet	Meets	Meets
8. School Culture and Discipline	Meets	Meets	Meets
9. Supplemental Programming	Meets	Meets	Meets
II. Organizational Plan	67% Meets 33% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	100% Meets 0% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	100% Meets 0% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet
10. Governance	Meets	Meets	Meets
11. Management and Staffing	Meets	Meets	Meets
12. Human Resources and Employment	Meets	Meets	Meets
13. Professional Development	Partially Meets	Meets	Meets
14. Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Partially Meets	Meets	Meets
15. Parent and Community Involvement	Meets	Meets	Meets
III. Business Plan	71% Meets 29% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	100% Meets 0% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	100% Meets 0% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet
16. Facilities	Partially Meets	Meets	Meets
17. Transportation	Meets	Meets	Meets
18. Food Service	Meets	Meets	Meets
19. School Safety and Security	Meets	Meets	Meets
20. Budget	Meets	Meets	Meets
21. Financial Management and Oversight	Partially Meets	Meets	Meets
22. Start-Up Plan	Meets	Meets	Meets
Ratings Summary – All Standards (1-22) Addenda A, A1 & B not applicable	55% Meets 32% Partially Meets 14% Does Not Meet	82% Meets 18% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet	86% Meets 14% Partially Meets 0% Does Not Meet

Ratings from the May 8, 2018 Evaluation Report of the February 2018 charter application are provided as a point of reference. Preliminary ratings for the amended charter application are based solely on CRC’s review of the written charter application submitted on August 14, 2018. Final ratings are based on the CRC’s evaluation of the application together with the written information provided by the applicant in response to questions and concerns stated in the *CRC Analysis and Initial Findings* report dated October 9, 2018.

Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument

Each section presents criteria for a response that meets the standard, and these criteria should guide the overall rating for the section. The Strengths and Weaknesses boxes provide space to identify data and other evidence that supports the rating. The rationale for each rating is important, especially if some of the data or evidence does not fit neatly into the criteria provided. As required by the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE), the Sarasota County Schools Charter Review Committee (CRC) used the *Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument* to evaluate the application.

In Sarasota, the format and layout of the FLDOE’s evaluation instrument report has been modified by dividing the boxes into three categories: 1) Strengths, 2) Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses, and 3) Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification. Sarasota offers each applicant an opportunity to respond to the “Areas in Need of Additional Information/Clarification.” However, this clarification process may not be used to submit new information (not requested) or make substantive changes to the submitted application. That is, deficiencies or missing information considered sufficiently significant in that corrections and revisions would constitute a material or substantial amendment to the original application is not permissible. Considering all information presented in the original application, in the written responses to the CRC’s questions, the CRC arrived at the final ratings for each standard by majority vote.

The following FLDOE definitions (per the application evaluation tool Form IEPC-M2) guided the Sarasota County Schools Charter Review Committee (CRC) evaluation results and ratings:

Meets the Standard	The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues and demonstrates capacity to open and operate a quality charter school. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation and presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.
Partially Meets the Standard	The response addresses most of the criteria, but the responses lack meaningful detail and require important additional information.
Does Not Meet the Standard	The response lacks meaningful detail; demonstrates lack of preparation; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the applicant’s understanding of the issue in concept and/or ability to meet the requirement in practice.

I. Educational Plan

The education plan should define what students will achieve, how they will achieve it, and how the school will evaluate performance. It should provide a clear picture of what a student who attends the school will experience in terms of educational climate, structure, assessment and outcomes.

1. Mission, Guiding Principles and Purpose

The Mission, Guiding Principles and Purpose section should indicate what the school intends to do, for whom and to what degree.

Statutory References:

s. 1002.33(2)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A clear and compelling mission and vision statement that defines the guiding principles and values of the school.
- Adequate references to evidence that the application fulfills the statutory guiding principles and purposes for charter schools. (Note: the substance of each addressed principle and purpose will be evaluated within appropriate application sections.)

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018. The mission, guiding principles and purpose of the Dreamers Academy school, as described in the August 14th amended application, have not changed relative to the February application, therefore, the standard maintains a rating of “Meets the Standard.”

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The mission and vision of the Dreamers Academy is to offer a Dual Language Two-Way Immersion educational program so that K-5 students will be bilingual and biliterate in English and Spanish, learn cross-cultural skills, and attain high levels of academic success. (P. 7)</p> <p>The Dual Language Two-Way Immersion (DL-TWI) model is research-based, shown to be effective and, if implemented with fidelity, would offer parents a school choice currently not available in Sarasota.</p> <p>Information/Comment Only: In Years 1-5, the school will implement a hybrid DL-TWI model. The entering Kindergarten cohort will receive the DL-TWI program and as they progress through the grade levels. However, Year 1 students enrolling in grades 1-5 will receive a hybrid or traditional program with an emphasis on striving towards Spanish-language proficiency.</p>
--

On the amended application the applicant team modified the vision statement for the school to remove the statement that students entering high school would be one grade level ahead of their peers (P. 7). Removal of this assertion addresses the CRC’s prior questions on the original application.

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
 Note: Because this standard was initially rated as meeting the criteria, the CRC did not re-evaluate items B – D on page 8.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

2. Target Population and Student Body

The Target Population and Student Body section should describe the anticipated target population of the school and explain how the school will be organized by grade structure, class size and total student enrollment over the term of the school’s charter.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(10)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A clear description of the students the charter school intends to serve including any target populations in accordance with Florida law.
- Alignment of the targeted student body with the overall mission of the school.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Although this section is significantly improved in terms of clarity and the provision of meaningful detail, the rating remains as partial until such time that the applicant obtains confirmation from the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) or another appropriate legal entity that the proposed enrollment criteria and dual lottery process to attain the target population and achieve a balance of English-dominant and Spanish-dominant students will be in compliance with Florida charter law in s. 1002.33 (10).

Strengths (reference page numbers)
<p>Information/Comment Only: In order to implement the Dual Language Two-Way Immersion program, the school’s plan is to have a K-5 student population that consists of 50% English-dominant and 50% Spanish-dominant language (Spanish identified as the home language). The Kindergartners in Year 1 will be the first cohort to go through the DL-TWI program as they progress from grade K to grade 5.</p> <p>The application states that the geographic area intended to serve is the north county Sarasota Community (P. 9). The school may likely be a feeder school to McIntosh Middle School. Sarasota Hispanic parents will be attracted to a school that offers a bilingual program in a small school setting with staff on hand who can communicate in their language (P. 13).</p> <p>The student registration form presented is appropriately revised so that parent response to the home language question is optional and the ELL status is not requested (Appendix S).</p>

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)

Although the applicant notes that kindergarten enrollments in north county Sarasota schools vary from 80-150 students, the CRC remains concerned that the projected enrollment number of 108 Kindergarten students for Year 1 may not be realistic (P. 12). The basis for the concern is the possible negative impact on the financial viability of the school.

The application states that admission will be open to all students, regardless of home language or ELL status (P. 9). The application also states that enrollment may be limited to specific student populations (P. 10). According to the application, if the school receives more student applications than available seats, random lotteries will be conducted separately within the English-dominant and Spanish-dominant student groups. The idea proposed is that students within each language-dominant group would have the same probability of selection. The CRC’s concern is that if the cap is 50% per language and more English-dominant students apply, then an English-dominant student will have a lower probability of admission.

CRC concerns pertaining to the target population, F.S. 1002.33(10)(d) and (e) as it relates to statutorily allowable open-enrollment, admissions criteria and the lottery process is presented and discussed under Section 14 of this report.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>The applicant is advised to obtain verification from FLDOE that it is legally allowable to designate seats available and to conduct lotteries for seats within each category (English-dominant, Spanish-dominant) as opposed to overall by grade level.</p>	<p>We met personally with Adam Emerson and other members of the FLDOE Charter School Department on October 17 and were advised that if approved, Sarasota’s Dreamers Academy will be the first dual language immersion two-way public charter school in Florida.</p> <p>Mr. Emerson stated it is inappropriate for him to comment at this point, since he handles both the appeals process and charter school grant program.</p> <p>However, we have reached out to Commissioner Pam Stewart and await her response. They are a bit busy because of the hurricane.</p> <p>We had a meeting with Jose Viana, US DOE Deputy Secretary of Education and Director of the Office of Language and English Acquisition, and also with his wife Aimee Viana, who directs the President’s Committee of Hispanic Education. We are set to meet again at La Cosecha in November, but will reach out to them prior to that to explain Sarasota School District requirements.</p>	<p>Several Florida schools have Dual Language Immersion Programs. Tice elementary in Lee County is a dual language immersion traditional school. Brevard County has a K-8 charter school that offers a K-3 Bilingual Immersion school within a school. Broward County has Dual Language Immersion programs offered in 44 traditional schools. It is the CRC’s understanding that the DL program have a balance of English and the target language students. However, in these cases the DL is offered as a program within a school or school within a school model rather than what is proposed by Dreamers Academy.</p> <p>Contrary to what is stated, Sarasota is not imposing any additional “requirements” beyond what is in the application template. The criteria in the application does require the applicant and the Sponsor to ensure that any proposed process in the application is “in accordance with Florida Law.”</p> <p>At this time neither the applicant or the CRC have received assurances from FLDOE. In an email dated October 19, 2018 from Mr. Adam Miller, FLDOE, to Ms. Chaffee he states that the FLDOE attorneys do not offer legal opinions</p>

	<p>At this point, we would like to reassure the CRC and the school board that this issue will be resolved in a manner that optimizes the implementation of the dual language instruction model.</p> <p>Since we are ahead of Florida history here, should policy not move fast enough before contractual negotiations, then we will hold an open enrollment process with one lottery per grade and manage our linguistic requirements through marketing, and reserve the right to control open enrollment as per state charter statute.</p>	<p>to individuals or schools because they serve as the attorneys for SBE and FLDOE. In the same email, he does suggest that s. 1002.33(10)(e)4 “may offer you some leeway.” Mr. Miller states that the applicant should consult with an attorney who understands charter school law to ascertain whether there are legal barriers to the proposed lottery process.</p> <p>In an email from Mr. Adam Emerson, FLDOE, to Ms. Geri Chaffee dated August 13, 2018, Mr. Emerson replied to her questions and stated that seats cannot be set aside for any reason other than those referenced in statute. He also states that weighting to obtain a student body language balance may not be allowed by law.</p> <p>The CRC looks forward to receiving a clear confirmation from the Commissioner or the US DOE that establishing school capacity by language spoken and conducting a two-lottery system is legally allowed.</p> <p>The applicant states that if the matter is not resolved, the school will <u>not</u> set aside seats for English and Spanish speakers. Rather, all eligible applications will be equally considered for enrollment at the school and, if more applications are received than seats available, a single lottery will be conducted so that every student, regardless of language spoken, has the same likelihood of being selected for enrollment.</p>
--	---	--

<p>How and at what point in the process will language dominance be ascertained in order to assign student applications into one of the two lottery groups? (P. 9)</p>	<p>At Dreamers Academy we have decided to have an optional question within the application asking for home language. We plan open houses, information sessions and focus round tables in both Spanish and English dominant communities (see preliminary list of locations p.89).</p> <p>Interest applications will be available at all events, and prospective students and their families will also be directed to our web site which will have sections in English and in Spanish.</p> <p>During the choice school open enrollment days, we will collect formal registration forms with the optional question being answered to ensure we are able to determine what language dominance the student would best fit. Once open enrollment is closed, numbers will be calculated, then and only then will we implement the two-lottery system for dual language grades. (Pending its approval of course.) For our first five years of operation, non-dual language grades will have one grade-level lottery should applications exceed available seats.</p>	<p>It’s been noted that the Student Enrollment Form (Attachment S in the Application) includes the optional question about home language, which is acceptable. If used for placement into the <u>program</u> (not the school but rather a program within the school), the home language may serve the purpose of identifying language dominance. Information will not be available if the parent does not respond to the question.</p> <p>Another viable option is to accept all applications within the enrollment window and enroll all students who apply, regardless of language. Then, once enrolled at the school level, offer parents 2 program choices, the DL-TWI program or a traditional program. Conducting the two-lottery process may be appropriate to place students into the DL-TWI program. Parents who opt not to participate in DL or do not get a seat due to program capacity would go into the traditional program.</p>
---	---	--

3. Educational Program Design

The Educational Program Design section should describe the educational foundation of the school and the teaching and learning strategies that will be employed.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)2.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present an educational program design that:

- An educational program design that:
 - Is clear and coherent;
 - Is based on effective, experience or research-based educational practices and teaching methods, and high standards for student learning;
 - Aligns with the school’s mission and responds to the needs of the school’s target population, and
 - Is likely lead to improved student performance for the school’s target population.
- A proposed daily school schedule and annual calendar that complies with statutory requirements for annual number of instructional minutes/days and aligns with priorities and practices described in the educational program design.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions remain relative to the evaluation criteria that the educational design is likely to improve performance for all students, including struggling readers. The 80-90% Spanish to 10-20 % English linguistic balance in the delivery of the curriculum remains a concern, therefore the rating remains as partially meeting this standard.

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The Dual Language Two-Way Immersion program (DL-TWI model) is research-based and well established. The program uses Spanish and English for literacy and content development. Spanish speaking students (ELL and non-ELL) and native English speakers become proficient in their native language and learn to master a second language and thus become bilingual and biliterate.</p> <p>The information presented in the amended application provides more specific detail about the education program design and the learning environment, especially for the first DL-TWI cohort as they progress through the grade levels. The applicant provided case scenarios to explain what the program would look like for a student and to describe a student’s typical daily schedule. (Pp. 16-17)</p> <p>A relevant and succinct summary of the research on the effectiveness of the Dual Language Two-Way Immersion Program is presented. (Pp. 18-20)</p>
--

The school will provide opportunities for students to experience different cultures and cross-cultural learning. Research stated also shows great benefits to native Spanish speakers.

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
 The foundational literacy program for native English speakers entering K is of great concern. *Please see questions below.*

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments																														
<p>Kindergarten students will be immersed in the 90/10 model with 90% of their instruction being delivered in Spanish. How does this benefit a native English speaker who is grappling with the foundational literacy skills needed to progress their literacy skills? (P. 16, P. 32 and Attachment FF5)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="166 722 924 1068"> <thead> <tr> <th>Kindergarten Status of English Reading range 90% - 10%</th> <th>Reading Block I</th> <th>I-Ready during Reading Block I</th> <th>Intervention & Enrichment</th> <th>Reading Block II</th> <th>Special Fine Arts Rotation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Proficient English Dominant</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>English</td> <td>Enrichment (Spanish)</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>Spanish</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proficient Spanish Dominant</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>English</td> <td>Enrichment (Spanish)</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>Spanish</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Struggling English Dominant</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>English</td> <td>Intervention (English)</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>Spanish</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Struggling Spanish Dominant</td> <td>English w/ Flexible Support</td> <td>English</td> <td>Intervention (English)</td> <td>Spanish</td> <td>Spanish</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Kindergarten Status of English Reading range 90% - 10%	Reading Block I	I-Ready during Reading Block I	Intervention & Enrichment	Reading Block II	Special Fine Arts Rotation	Proficient English Dominant	Spanish	English	Enrichment (Spanish)	Spanish	Spanish	Proficient Spanish Dominant	Spanish	English	Enrichment (Spanish)	Spanish	Spanish	Struggling English Dominant	Spanish	English	Intervention (English)	Spanish	Spanish	Struggling Spanish Dominant	English w/ Flexible Support	English	Intervention (English)	Spanish	Spanish	<p>According to Fred Genesee, author of <i>Dual Language Development and Disorders</i>, a common misconception is that students who are enrolled in dual language programs may struggle in their native language (2015). His research asserts that ‘literacy skills transfer from one language to the next, particularly in languages with similar alphabetic characters’ and struggling students who are in a language immersion program outperform their traditional school ‘struggling’ counterparts.</p> <p>To further support our struggling English dominant students, if initial screenings and diagnostic assessments identify an English speaker to have deficiencies in English foundation literacy skills, those skills will be targeted during the I & E time where this student will be provided his or her intervention in English, as noted in chart to the left.</p> <p>Furthermore, word work instruction, which secures foundational skills, is also delivered in English. Writing, where students bring together the alphabetic sounds and symbols, is a <i>language flexible block</i> of time where students are able to apply the learning necessary to develop their foundational literacy skills in L1 and L2.</p>	<p>The response does not fully address the CRC’s concern about the 90/10 curriculum model.</p> <p>During a typical school day 6 hours of instruction equates to 360 minutes. If Kindergarten students receive 10% of their instruction in English, then that equates to 36 minutes or a total of 180 minutes per week. This support during the I&E time for struggling learners of both native English and Spanish speaking students will be in English as well as the 45 minutes per week of i-Ready. When you subtract the i-Ready time, you are down to 135 minutes per week of literacy instruction in English.</p> <p>While the research quoted in the applicant’s response states that “literacy skills transfer from one language to the next...”, the committee is focused on the intensity of instruction in English that occurs in our current kindergarten classrooms with our striving students and the challenges of closing the gaps for them at this young age. Where will students go when the Dual Language Immersion program doesn’t meet their needs? How much further behind will a kindergarten student fall before we react?</p>
Kindergarten Status of English Reading range 90% - 10%	Reading Block I	I-Ready during Reading Block I	Intervention & Enrichment	Reading Block II	Special Fine Arts Rotation																											
Proficient English Dominant	Spanish	English	Enrichment (Spanish)	Spanish	Spanish																											
Proficient Spanish Dominant	Spanish	English	Enrichment (Spanish)	Spanish	Spanish																											
Struggling English Dominant	Spanish	English	Intervention (English)	Spanish	Spanish																											
Struggling Spanish Dominant	English w/ Flexible Support	English	Intervention (English)	Spanish	Spanish																											

If native English speakers are being taught a majority of their lessons in Spanish, do they become ESOL students needing specific interventions to support their development in all content areas? The data provided shows where students typically enter K from the targeted demographic area. (P. 16 and Attachment FF6)

We anticipate our students to reflect incoming baseline test scores comparable to area schools with similar demographics to our targeted population. The baseline scores selected for incoming students were derived from Sarasota School District's Dashboard 2017-18 average scores from Tuttle, Gocio and Emma E. Booker elementary schools. They are as follows:

Sarasota Grade Level	2017-18 Reading – i-Ready AP1	2017-18 Reading – i-Ready AP3	2017-18 Reading – FSA	2017-18 Math – i-Ready AP1	2017-18 Math – i-Ready AP3	2017-18 Math – FSA
Kindergarten	16%	88%		12%	82%	
First Grade	12%	61%		6%	56%	
Second Grade	24%	64%		11%	68%	
Third Grade	38%	66%		21%	63%	
Fourth Grade			40.5			47.5
Fifth Grade			41.1			51.7

These students will not be traditional ESOL students. These students will have the life-long advantage of living in an English-saturated community. Simply put, all students will benefit from the language acquisition strategies of sheltered instruction as outlined in our application's Primary Instructional Approach (p. 24), which states:

Sheltered instruction will be the primary instructional approach that will be the foundational piece to engage our second language learners whether Spanish-dominant or English-dominant speakers. This approach expects teachers to use clear, direct, simple language and a wide range of scaffolding strategies to communicate meaningful input in the content area to students.*

Learning tasks that connect new content to students' prior knowledge, that require collaboration among students, and that spiral through content area material, offer second language learners the grade-level content instruction of their monolingual peers, while adapting lesson delivery to suit their individual language proficiency levels. Strategies that support sheltered instruction will be used in all K-5 classrooms and special area classes.

The data shows that only 16% of students from the targeted geographic area enter kindergarten on grade level. Research shows the 30 million word gap study http://www.wvearlychildhood.org/resources/C-13_Handout_1.pdf is real and closing the language gap is a big part of our work with this population. Helping students to read sight words in English (those words that aren't traditionally said as they are spelled, i.e., was, you, from) is a critical first step in reading along with the foundational decoding skills. In English the "a" in cat is very different than the "a" sound in gato (Spanish word for cat). In Spanish the "a" sounds like a short "o" as in the word shop or cot.

The CRC's concern is that many of the Native Spanish speakers will have the oral language component but not the sound symbol relationships related to reading and writing in Spanish. Therefore, it is likely that the native English speakers will not speak the language or have the print component and will be at a greater deficit.

4. Curriculum Plan

The Curriculum Plan section should explain not only *what* the school will teach but also *how* and *why*.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)(a)2.; s. 1002.33(6)(a)4.; s. 1002.33(7)(a)2.; s.1002.33(7)(a)4.

A response that meets the standard will present a curriculum plan that:

- Provides a clear and coherent framework for teaching and learning;
- Is research-based;
- Is well-aligned with the school’s mission and educational philosophy;
- Provides an emphasis on reading;
- Will enable students to attain Florida standards and receive a year’s worth of learning for each year enrolled; and
- Will be appropriate for students below, at, and above grade level.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The information provided in the amended application addresses many of the deficiencies and weaknesses in the initial application, therefore the rating moves from Does Not Meet, as assigned in the May 8th report, to Partially Meets the Standard. The additional clarification provided by the applicant on October 17th was insufficient to meet the evaluation criteria that below grade level students will gain a year’s worth of learning for each year enrolled. Therefore, the rating remains at partial.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The application states that the curriculum for the DL-TWI program will be developed and provides a good description of the proposed curriculum, the development plan and a realistic timeline for completion and implementation. (Pp. 27-29)
The proposed curriculum for the DL-TWI Kindergarten cohort is well aligned with their mission and educational philosophy.
The school’s reading plan is presented in the application. (Pp. 30-32)
Dreamers Academy plans to focus on standards-driven instruction and will provide opportunities for students to be well-rounded including PE, Art and Music. The MTSS process is well defined throughout this section.
Given the school’s mission and educational program design, additional academic standards for Spanish language proficiency and for biliteracy will be established and adopted. (P. 29)

<p>Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)</p> <p>Concern remains regarding how the school will meet the needs of English language-dominant students who are struggling readers, specifically, Kindergartners in the DL-TWI who receive 80 - 90% of their instruction in Spanish.</p> <p>Meeting the needs of striving learners within the core curriculum as well as interventions to target areas of need for ALL learners is of great concern.</p>

<p>Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)</p>	<p>Charter Applicant’s Response</p>	<p>CRC Review/Comments</p>
<p>Since the goal is to have students become bilingual in reading, writing, listening and speaking, how will the 30-minute block of writing be taught? 50% Spanish, 50% English? (P. 23) What does writing look like for a Kindergarten student?</p>	<p>Writing, where students bring together the alphabetic sounds and symbols, is a <i>language flexible block</i> of time where students are able to apply the learning necessary to develop their foundational literacy skills in L1 and L2.</p> <p>Initially, research would support, that two language learners use modeled writing, word banks, sentence starters and language frames, primary verb conjugations, all through the Language Experience Approach to support the use of phonics and syntax in English and Spanish.</p> <p>Additionally, the Writing Units of Study, which include narrative, informational and opinion genre specific units, will be implemented alternately in English and Spanish while parallel to the Reading Units of Study, respectively.</p>	<p>Writing and reading are reciprocal processes. Invented spelling allows students to use language they can speak rather than focusing totally on the correct spelling. However, the difference will be writing the word for “ferocious Doberman pincher” in Spanish as opposed to “mean dog.” It is essential that students use their oral language in print and not limit their word choice.</p>

If Social Studies and Science concepts are taught through the Reading block, what does a balanced approach to literacy look like? If the same lesson is then repeated in English, do the students do the same tasks? Experiments? Is there a hands-on approach to Science for K-5? How will content specific vocabulary be taught? (P. 24)

The balanced approach to literacy is an instructional framework which coincides with the Gradual Release of Responsibility. Hence, Social Studies and Science concepts will be embedded and scaffolded across the literacy framework (modeled, shared, guided, independent) within the 90-minute reading block.

Lessons will not be repeated but extended in the partner language within the Reading Block II, with emphasis on the focus or extension of standard, alternate mentor texts, academic vocabulary and transference of all reading strategies to independent reading.

As stated on p. 24 “Science instruction will include hands-on labs, field trips, and problem-based learning to ensure that students can engage in relevant application of the standards.” Specific science content vocabulary will be taught explicitly using the experience of the lab, field trip or problem-based learning event in a meaningful context.

Our ongoing research and best practices (Urow and Beeman, 2013) recommend that every moment in the teaching environment integrates reading, writing and academic vocabulary within the framework of all content areas. This is a foundational concept of Teaching for Biliteracy.

The response partially addresses the question posed. Granted that the learning of content and concepts (e.g., the scientific method) occurs regardless of the language in which it is taught and learned. The question remains, how will content-specific vocabulary be taught, especially to prepare students for Math and Science assessments that are administered in English?

<p>Math occurs during a 60-minute block. What does this look like in the bi-lingual methodology? Do students spend 30 minutes learning the lesson in Spanish and another 30 minutes in English? Is one day in Spanish and the next English? Vocabulary is very important to deepening conceptual understanding in math. How will this be addressed? (P. 24)</p>	<p>For our Kindergarten cohort, all Math instruction will be in Spanish. Furthermore, due to the concrete nature of mathematics, this content area is more easily acquired in a different language than other content areas.</p> <p>Problem-solving and mathematical reasoning are closely linked to language, therefore, sheltered instructional strategies will support the acquisition of mathematical thinking and language.</p> <p>As noted, all Vocabulary instruction, whether in English or Spanish, will be supported by utilizing realia, pictures, graphics, word walls and scaffolded throughout the lesson with integration of related cognates. Additionally, other sheltered instructional methodologies will be used.</p>	<p>The school’s plan is that mathematics would be taught 100% in Spanish. While we understand that the concepts of parts of 10, one to one correspondence, addition and subtraction can look the same with the use of manipulatives, there is a big concern about the language of mathematics void in the students’ learning. Our Kindergarten students begin having mathematical discourse early on to explain their thinking using academic vocabulary.</p> <p>How/when will students learn the specific vocabulary of mathematics, as expressed in English, and as measured in English language math tests, such as the FSA?</p>
<p>i-Ready will be used as part of the Reading Block. Will it be used for math as well? Does this occur within the 60-minute block? How often? How many minutes?</p>	<p>iReady will be used as part of our ongoing center rotations in both Reading and Math with students expected to follow a 45-minute weekly requirement. We will ask teachers to meet with students at least twice a week to review lessons and conduct a data chat with student</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>
<p>If Curriculum Associates does develop a Spanish Diagnostic in 2019, which students will take the assessment, when, how often? How will the data add value to the information available from the iReady and Fountas & Pinnell tests? (P. 33)</p>	<p>Given when Curriculum Associates Spanish Diagnostic is released, we will work closely with representatives from this organization to compare the diagnostic and progress monitoring feedback which it will provide. Once this comparison is complete, the school leadership team will decide the best way to implement in conjunction with the Fountas & Pinnell assessments.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>

5. Student Performance, Assessment and Evaluation

The Student Performance, Assessment and Evaluation section should define what students attending the school should know and be able to do and reflect how the academic progress of individual students, cohorts over time, and the school as a whole will be measured.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)(a)3.; s.1002.33(7)(a)3.; s.1002.33(7)(a)4.; s.1002.33(7)(a)5.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- An understanding of academic accountability provisions and goals mandated by the state.
- An indication that the applicant will hold high expectations for student academic performance.
- Measurable goals for student academic growth and improvement.
- Promotion standards that are based on high expectations and provide clear criteria for promotion from one level to the next, and for graduation (if applicable).
- Evidence that a range of valid and reliable assessments will be used to measure student performance.
- A proposed assessment plan that is sufficient to determine whether students are making adequate progress.
- Evidence of a comprehensive and effective plan to use student achievement data to inform decisions about and adjustments to the educational program.
- Plans for sharing student performance information that will keep students and parents well informed of academic progress.
- Acknowledgement of and general plan to meet FERPA requirements.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The amended application provides essential detail and addresses all of the areas which were not sufficiently addressed or missing from the prior application. The information presented meets the majority of the criteria, therefore, the rating changed from Does Not Meet on the May 8th report to Partially Meets the standard. The final rating moved to “Meets” because the applicant agreed to set school performance goals to reflect higher achievement targets if the application is approved. Such goals will be established in the charter contract.

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The school plans to use a Spanish Language Arts assessment to measure students’ proficiency in Spanish and has established achievement goals. This is in alignment with the school’s mission and educational program design. (P. 38)</p> <p>The applicant availed themselves of the District’s Data Dash Board to study the achievement data for surrounding schools in order to examine baseline data and set performance goals. (Pp. 36-37)</p>

Performance goals are established for all grade level groups (e.g., K-2, 3-5) and for all content areas, English Language Arts (ELA), mathematics and science. (Pp. 36-38, Attachment FF6)

The information provided shows that the school will have a comprehensive and effective plan to use student achievement data to inform decisions about students’ needs and make adjustments to instruction and support systems. (Pp. 42-43)

The types of training and support planned for teachers on how to interpret and use data to identify student needs and target instruction is solid. (Pp. 43-44)

The school will use the Fountas-Pinnell BAS test, a reliable and valid measure. It is anticipated that 60% of DL-TWI students, both English and Spanish dominant language students, will be proficient in Spanish by Year 4 of the program.

The school aims to have 90% of their families involved in the school as measured by the Parent Contract criteria for engagement and 10 hours of volunteer work. (Attachment FF6, projected SIP Goals)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)

This section of the amended application is greatly improved. School Performance goals are set for all grades and content areas. The expected student growth of 5% each year over the years is commendable, however, the proposed initial annual goals and targets do not reflect high expectations for student academic performance (Pp. 36-37). In light of the research claims that the DL-TWI model has “astounding” academic results (P. 19), the Dreamers Academy goals are low.

For example:

- The Year 1 goals for K-3 students is 60% on or above grade level in ELA and 65% in math (Spring 2020 iReady). These targets are lower than the current Spring 2018 iReady scores, 66% ELA and 67% math, for schools identified by the applicant as comparable schools (combined data for Emma E. Booker, Gocio and Tuttle).
- Goals for percent proficient in Year 1 for grades 3-5 is set at 45% for ELA-FSA and 50% for Mathematics-FSA. The Dreamers Academy’s FSA proficiency goals for 2020 are either the same or lower than the district’s current 2018 performance for surrounding schools. The percent proficient for Emma E. Booker, Gocio and Tuttle (combined) is 45% ELA and 53% Math. Including Alta Vista and Wilkinson in the analysis raises the baseline to 49% ELA and 57% in Math (Data Dashboard School Grades 2018).
- The Science goal for grade 5 is 50% proficient in Year 1, not reflective of high expectations as compared to the current 50% proficient for Tuttle/Gocio/Emma or the 52% proficient when Alta Vista and Wilkinson are included in the 2018 school averages.
- For the entering K students (2019-2020), who will be the cohort fully immersed in the DL-TWI program, only 55 % are projected to be proficient in reading (level 3 or higher) in 3rd grade after 4 years in the school. For ELL students, after 4 years of school, the proficiency goal is 50% in ELA. This level of performance goals for the DL-TWI cohort after 4 years in the program is unacceptably low.

The question arose as to why the applicant identified only three schools, Tuttle, Emma E. Booker and Gocio, as comparable schools for baseline data as the basis for setting the school’s annual goals. Why not also include Alta Vista and Wilkinson elementary? These schools are within miles of each other and serve the same types of communities. Using McIntosh Middle as a central pivot point, Alta Vista is the closest followed by Tuttle and Wilkinson. Including all five schools provides baseline data that is higher compared to scores based only on Tuttle, Gocio and Emma, thus making the school’s performance goals relatively lower and not reflective of high academic expectations.

The school plans to adopt Sarasota’s Student Progression Plan. However, the school’s proposed Dual Language Two-Way Immersion program does not align to the district’s course offerings or sequence. The school’s mission of English and Spanish biliteracy cannot be fulfilled by only following the district Student Progression Plan. (P. 41)

There appears to be several assessments that provide similar if not redundant information, such as iReady 4 times a year and SAT at grade 2. The school should consider the impact of too much testing for students and eliminate the use of SAT-2. (P. 42)

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>If approved, the school’s governing board will be asked to submit, for district approval, school performance goals based on the achievement levels of comparable/surrounding schools and which reflect high expectations for students.</p>	<p>Expectations for our students will be very high across academic content, in both English and Spanish. We anticipate that the families of students who are struggling in surrounding schools will be very attracted to our inclusive, linguistically-accessible and culturally-competent dual language model.</p> <p>In fact, on October 16 Principals of six struggling schools with over 1,000 Hispanic students among them, presented their SIPs to the school board, and EEB’s Principal Ms. Oliver stated that of the 12 students that were retained, she’s pretty certain 11 went to charter schools. We anticipate that this trend will continue, and we welcome many of the children that are struggling in the three district schools in our target attendance area.</p> <p>We also believe we will be attractive to families who currently have their children at various religious schools and charter schools.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable, thank you.</p> <p>If the application is approved, the governing board for Dreamers Academy will submit for district approval a set of school performance goals that are in line with the performance of surrounding schools and reflect high expectations for students. Such goals will be specified in the charter contract.</p>

	<p>We look forward to working together to get the correct FSA numbers for any schools the district deems comparable, and we will abide by achievement performance goals the district sets for us.</p> <p>We did not include Alta Vista or Wilkinson in our calculations because all the sites we are considering are north of Fruitville Road, and these two schools are much further south from where the families we hope to serve reside.</p>	<p>The CRC examined the correct data two ways, the Spring 2018 FSA data and 2018 School Grades data. Either way, with the exception of FSA ELA, all other goals are at or lower than results for Tuttle, Gocio and Emma combination as well as for the three schools plus Alta Vista and Wilkinson.</p> <p>Two points for consideration. First, the application states that the school will be open to all students and, there is an expectation that Hispanic families will be attracted to school, so the distance from Fruitville Road should not be a consideration. Secondly, the distance between Alta Vista and Tuttle is 1.6 miles, so the schools serve similar communities. Using McIntosh Middle as the central pivot point, all 5 schools are within a 5-mile radius, with Emma being the farthest away and Alta Vista being the closest.</p>
<p>Please be advised that, if approved, the Dreamers Academy school will have to create their own school’s Pupil Progression Plan and Reading Plan as their curriculum is not in alignment with Sarasota County Schools. This is allowable, by state law, as long as the plan is completed and presented in a timely fashion, to the sponsor at the time the charter is negotiated. Please acknowledge.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. We have reviewed all the changes The District is recommending for its Pupil Progression Plan, most of which have to do with ELLs. We are in the process to adapting it to our instructional model. For the most part, it will be very similar.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>
<p>Regarding report cards and grading, will students be graded on Spanish and English proficiency? That is, how will students’ level of bilingual literacy be determined and reported to parents? (P. 40)</p>	<p>Students will receive an official ELA grade, as deemed by state statute. SLA grades will be reported in the special comment section provided for these content specific grades.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>

6. Exceptional Students

The Exceptional Students section should demonstrate an understanding of the requirements of the school to serve all students and provide a concrete plan for meeting the broad spectrum of educational needs and providing all students with a quality education.

Statutory Reference(s): s. 1002.33(16)(a)3.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A clear description of the programs, strategies and supports the school will provide to students with disabilities that will ensure appropriate access for students with disabilities and that the school will not discriminate based on disability.
- A clear description of how the school will ensure students with disabilities will have an equal opportunity of being selected for enrollment.
- A comprehensive and compelling plan for appropriate identification of students with special needs to ensure they are served in the least restrictive environment possible, have appropriate access to the general education curriculum and schoolwide educational, extra-curricular, and culture-building activities in the same manner as non-disabled students, receive required and appropriate support services as outlined in their Individual Education Plans and 504 plans, and participate in standardized testing.
- An understanding and commitment to collaborating with the sponsor to ensure that placement decisions for students with disabilities will be made based on each student’s unique needs through the IEP process.
- An appropriate plan for evaluating the school’s effectiveness in serving exceptional students, including gifted.
- A realistic enrollment projection (SWD) and a staffing plan that aligns with the projections.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For the most part, the information presented addressed the criteria and meets the standard. For the most part the clarification was sufficiently adequate to maintain the “Meets” rating. If the application is approved, any lingering issues will be clarified at the time the charter is established.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
Information/Comment Only: The school anticipates serving an ESE population of approximately 10% or less.
The application provides an adequate description of the programs, strategies and supports the school will provide to students with disabilities as well as gifted students.
The MTSS process the school will follow to identify students with disabilities who have not yet been identified is thoroughly described and sound. (Pp. 47-49)
Appropriate and sufficient ESE staff will be hired. The school will also contract with licensed providers for additional ESE services. (P. 53)

<p>Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)</p> <p>Based on statements in the application, the school may be unaware of the role of the district versus the school’s responsibility as it pertains to ESE services and support. (P. 47, 52)</p> <p>There is reference in the application to modifying the curriculum and level of rigor in an IEP as a way to adjust what and how a student learns (P. 51). This would be a violation in that the curriculum itself and the academic standards cannot be modified for ESE students. The CRC will seek clarification and assurances that this is not the intention. Perhaps there is a misunderstanding of the difference between modifications and accommodations.</p>

<p>Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)</p>	<p>Charter Applicant’s Response</p>	<p>CRC Review/Comments</p>
<p>Clarification: Please be advised that the school is solely responsible for the development and implementation of IEP/504 plans and district staff do not participate in school IEP team meetings. Charter schools receive funding and are responsible for these activities (Pp. 47, 52). Please acknowledge.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>
<p>Please elaborate on the role and function of the PST chairperson. (P. 47)</p>	<p>The PST Chairperson will be responsible for developing, leading, implementing, monitoring, and collaborating with other educators in the schoolwide integration of MTSS. This includes coordinating PST meetings, managing student data, and maintaining all files and required documents.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>
<p>What is meant by “increase the number of students with low and high incidence disabilities” in the 1st paragraph, last sentence under E. (P. 50)</p>	<p>Our goal is that the majority of our students with disabilities are included in general education classrooms, or Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), as much as possible, with the necessary programs, strategies and supports, to achieve academic success.</p> <p><u>Clerical error.</u> “The school leadership team will continuously analyze data and processes to identify barriers and initiate improvement steps, including supplemental supports, services, modifications and accommodations, that decrease the number of students with low and high incidence disabilities, across all grades, in general education and natural contexts.</p>	<p>Unclear as to the explanation of the “clerical error.” One cannot decrease or increase the actual number of students with disabilities that enroll in the school. What does “low and high incidence disabilities mean? Is the applicant referring to the type of disability?</p>

<p>On page 51 of the application it states that “modifications of the curriculum and level of rigor will be delineated in a student’s IEP and will potentially adjust what and how the student learns.” Please explain. Also state your understanding of modification vs. accommodation as it relates to providing instructions to ESE students.</p>	<p>If a child requires either accommodations or modifications those adjustments will be outlined with the child’s Individual Education Plan. Simply stated, a modification is a change to what the student learns which will differ than their non-disabled peers and accommodations are instructional strategies and supports to ensure the student can reach what all students are learning.</p>	<p>Again, the CRC believes the applicant either does not understand or is misusing the term “modifications” as it relates to the education of ESE students.</p> <p><u>What</u> the student learns (i.e., curriculum and rigor) is NOT modified.</p>
--	--	---

7. English Language Learners

The English Language Learners section should demonstrate an understanding of the requirements of the school to serve English Language Learner students and provide a concrete plan for meeting the broad spectrum of educational needs and providing all students with a quality education.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(10)(f)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- Demonstrated understanding of legal obligations regarding the education of English Language Learners.
- A comprehensive and compelling plan for educating English Language Learner students that reflect the full range of programs and services required to provide all students with a high-quality education.
- A clear plan for monitoring and evaluating the progress of ELL students, including exiting students from ELL services.
- Demonstrated capacity to meet the school’s obligations under state and federal law regarding the education of English Language Learners.
- A realistic enrollment projection (ELL) and a staffing plan that aligns with the projections.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The amended application provides responses to the questions and prompts in the application template. The essential details provided clarified and addressed the concerns raised by the CRC in the May 8, 2018 report. For the amended application, the rating of this section remains as Meets the Standard.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The Dual Language Two-Way Immersion (DL-TWI) program is a research-based program that demonstrates a connection with academic student success when appropriately implemented in schools. (Pp. 55-57)
One of the school’s goal is to substantially close the achievement gap between ELL and non-ELL students. (P. 56)
The school plans to hire and retain a fully bilingual staff. (P. 42)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
Although a solid recruiting plan is in place, it may be challenging to staff the school with bilingual personnel to fully realize the potential of the DL-TWI model. (P. 63)

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
On page 56, 4 th paragraph it states that “[students] are offered a chance to be placed in the ELL program...” Students <u>shall be</u> placed upon initial identification of the home language survey and language assessment to receive ESOL services. Students are exited based on state statute or as the result of an ELL Committee Meeting based on 2 of the 5 Consent Decree criteria. It is not an offering or an opportunity for placement or exit, rather, it is a requirement based on specific criteria. Rule 6A-6.0902 Please acknowledge.	Thank you for the clarification. Acknowledged.	Response is acceptable.
Please be informed that students assessed with the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) in grades 3-12 are to be given the whole battery of tests: listening/speaking, reading and writing, not just reading and writing, or not selected tests based on proficiency on one or another test. (P. 57)	Thank you for the clarification. Duly Noted.	Response is acceptable.
Rule: 6A-6.0903 Requirements for Exiting English Language Learners from the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program states that “(b) Upon receipt of the statewide English Language Proficiency Assessment and FSA in ELA scores, schools shall exit students no later than the last school day of the school year...” Students are exited based on this rule and not, as stated on page 63, the ELL Committee or the Grade Level Leadership Team’s determination as to “whether the child is ready to exit the ESOL Program.” Other than the state identified assessments, no other “variety of data, metrics, assessments” or grades or teacher recommendations are the basis for the determination of eligibility to exit the ESOL program. (P. 63) Please reply.	Thank you for the clarification. We will comply with all the rules and regulations governing ELL and ESOL programs.	Response is acceptable.

8. School Culture and Discipline

The School Climate and Discipline section should describe the learning environment of the school and provide evidence that the school will ensure a safe environment conducive to learning.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)7.; s. 1002.33(7)(a)11.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A planned school culture that is consistent with the school’s mission and congruent with the student discipline policy.
- An approach to classroom management and student discipline that is consistent with the overall school culture and philosophy.
- Recognition of legal obligations and children’s rights related to enforcing student discipline, suspension, and recommended expulsion, including the school’s code of conduct, if available.
- Consideration of how the code of conduct will apply to students with special needs.
- Appropriate and clear roles of school administrators, teachers, staff, and the governing board regarding discipline policy implementation.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018. The rating of Meets the Standard is maintained for the amended application.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
Dreamers Academy will be a Servant Leader institution. (P. 64)
One of the pillars of dual language education is cross-cultural competency, which enables students to understand and respect cultural diversity in a variety of social contexts.
The school will follow the District’s Code of Conduct (P. 65). They will also establish a PBIS Team to develop a school-wide positive behavior support plan.

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>Unlike traditional schools, charter schools may dismiss (discharge) students from their school based on pre-determined criteria for discontinuing enrollment (or declining re-enrollment). For example, some schools have a parent/student contract that students must adhere to in order to continue enrollment at that school. The district’s Code of Conduct does not address dismissal, therefore, briefly describe the grounds for dismissal and the school’s procedures for dismissing a student from the school.</p>	<p>We are in the process of developing our parent/student contract that students and families must adhere to as to ensure continued enrollment. The contract will be finalized and communicated prior to beginning the application process.</p> <p>As described on page 66, we will have an ad hoc Disciplinary Committee which will ensure that school policies, progressive discipline, and federal guidelines for ESE/ELL students are followed.</p> <p>Additionally, the Principal will inform the Dreamers Academy Board of the decision and rationale of any discharge or decline of re-enrollment within the Monthly Board Report.</p>	<p>Response does not address the question, which was “<i>briefly describe the grounds for dismissal and the school’s procedures for dismissing a student from the school.</i>”</p>

9. Supplemental Programming

The Supplemental Programming section should describe extra and co-curricular activities offered by the school. This section is optional.

Statutory Reference(s):

NA

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A clear description of extra- and co-curricular activities that support, and do not detract from, the educational program.
- Evidence of an adequate funding source for extra- and co-curricular activities.
- Lack of supplemental programming may not be a basis for denial.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018 and maintains this rating for the amended application.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The described extra- and co-curricular activities should support the school’s educational plan. (P. 67)
Prior references to the Perkins grant and CTE funds are deleted in the amended application to correctly reflect that as an elementary school the school would be ineligible for these funds.

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

II. Organizational Plan

The Organizational Plan should provide an understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. It should present a clear picture of the school’s governance and management priorities, what responsibilities various groups and people will have, and how those groups will relate to one another.

10. Governance

The Governance section should describe how the policy-making and oversight function of the school will be structured and operate.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)15.; s. 1002.33(9)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A governing board that is legally structured, or has a plan to organize in conformity with the laws of Florida.
- A clear description of the governing board’s roles, powers, and duties that are consistent with overseeing the academic, organizational, and financial success of the school.
- Appropriate delineation between governance and school management roles.
- At least the core of the Governing Board is identified that has a wide range of knowledge and skills needed to oversee a charter school.
- A board structure (e.g. bylaws and policies concerning member selection, committees, meeting frequency) that supports sustainable and effective school governance.
- Evidence that applicant understands and intends to implement open meeting and records laws.
- Clear policy and plan for dealing with conflicts of interest.
- Appropriate and clear role for any advisory bodies or councils if included.
- An outline of a grievance process (or policy) that will simultaneously address parent or student concerns and preserve appropriate governance and management roles.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018. Significant additional detail has been provided.

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The Bylaws, Conflict of Interest Policy, as well as Roles, Duties, and Powers are clearly written, delineated, and within legislative recommendations. (Attachments H, I, J and K)</p> <p>The board intends to hold 11 meetings; which aligns with monthly financial review, as well as SAC requirements. This allows the board to serve in both capacities (P. 69). It is evident that the applicant team understands the structure of meetings and requirements of Sunshine Law. (P. 70)</p>
--

The school’s governing board is a diverse, knowledgeable group. The majority of the board members are Sarasota community residents. (P. 70)

The process for addressing a parent grievance or objection is fair and timely. (P. 73)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)

None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

11. Management and Staffing

The Management and Staffing section should describe how the day-to-day administration of the school’s operations will be structured and fulfilled.

Statutory Reference(s): s. 1002.33(7)(a)9.; s. 1002.33(7)(a)14.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- An organizational chart or charts that clearly and appropriately delineate lines of authority and reporting.
- A management structure that includes clear delineation of roles and responsibilities for administering the day-to-day activities of the school.
- Identification of a highly-qualified school leader or a sound plan for the recruitment and selection of the school leader.
- A viable and adequate staffing plan.
- A sound plan for recruiting and retaining highly-qualified and appropriately-certified instructional staff.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018.

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>Organizational charts delineate lines of authority with school responsibility being clearly defined as belonging to the principal (Attachment M). Roles and responsibilities for daily activities of the school are clearly separate from the board and given to the principal and other school support.</p> <p>The Dreamers governing board has identified the principal of the school. This individual has 29 years of experience as an educator and has served as a Florida public school principal. She has the credentials and qualifications for the position of school principal. (P. 74)</p>
--

<p>Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)</p> <p>Although the applicant does not state that all bilingual employees will be certified in Spanish, given the demographics of Sarasota County as well as the demographics of Sarasota County Schools employees, concerns do exist in how the school will recruit and meet their expectations that all instructional personnel for all subjects (to include math, science, language arts and social science) will be bilingual.</p>

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

12. Human Resources and Employment

The Human Resources and Employment section should define the policies and procedures that frame the school’s relationship with its staff.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)14.; s. 1002.33(12)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A clear explanation of the relationship between employees and the school.
- Description of the school leader and teacher evaluation plans, or outline of such plans, which align with the Student Success Act as defined by state law.
- A compensation and benefits plan or outline of such a plan that is aligned with Florida’s Student Success Act and will attract and retain quality staff.
- Procedures that are likely to result in the hiring of highly-effective personnel.
- Policies and procedures that hold staff to high professional standards or a plan to develop such policies and procedures.
- An effective plan to address any leadership or staff turnover.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018, and the information in the amended application also meets the standard.

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The school plans to be a participant of the Florida Retirement System and be an at-will employer. (P. 79)</p> <p>The relationship between employees and the school is clearly outlined with the principal being responsible for the employees of the school and daily operations. (P. 79)</p> <p>Although the benefits package has not been chosen yet the applicant did commit to offering a competitive benefit and salary package comparable to that of the School Board. The budget accounts for these benefits although the estimated cost appears to be too low compared to what the district offers its employees.</p>

<p>Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)</p> <p>None.</p>

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>Please be advised that the estimated insurance premiums are unrealistically low – i.e., lacking workman’s comp and the additional liability insurances required now for charter schools. The school should give consideration to obtaining an Active Shooter Policy if a guardian will be employed (unsure as it is not specified in the application) and a sexual abuse insurance policy because these items are excluded in typical liability policies.</p>	<p>The school is considering many different options providing group health care at a significant savings from a traditional fully insured group health plan. One option is to provide a high deductible plan for full time employees only. It is anticipated this high deductible plan will cover catastrophic medical needs. A Health Savings plan is being investigated through PeopleKeep that will cover a fixed dollar amount per employee for regular health screenings, doctor visitations, and prescription drugs. Another option is to provide an allocation per employee to allow them to purchase insurance through insurance exchanges using a Health Saving account arrangement. It is anticipated these types of program will be significantly below a traditional group health insurance plan. This type of plan is very attractive, as participants are allowed to manage their health insurance allocations to meet their individual needs.</p> <p>Acknowledged we should consider obtaining an Active Shooter Policy and a sexual abuse insurance policy. Thank you.</p>	<p>The cautionary notice pertained to the costs for other insurance policies, not the health plan.</p>
<p>Please be advised that, because of the school’s unique curriculum, teaching assignments and bilingual programs, the district’s Teacher Evaluation System (TES) will not be appropriate for the proposed school. The school may be solely responsible for the design, implementation and analysis of data for the student growth component of TES.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>

13. Professional Development

The Professional Development section should clearly describe the proposed expectations and opportunities for administrators, teachers, and other relevant personnel.

Statutory Reference(s):

NA

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- Professional development activities for administrators and instructional staff that align with the educational program and support continual professional growth as well as growth in responsibilities related to specific job descriptions.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The information provided in the amended application addresses many of the initial deficiencies, therefore the rating moves from Partially Meets to Meets the Standard.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The application provides a thorough description of the school’s core components of professional development. (P. 84)
Professional development in the areas of bilingual education and second language acquisition, aligned to the school’s educational program and curriculum, will be offered to teachers. (P. 84)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

14. Student Recruitment and Enrollment

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment section should describe how the school will attract and enroll its student body.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)7.; s. 1002.33.(7)(a)8.; s. 1002.33(10)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A student recruitment plan that will enable the school to attract its targeted population.
- An enrollment and admissions process that is open, fair, and in accordance with applicable law.
- A plan and process that will likely result in the school meeting its enrollment projections.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section 2-Target Population and Section 14-Student Recruitment and Enrollment are interrelated and must be aligned. Please note that the rating assigned for the amended application is “Meets the Standard” based on the expanded explanations and the addition of information missing from the February 1st application. However, as stated under Section 2-Target Population the FLDOE has suggested to the applicant that they obtain confirmation from an appropriate legal entity that the proposed lottery process will not be in violation of s. 1002.33(10), F.S.

<p>Strengths (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The proposed marketing and recruitment plan is comprehensive and will use a variety of strategies, including digital and traditional methods, social media, and reach-out efforts through community agencies. These strategies should be effective in reaching low-income families as well as Hispanic families. (Pp. 88-90)</p> <p>The process and timeline for open-enrollment, registration, lotteries and admissions is well described. (Pp. 93-94)</p>

<p>Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)</p> <p>The CRC remains concerned that despite the school’s location and solid marketing efforts, the school may not realize the desired student composition that is optimal for the DL-TWI model. As stated in the application: “The student body is expected to include a balance of Spanish-dominant and English-dominant speakers in each classroom.” (P. 90)</p>

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>How will “language dominance” be determined? At what point in the enrollment/admissions process will this occur?</p>	<p>During the choice school open enrollment periods, we will collect formal registration forms with the optional question being answered to ensure we are able to determine what language dominance the student would best fit.</p> <p>Since this is a dual language program, our orientation events will address the requirements of such, one of which is that language dominance is identified to achieve the linguistic balance in each dual language grade level.</p> <p>During our research, this appears to be standard practice in Florida districts that have implemented dual language programs.</p> <p>Please keep in mind this is a choice school, and applicants have the option of also choosing among any one of the 23 monolingual district schools, charters and private schools.</p> <p>Parents seeking the advantages of bilingualism for their children will complete an orientation that will thoroughly explain the rigor and high expectations of the dual language program. We will encourage all applicants to answer the optional question on the application form, and we will explain why we are asking this optional question.</p> <p>Cuando las sesiones de orientación se conduzcan en español, le explicaremos a las familias el programa educativo, y la necesidad de mantener un balance lingüístico en cada salón de clase.</p>	<p>See comments under Section 2 for the same question posed.</p> <p>Understood, marketing and awareness is key.</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification.</p>
<p>Please indicate the pages in the application that provide a description of the enrollment criteria for new students (other than sibs or employee’s children) who apply in years 2-5 of the school and are thereby not in the DL-TWI cohort?</p>	<p>Pages 91 – 94 detail the enrollment criteria for all students, including those in years 2 – 5.</p>	<p>We did not see specifics for students who were NOT in the DL-TWI cohort. For example, can a 2nd grade student (not in cohort, not sub, etc.) enroll in the school in Year 3?</p>

<p>According to the application (P. 92), the plan calls for two enrollment groups based on language dominance. If more applications are received than the number of seats available, the plan is to run two lotteries, one for English-dominant and one for Spanish-dominant language students. The CRC is unable to confirm if this strategy meets the provision in s.1002.33(10)(e)(5) for limiting enrollment to students who meet eligibility standards (i.e., home language) or if the interpretation is that dual language is considered the program, and enrollment is based on program capacity, as per paragraph (10)(b).</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2, if approved, Sarasota School District will make history again, as it opens the first dual language public charter school in Florida. The country’s first military public charter school opened 15 years ago – Sarasota Military Academy.</p> <p>Dreamers Academy is committed to a fair and equitable process for <i>all</i> students, while maintaining fidelity to our academic program model which is targeted to closing the achievement gap.</p> <p>It is our hope that FLDOE and US DOE will work together to grant Dreamers Academy the use of the two-lottery system in effect in Broward School District and in other states. The OLEA office of the US DOE has published rules and policies governing these programs in the document located at this link. https://ncela.ed.gov/files/rcd/TO20_DualLanguageRpt_508.pdf</p> <p>Innovation is often ahead of government and regulations, and should policy not move quickly enough, we will proceed with open enrollment and one lottery per grade level for which applications exceed capacity, and we reserve the right to follow Florida open enrollment statutes for charter schools.</p>	<p>See comments in Section 2.</p> <p>The district shares the same goal.</p>
<p>On page 91 you indicate that Mr. Adam Emerson, FLDOE director for charter schools, has been contacted regarding the school’s proposed enrollment and lottery process. Have you received a response from Mr. Emerson? If so, please provide a copy.</p>	<p>We met personally with Adam Emerson and other members of the FLDOE Charter School Department on October 17 and were advised that if approved, Sarasota’s Dreamers Academy will be the first dual language immersion two-way public charter school in Florida.</p> <p>Mr. Emerson reiterated that it is inappropriate for him to comment at this point, since he handles both the appeals process and charter school grant program.</p>	<p>See comments in Section 2.</p> <p>The district has copies of the emails from Mr. Emerson and Mr. Miller.</p>

	<p>On Oct 15, 2018, at 2:34 PM, Emerson, Adam <Adam.Emerson@fldoe.org> wrote:</p> <p>Geri, at this point in the application process, it would be inappropriate to answer any questions about the allowability or feasibility of any part of your proposal. If the district decided to deny based on what it thought was a material deficiency in the application, my office would manage the appeal process.</p> <p>In addition, we have reached out to Commissioner Pam Stewart and await her response. They are a bit busy because of the hurricane.</p> <p>We had a meeting with Jose Viana, US DOE Deputy Secretary of Education and Director of the Office of Language and English Acquisition, and also with his wife Aimee Viana, who directs the President’s Committee of Hispanic Education. We are set to meet again at La Cosecha in November, but will reach out to them prior to that to explain Sarasota School District requirements.</p> <p>At this point, we would like to reassure the CRC and the school board that this issue will be resolved in a manner that optimizes the implementation of the dual language instruction model.</p> <p>Since we are ahead of Florida history here, should policy not move fast enough before contractual negotiations, then we will hold an open enrollment process with one lottery per grade and manage our linguistic requirements through marketing, and reserve the right to control open enrollment as per state charter statute.</p>	
--	--	--

15. Parent and Community Involvement

The Parent and Community Involvement section should provide a broad overview of the school’s plans to encourage and support parental and community involvement.

Statutory Reference(s):

NA

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A general conception of how parents will be involved with the school that aligns with the school’s mission and provisions of the educational program. A detailed plan may be developed following approval.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The application provides a clear and comprehensive plan on how parents and the community will be reached and engaged in school activities. (Pp. 95-96)
The school plans to establish a Parent Involvement Committee charged with facilitating parent/family involvement. The school also plans to create a Parent Resource Center and involve parents in planning and participating in curriculum-based workshops. (Pp. 95-96)
The applicant provides numerous and varied letters from local community agencies, organizations, parents and education institutions as evidence of support for the Dreamers Academy charter school. (Attachment T)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

III. Business Plan

The Business Plan should provide an understanding of how the charter operators intend to manage the school’s finances. It should present a clear picture of the school’s financial viability including the soundness of revenue projections; expenditure requirements; and how well the school’s budget aligns with and supports effective implementation of the educational program.

16. Facilities

The Facilities section should provide an understanding of the school’s anticipated facilities needs and how the school plans to meet those needs.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)13.; s. 1002.33(18)

Evaluation Criteria:

If a facility is acquired, reviewers will look for:

- Evidence that the proposed facility complies with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies and can be ready for the school’s opening OR a timeline to ensure the facility will be in compliance and ready by school’s opening.
- A facility that is appropriate and adequate for the school’s program and targeted population.
- Evidence that the school has the necessary resources to fund the facilities plan.
- A reasonable back-up plan should the proposed facility plan fall through.

If a facility is not yet acquired, reviewers will look for:

- A realistic sense of facility needs.
- A plan and timeline for securing a facility that is appropriate and adequate for the school’s program and targeted population.
- Reasonable projections of facility requirements.
- Evidence that the school has the necessary resources to fund the facilities plan.
- Adequate facilities budget based on demonstrated understanding of fair market costs.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The information provided in the amended application meets the evaluation criteria for this standard.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The governing board is considering a location in the north or central Sarasota area. There is a possibility that Dreamers Academy will be a feeder school to McIntosh Middle School. (P. 98)
The strategies and timeline for securing an adequate facility in time to open in 2019-2020 are reasonable. (P. 99)

The identified locations under consideration are in areas serving the types of communities the school proposes to serve. (P. 100)

The estimated costs for a lease are realistic and are reflected in the budget (P. 99). The applicant provided a letter of assurance from Building Hope as evidence of funding that will be available for the facilities. (Attachment U)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)

None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

17. Transportation

The Transportation section should describe how the school will address these services for its student body.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(20)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- An outline of a reasonable transportation plan that serves all eligible students and will not be a barrier to access for students residing within a reasonable distance of the school.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The criteria for this standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018. The information in the amended application also meets the standard.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The school plans to contract with Sarasota County District for transportation services. (P. 100)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
The expectation that 70% of students will be transported seems high based on District percentage of 47%. There is concern over the number of Transportation FTE used in the Revenue Worksheet (overall and ESE FTE). This will impact budget projections for both revenue and expenses. (Budget Revenue Estimate Worksheet attachment)

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>Please note that transportation funds are not disbursed to charter schools. They are billed, by transportation, for all county services, routes, drivers, gas, etc. Please be advised that transportation costs typically exceed the allocated amount, so the school will need to use operating funds to reconcile the gap. The school may choose to provide transportation within a radius of the school, which controls costs, however, the application must state that transportation will be limited to students living within a specific mile-radius of the school.</p>	<p>Understood, and thank you for the clarification.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>

18. Food Service

The Food Service section should describe how the school will address these services for its student body.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(20)(a)1.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A food service plan that will serve all students and makes particular provisions for those students who may qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.
- A food service plan that places an emphasis on quality, healthy foods.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
Dreamers Academy will utilize the services of the school district’s Food and Nutrition Services for provision of the National School Lunch Program. (P. 100)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
The description for the school’s Food Service Plan consists of 3 sentences. However, given that the school plans to contract with the district, the committee accepted the response.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

19. School Safety and Security

The School Safety and Security section should provide a description of the school’s plan to ensure the safety and security of its students and faculty.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)11.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A plan that will reasonably ensure the safety of students and staff and the protection of the school facility and property. Note that a fully-developed plan will be completed upon approval of the application.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018.

Strengths (reference page numbers)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
Please be reminded that when school opens either a qualified guardian or SRO must be employed or under contract in order to be in compliance with the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Safety Act requirements.	Understood. Thank you.	Response is acceptable.

20. Budget

The Budget section should provide financial projections for the school over the term of its charter.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)(a)5.; s. 1002.33(6)(b)2.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- Budgetary projections that are consistent with and support all key aspects of the application, including the school’s mission, educational program, staffing plan, and facility.
- A realistic assessment of projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school.
- A sound plan to adjust the budget should revenues not materialize as planned.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

In general, the evaluation criteria were met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018. However, the CRC re-evaluated the budget to ensure alignment with the school program (which was clarified by the provision of essential information) and to other changes made in the amended application. Please note that although the rating remains at “Meets,” the applicant will be required to submit contingency plans prior to commencing the charter contract process.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
 The proposed budget will support the programs and operations for the school. Please note that some of the projected expenses may in actuality be higher than what is allowed for in the budget. For example, insurance costs, employee benefits.

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>Adjustments need to be made to some utility bills to ensure a sound budget. For example, the electric bill estimate is incredibly modest. Electric in new construction can cost between \$7000 and \$10,000 a month. In an older building, it can rise to \$15,000. Internet and cable services, at the level required for statewide assessments, costs approximately \$800 per month. The furniture and computer equipment line items are also very low.</p>	<p>The furniture and equipment budget is based upon using district surplus classroom furniture available from the school district. This is based upon information from other charter schools when they began operations.</p> <p>The estimate was made from our accounting firm that has many of the charter schools in the Sarasota District. The school will not have high energy consuming kitchen equipment and high energy consuming water heaters for gymnasium showers, etc. Using data from the Florida Power and light web site indicates the yearly amount could be approximately \$31,000 per year based upon approximately a 46,000 square foot building. If electrical costs do come in above the budget there is a contingency of \$221,604 that would be available to fund the approximately \$15,000 difference.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>
<p>Please note that the cost estimate for group insurance is unrealistically low. Typically, it is \$6000 per person, unless the school has plans for cost-sharing.</p>	<p>The school is considering many different options providing group health care at a significant savings from a traditional fully insured group health plan. One option is to provide a high deductible plan for full time employees only. It is anticipated this high deductible plan will cover catastrophic medical needs. A Health Savings plan is being investigated through PeopleKeep that will cover a fixed dollar amount per employee for regular health screenings, doctor visitations, and prescription drugs. Another option is to provide an allocation per employee to allow them to purchase insurance through insurance exchanges using a Health Saving account arrangement. It is anticipated these types of program will be significantly below a traditional group health insurance plan. This type of plan is very attractive, as participants are allowed to manage their health insurance allocations to meet their individual needs.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>

<p>Although required in the application, there is no meaningful discussion of the school’s contingency approach and plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated. Rather, the application states that three plans will be created (P. 104). Please discuss your contingency approach here and <u>provide as an attachment</u> a budget for 75% of revenue projections (or whatever percentage you consider minimal to support operations).</p>	<p>On page 104 of the application the contingency plan will be prepared once facilities are secured. Without knowledge of the planned facility preparing a contingency plan is very difficult, as one does not have the basis to make cost estimates. As indicated in the application 3 contingency plans will be developed once the facility is secured. In answer to the revenue projection decrease we are basing the decrease upon prior year’s state holdbacks during prior recessions. From 1980 through 2017 the largest midyear holdback was 5% of state Florida Education Finance Program Funds. Applying a 5% reduction to revenues for the first year would result in a reduction of approximately \$119,000 in revenues. The Board would have to decide to take the shortfall from either the \$221,604 contingency or review expenditures for reduction. It could also be a combination of expenditure reductions and using a portion of the contingency.</p>	<p>Response not acceptable.</p> <p>The applicant has not provided a contingency plan. The response that a plan <i>will be</i> prepared is not equivalent to submitting an actual plan, as requested in the application.</p> <p>If the application is approved, work on the charter contract will be delayed until such plan is provided.</p>
---	--	--

21. Financial Management and Oversight

The Financial Management and Oversight section should describe how the school’s finances will be managed and who will be responsible for the protection of student and financial records.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)(a)5.; s. 1002.33(7)(a)9.; s. 1002.33(7)(a)11.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A clear description of how the school’s finances will be managed, including who (or what contracted entity) will manage the finances. Such plan should contain strong internal controls to ensure appropriate fiscal management and ability to comply with all financial reporting requirements.
- A plan for the governing board to regularly exercise oversight over and take accountability for all financial operations of the school.
- Provisions for an annual financial audit.
- Appropriate public transparency of school financial health.
- Appropriate plan to securely store financial records.
- A plan to obtain appropriate and reasonable insurance coverage.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The additional information provided in the amended application meets the evaluation criteria for this standard.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The information presented in the amended application describes the internal controls the school will implement to ensure appropriate fiscal management. (P. 105)
Former Deputy Chief Financial Officer of Sarasota Schools will serve on the school’s governing board and head the finance committee. (P. 84)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
Note: Pellegrino, Honick, McFarland, & Miller have split into two separate agencies. This is new information and it is understood that the applicant may not have been aware of this at the time the application was written. Several HR companies can be contracted for audit or accounting services. It is suggested that separate contracts be issued with: an auditor, a payroll company, and an accountant. These three should be separate companies as a check and balance. However, if you choose to contract with them, please confirm which branch of the two new companies you will work with and verify that they can do all of the service items, including: Payroll, Accounting, Audit, Comprehensive Internal Control Manual (one-time service), Reconciliation of Monthly Bank Statements, Monthly financial reports, Store financial records for audit.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
<p>Please be advised: The comptroller/finance manager should not sign checks – this will become an audit finding due to the possibility of fraud.</p>	<p>Understood.</p> <p>All expenditures will be paid by checks requiring two signatures. No expenditure of funds will be paid from cash. Three to four individuals will be authorized to sign the checks. The signers will include the school Principal, Board Treasurer, Bookkeeper, and a designated back up individual when no other signer is available.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p> <p>Note: The position of the designated “back-up individual” will have to be identified.</p>
<p>Regarding the response to Item E on page 107 stating that the audit will be submitted by the school within 45 days but no later than nine months after the end of the fiscal, nine (9) months later would result in non-compliance. Please acknowledge that a copy of the audit report must be submitted to the Sponsor (district) by October 1st (rather than as stated in Item E on page 107).</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Also, regarding our accounting firm of Pellegrino & McFarland, the partners have separated but they remain in the same building and cooperating with clients. This just happened a few weeks ago, after our application submission of August 14, 2018. We have three separate companies handling auditing, payroll and accounting. They are: Pellegrino & McFarland PA, accounting; ADP for payroll; and Miller & Miller PA for the audits.</p>	<p>Response is acceptable.</p>

22. Start-Up Plan

The Start-Up Plan should provide a clear roadmap of the steps and strategies that will be employed to prepare the school to be ready to serve its students well on the first day of operation.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(7)(a)16.

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present an action plan that:

- Provides a thoughtful and realistic implementation plan that covers major operational items and provides flexibility for addressing unanticipated events.

CRC Rating	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This standard was met in the initial application submitted on February 1, 2018. The applicant added important detail to significantly improve this section in the amended application.

Strengths (reference page numbers)
The key events for the start-up plan are thoroughly presented in the amended application. The timeline for opening in 2019-2020 is realistic. (Pp. 108-109)

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
None.

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
None.		

Addendum

Addendum A: Replications [THIS SECTION NOT APPLICABLE]

The Replications section should identify the school to be replicated and provide evidence that the model has been successful in raising student achievement, while also describing the capacity of the organization to operate an additional school.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present an action plan that:

- Evidence that school or model to be replicated demonstrates academic, organizational, and financial success.
- A clear, compelling vision for what is being replicated in terms of essential components of the educational program.
- A convincing rationale for how the school or model to be replicated will successfully serve the proposed target student population.
- A strong justification for changing key components of the original school or model in the proposed school. Such justification should include why the changes will better suit the targeted student population and whether the model is still similar enough to the existing model that comparable successful outcomes are likely.
- Evidence that the applicant group has a sound plan for developing the capacity to replicate an existing school including adequate financial and human resources.
- If applicable, evidence of successful past replications or lessons learned from unsuccessful attempts at replication that will increase the probability that this replication will be successful.

CRC Rating	Not Applicable	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Strengths (reference page numbers)
N/A

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
N/A

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
N/A		

Addendum A1: High-Performing Replications [THIS SECTION NOT APPLICABLE]

The High-Performing Replications section should identify the school to be replicated and provide evidence that the proposed school meets the statutory requirements of being a substantially similar model of a school that has been designated as a High-Performing Charter School and is being established and operated by an organization or individuals that were significantly involved in the operation of the school being replicated.

Statutory Reference(s):
s. 1002.331

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present an action plan that:

- Evidence that the applicant’s school and the school to be replicated (if different) are designated by the Commissioner of Education as a High-Performing Charter School.
- Evidence that the proposed school will be substantially similar to the high-performing school that is being replicated. Reviewers should base this determination on the response to this question as well applicant’s proposed educational, organization, and business plans as described throughout the application.
- Evidence that the organization or individuals involved in the establishment and operation of the proposed school are significantly involved in the operation of the high-performing school that is being replicated.

CRC Rating	Not Applicable	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Strengths (reference page numbers)
N/A

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
N/A

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
N/A		

Addendum B: Education Service Providers [THIS SECTION NOT APPLICABLE]

The ESP section should provide a rationale for contracting with the ESP, evidence of ESP success in operating high-quality charter schools, the capacity of the ESP to successfully operate this school, and evidence that the governing board and ESP are able to operate free from conflicts of interest.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)(a)

Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present an action plan that:

- A clear explanation of the reasons for contracting with an education service provider and how and why the ESP was selected and a description of the due diligence employed to assess the capacity of the ESP.
- Sufficient evidence of the ESP’s previous academic, organizational, and financial success and capacity for future success that make it more likely than not that it will be successful with the proposed school.
- Evidence of the ESP’s organizational capacity to manage an additional school or schools as determined by its growth plan.
- A comprehensive list (Form IEPC-MIA) of all schools affiliated with the ESP and ensuing performance data used to support the selection of the ESP (past and current).
- Evidence of success working with similar populations to the target population. If there are deficiencies or lack of experience working with the target populations, then reviewers will look for a sufficient explanation of programmatic adjustments that will be made to ensure success with any new school(s).
- A clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities and decision-making authority of the school’s governing board and the ESP, structured to ensure a clearly defined arm’s-length, performance-based relationship that is free from conflicts of interest. This includes evidence that the school’s governing board has a clear plan for holding the ESP accountable for negotiated performance.
- A clear delineation of the term of the management agreement, the conditions, grounds and procedures by which the agreement may be renewed and terminated, and a plan for continued operation of the school in the event of termination.
- A draft of the proposed contract with all key terms included.

CRC Rating	Not Applicable	Meets the Standard	Partially Meets the Standard	Does Not Meet the Standard
Final Rating May 8, 2018 Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preliminary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Strengths (reference page numbers)
N/A

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: (reference page numbers)
N/A

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification (reference page numbers)	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
N/A		

Applicant History Worksheets (Form IEPC-M1A) [THIS SECTION NOT APPLICABLE]

The Applicant History Worksheets should provide information regarding the track record of the applicant, the applicant’s governing board, and if applicable, the applicant’s ESP with regard to the operation of other charter schools. The sponsor should review the entire portfolio of charter schools of the foregoing entities when evaluating performance. The academic and financial performance of the portfolio should be considered in the decision to approve or deny the application.

Statutory Reference(s):

s. 1002.33(6)(a)

Evaluation Criteria:

A sponsor should review the portfolio of schools operated by the applicant group, governing board, or ESP to determine if the academic and financial performance demonstrates the capacity to operate a high-quality charter school.

Strengths <i>(reference page numbers)</i>
N/A

Deficiencies/Concerns/Weaknesses: <i>(reference page numbers)</i>
N/A

Areas in Need of Additional Information and/or Clarification <i>(reference page numbers)</i>	Charter Applicant’s Response	CRC Review/Comments
N/A		