APPENDIX N:

Champion Application – Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Name of School: Career Tech Charter High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Grade Levels: 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name(s): Maureen Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Team Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Individual Reviewer: Scott Breeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Review: 1/3/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part IV: Education Plan (Curricula)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On 426, the school begins to list the Big Ideas by Year and Quarter, however PA Core Standards are missing.
- It is not noted when the Keystone Algebra 1 course will be completed so that students will be prepared to take the test.
- On page 429, Year 4 planned instruction is missing.
- Beginning on pg 430, Benchmarking Activities are listed but not tied to any PA Core Standard. Again PA Core Standards are missing from these documents as well.
- Following pg 451, there is a Curriculum Example, PA Core Standards for Mathematics 9-12 are listed without any details of the standards. The standards listed span over Algebra 1 and Algebra courses.
- There is a statement at the bottom of the last page of the example which states, “It is possible to address 113 out of the 129 PA Core Standards across the content areas with this situation.” Without more detailed planning, I find this statement questionable. Otherwise all high schools would be reduced to this 9 week unit. I believe that the PA Core Standards are meant to be mastered by students, not just merely addressed.
- The first Project listed in the Curriculum section is “Building the School Community and Exploring Interests and Passions”. The Key Knowledge and Understanding is not complete, Success Skills are not listed, Authenticity is missing, Student Voice and Choice is missing, Reflection, Critique, and Revision is missing, Public Product is missing, There are two Driving questions but no Challenging problem or question. No evidence of Sustained Inquiry. These are all key components of a graphic on pg 152 showing the Essential Project Design Elements that demonstrate the Gold Standard for PBL. Those include Key Knowledge, Understanding, and Success Skills, Authenticity, Student Voice & Choice, Reflection, Critique & Revision, Public Product, Challenging Problem or Question, and Sustained Inquiry. Math standards are missing from this project.
- At the conclusion of the projects there are two pages which show standards coverage but are difficult to read at this time. There is a statement on the charts, “Standards met will vary based on project chosen”. It should be known which standards are to be covered and when.

In the resubmission response,
- a reference to pg 23 is made. Page 23 does not exist.
- Page 23-34 are listed as the pages for Best Practices. No Best Practices are listed on those pages.
- Can’t locate Appendix N or T
- Pg 27 has school day times but no school calendar exists
- Professional Development Plan is included but calendar is still absent.
- Technology Implementation Plan was lifted as a complete document from City Charter High School. Implementation Plan for Career Tech is missing

| Pittsburgh Public Schools, Office of Data, Research, Evaluation and Assessment | 1 |
The following items were noted previously and still exist.

- There is no demonstration of an alignment between curriculum and the PA Core standards.
- Components of Metrics are described but are not tied to any subject areas required by the PA Department of Education for any grade levels.
- Best pedagogical practices are not specifically included in the application.
- Pedagogical practices and teaching methods are not defined.
- Applicant gives examples of professional development topics, but they are not aligned to the curriculum and they are not content specific.
- The applicant includes information concerning special education and ELL services but does not describe how it plans to increase opportunities for every child including learners in these subgroups.
- Applicant does not provide a copy of the proposed school calendar.
- Applicant does not describe how it will use instructional technology in the classroom and does not include a description of how it will provide technical support and training that enables educators and charter school staff to implement technology in the workplace.
### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Name of School:</th>
<th>Career Tech Charter High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Grade Levels : 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Applicant Name(s):      | Maureen Anderson               |

### Review Team Information

| Name of Individual Reviewer: | Lisa Augustin                  |
| Date of Review:              | 12/18 - 1/19                   |

### Section Review

#### Application

- The resubmitted application still makes inconsistent references to elementary and middle schools, however the plan is only for a high school. Subsequent configurations cannot simply be added on as “phases” of a different application.
- I was unable to locate any information on the Rios Family foundation who the applicant claims is providing funding.
- I was unable to locate any research, peer-reviewed or otherwise, on the Whole Person Model of education by Angela Musto.
- The application claims that survey results (pg. 37) provide evidence of the need for the charter school. No information, description or example of the survey is provided.
- The application still describes the target audience as all of PA (pg. 28).
- Resubmitted review still finds support to be insufficient.

  **Of 30 letters of support submitted:**
  7 are not current
  2 are duplicates
  3 have no date
  2 are not about the proposed school
  3 are agreements, not support

  **Of 96 Signatures**
  86 invalid signatures, submitted with no date
  4 signatures not within the district
  6 valid

- The resubmitted application is still missing multiple assessment types.
- The applicant submitted PDE’s Industry-Based Learning Indicator for the Future Ready PA Index: Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring, and Reporting but no evidence that there is a clear understanding of what/how to assess, data collection, monitoring, or reporting.
- The application explains the importance of external partnerships and community involvement, but still does not detail specific partnerships or how community partnerships play a role in the school (pg. 114-116).
The resubmitted application **still does not** provide sufficient evidence that it will improve pupil learning.

The resubmitted application **still does not** provide evidence of increased learning opportunities for all pupils.

The resubmitted application **still does not** provide evidence that the use of different and innovative teaching methods are encouraged.

The resubmitted application **still does not** provide sufficient evidence that new professional opportunities will be created for teachers.

The resubmitted application **still does not** provide parents and pupils with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system.

The resubmitted application **still does not** describe an understanding of meeting measurable academic standards or establishing accountability systems.
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Name of School:</strong></td>
<td>Career Tech Charter High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Grade Levels:</strong></td>
<td>High School years 1, 2, 3, 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name(s):</strong></td>
<td>Maureen Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Team Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Individual Reviewer:</strong></td>
<td>Linda Wolfgang, Angela Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Review:</strong></td>
<td>1/4/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part IV:</strong></td>
<td>Education Plan (Curricula)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix V Page 30 and Revision page 71**

While a college certificate or College Associates of Science Degree is indicated as an option under each of the CTE programs or magnet offerings, there are no courses identified that would allow for assessment of how student will obtain these certificates or degrees as part of their high school course work. No curriculum or scope and sequence were provided for review.

The Automotive Technology certificate or Associates degree is identified for Auto Body Repair and Auto Technology. This correlates only to Auto Technology and requires 50 earned credits. No plan is provided to show how students would be able to earn these 50 credits as part of year 4-5. In addition, the application does not address how the OSHA certifications and CPR/AED/First Aid training and certification will be offered. They are not part of the CCAC certificate.

**Appendix V Page 31 and Revision page 381**

The note at the bottom of the chart on page 318 indicates that Career Tech Charter High School has no high school based, traditional vo-tech/CTE programs like the district. Page 71 notes that Career Tech Charter High School’s development group has established a relationship with CCAC to collaboratively address the mission so students successfully complete these programs. CTE programs listed are Auto Body Repair, Auto Tech, Carpentry, ERT, Engineering, Health Careers Technology, Information Technology, Machine Operations, Multimedia Production and Coding, RHVAC. The CTE Pre-Engineering Magnet at Allderdice is also listed. Other CTE electives are not addressed.

**Appendix V Page 32 and Revision page 406**

Referred to page 406 Appendix T. Page 406 is in Appendix O and does not pertain to curriculum.

Revision: Appendix T – Framework of Inquiry, Project Based Learning Documents, and Sample Student Project does not include a framework for year 4. Year 5 is not addressed.

Page 55 notes that during year four, students will be pursuing their certificate or Associate’s degree at the community college or other program. No scope and sequence provided. Year 5 is not addressed.
### Section Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV:</th>
<th>Education Plan (Curricula)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Is there a complete curriculum with goals, objectives, scope and sequence, units, resources, pacing guide, curriculum-based assessments, etc?**
   Insufficient - The curriculum and encompassing components do not establish all skills and content to be mastered by grade. Each project-based learning module has few standards which will be explicitly met. The CBA’s are missing scoring rubrics which meet the needs of each assessment. The Year 4 curriculum is entirely absent.

2. **Is there a complete and comprehensive curriculum for all grade levels and subjects proposed?**
   Insufficient - the curriculum is not comprehensive. The projects established for each quarter are vague and intentionally ambiguous.

3. **What is the quality of the curricula submitted?**
   Insufficient – the curricula for each grade level lacks skill and content knowledge development which meet the rigor expected of high school students.

4. **Are all of the curriculum materials submitted clearly aligned to state standards?**
   Insufficient - The project overviews, beginning on page 694, have vague goals and objectives and align numerous standards to the project without explanation of how these standards will be met or measured. Beginning on page 778, the check sheet for standards met per quarter do not match the project overviews. In example, the Year 1, Quarter 1 project overview has no listed standards for mathematics being met, but the check sheet has 14 mathematics standards checked. Similarly, Year 1, Quarter 1 has no listed standards for Economics, Geography, or History, but 11 standards are tagged in the check sheet.

5. **Does the curriculum clearly align to the theme of the proposed school?**
   Insufficient – With the whole child model being the priority focus, nowhere in the curriculum are the socio-emotional aspects specifically addressed. In the curriculum standards check sheet, the areas where socio-emotional learning might be addressed are marked as “TBD” across the sheet. With the additional STEM Career focus, there is no clear indicator that students will be exposed specifically to STEM careers in their projects since students may choose to study non-STEM careers. All projects place emphasis on what students “might” do in their projects, but do not explicitly state what they “will” do as it relates to STEM careers.
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Facilities

Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Name of School:</th>
<th>Career Tech</th>
<th>Proposed Grade Levels:</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name(s):</td>
<td>RefocusED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Team Information

| Name of Individual Reviewer: | Stephen Connell, PPS/Cherie Moshier, Moshier Studio |
| Date of Review:             | 1/4/19                                           |

Section Review

The application requires a proposed location for the school and identifies the Energy Innovation Center (EIC), 1435 Bedford Avenue. This is the former location of the Connelly Technical Institute. The application also states they have an agreement with Land and Property Real Estate to locate other sites and secure the most appropriate building for the school.

The application requires details of the ownership of the facility and any lease arrangements. No agreements or letters of interest were available for review containing these details. The application states that a lease agreement will contain a number of five-year renewal options and include rent and build out costs. The application states that the school is working to secure commitments from local foundations, corporate and financial entities to provide start-up and implementation costs. No letters of commitment for financing the build out were available for review.

A site visit was conducted at the EIC location on 30 January 2018 with representatives of the school and of the EIC. A conversation was conducted with the operations manager in December 2018 who confirmed that no changes have occurred since that walk through in the spaces proposed for the school’s use. The current Occupancy Permit for this location is for use group B, Business use. The following comments only apply if the school is located in the EIC, if a different location is identified then a separate review will need to be conducted.

1. Career Tech Charter High School (CTCHS) intends to begin instruction with 100 students in grade 9, adding a grade each year until reaching 9-12. Grade 12 students will not be housed in this facility but will be placed with partnership organizations. In year five (Phase II) 165 middle and elementary school students are proposed to be added for 565 total students. The description of the facility states that it needs a facility for 300 students, 30,000-35,000 SF in size, this only accounts for the high school population.

2. They intend to occupy either the 4th or 5th floor in the former school building facing Bedford Avenue. The 4th floor is un-renovated former classrooms with about 15,000 gsft and the 5th floor is un-renovated former cafeteria space with about 9000 sf. Both floors together do not have the square footage that the application says is needed.

3. The students will arrive by public transportation and will enter the building on Bedford Avenue, using two elevators to access the school on an upper floor. EIC intends to separate CTCHS from the rest of the building using appropriate rated partitions between the school’s E occupancy and the balance of the tenants’ B occupancies. The construction of the original building would appear to not to rule out an E occupancy on these floor levels. The building is also equipped with an automatic fire suppression system (sprinklers) and has a new fire alarm system.

4. CTCHS initially intends to collaborate with the YWCA to satisfy Physical Education requirements. Longer-term, they intend to develop a fitness facility on site, with an emphasis on lifelong activity and not team sports.

5. CTCHS may also partner with the Citizen Science Lab tenant to deliver Life Sciences instruction. This organization provides educational services for middle and high school students.

Concerns regarding this proposed location are as follows:

1. New construction on the 5th floor can fully comply with ADA. New construction on the 4th floor must also fully comply with ADA, and renovations should address existing recessed classroom doors and other elements which may be inaccessible in their current configuration. No conceptual plans were available for review, these are not required for the application but should be submitted when they are available, prior to the build out of the space.

2. CTCHS has not determined how they will provide food service for the students; they state that they will prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) for prospective vendors (p.221) and also note that Community Kitchens Pittsburgh is located in the EIC and has provided a letter of collaboration to provide food service (p.223, letter not found in Appendix C). They do not intend to develop their own kitchen in the short or long term.
3. A preliminary study of how the school will be secured and how visitors will be processed is included in the application. While the school’s physical location can be secured, if during the proposed collaborative partnerships students utilize other areas of the EIC for instruction or activities CTCHS will need to address the safety of students at these times. The Charter School Law requires background checks and clearances for all individuals who shall have direct contact with students. This will be especially important when the middle and elementary grades are added.
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Finance

Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Name of School:</th>
<th>Career Tech Charter High School</th>
<th>Proposed Grade Levels:</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name(s):</td>
<td>Maureen Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Team Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Individual Reviewer:</th>
<th>Jerome McCray</th>
<th>Date of Review:</th>
<th>1/4/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section Review

Part V: Operations

Upon reviewing Career Tech’s budget and fiscal operations the district has found this charter insufficient. The following reasons are to support this claim: Budget and no significant changes.

Budget:

- Career Tech budget was illegible therefore anyone reading it would have a hard to interpreting what’s written.
- The budget doesn’t not show the amount of employees needed for each position
- As stated in their application their 1st year assumption is for 100 students but never specified how many teachers are needed.
- Did not see documentation on the grant they claimed they would have for the startup year. No proof that the grant was signed.
- Due to lack of employees within the budget the financials are not correct
- Career Techs budget is insufficient and not financially viable for the startup year.

No Changes:

- This is the exact same budget that we received from the first submission.
- Career Tech has still not updated there budget to reflect the number of teacher needed for an estimate 100 students
- Career Tech still did not provide how the implantation team will be paid and did not see funding within the budget.
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Governance

Applicant Information

| Proposed Name of School: | Career Tech Charter High School  
Makers Middle School  
Innovations Elementary School | Proposed Grade Levels: | K-12 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Review Team Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Individual Reviewer:</th>
<th>Weiss Burkardt Kramer LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Review:</td>
<td>1/2/19 - 1/4/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Review

Part III: Management Plan and Appendix O

Governance

- The governance structure is convoluted and only contains some of the required governance information.
- The Applicant is identified as ReFocusED Inc., a Pennsylvania Non-Profit, incorporated by Elizabeth Hallett and verified through the Pennsylvania Department of State:
  
  **Business Entity Details**
  
  Name: RefocusED, Inc.
  
  Entity Number: 6602716
  
  Entity Type: Non-Profit (Non Stock)
  
  Status: Active
  
  Citizenship: Domestic
  
  Entity Creation Date: 09/07/2017
  
  Effective Date: 09/07/2017
  
  State of Inc: PA
  
  Address: 615 Vallevista Ave Pittsburgh PA 15234 Allegheny County

- Although the application is identified for the creation of a high school named “Career Tech Charter High School,” the applicant is RefocusEd Inc. and there are references throughout the application to separate middle and elementary schools, and an indication that a single Board of Trustees will oversee all 3 schools despite the application being focused throughout on the high school. (p. 102)

- The Applicant indicates that it will subsequently reserve the names for the High School, Middle School and Elementary School, but RefocusED Inc. will be the legal organization. (p. 100)

- The Applicant identifies having a Board of 5-9 Trustees who will represent a diverse group (e.g. community groups, college/university educators, parents, K-12 educators, entrepreneurs, lawyers, accountants, business experts, technology leaders and industry/workforce representatives). However, only 6 Trustees are identified in the application (p. 104) Two additional Board members are left “to be determined.”

- Later in the application, the two founders, Maureen Anderson and Angela Musto, are described as follows: “In order to begin the proposed charter school and to insure continuity with the charter application, the founders of the school—Maureen Anderson and Angela Musto—may
choose to occupy two seats on the Board of Trustees, until that time when the school receives its charter. At that time, when the school receives its charter, they may no longer hold a seat on the board, as they will become employees of the school.” (p. 105)

- The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) is described by the Applicant as a non-voting member of the Board. (p. 100)
- Employees or future employees may not serve as members of the Board of Trustees, in violation of the Ethics Act.
- The Board of Trustees as envisioned by the Applicant contains an even number of members, making majority voting problematic.
- The process by which the Board of Trustees intends to fill vacancies is in violation of the Ethics Act and is described inconsistently in the application and the Bylaws. In the case of a Board vacancy, the Applicant describes that a Board Nominating Committee “(chaired by the board president and consisting of the Chief Administrative Officer and a three-member external working group) will nominate two candidates for the opening. The Nominating Committee will present two names for each vacancy to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees, through majority vote, will add a new member from this list of candidates.” (p. 101) It is a violation of the Ethics Act and a conflict of interest for the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), an employee, to nominate a replacement for a Board vacancy, as a Trustee has direct responsibility in hiring, evaluating and setting compensation for the CAO.
- Section 4.10 of the Bylaws which addresses Vacancies on the Board (p. 400) describes that a majority of the Board shall be required to fill a vacancy. Section 7.07 of the Bylaws (p. 405) which addresses Nominating Committee describes a “Board Nominating and Development Committee” whose role it is to nominate members to fill vacancies on the Board, adds additional deadlines and also permits individual Board members to nominate candidates to fill vacancies. This Section fails to describe the CAO or external working group as part of this Committee. This is inconsistent with the information provided in the Application on p. 101.
- The number of meetings per year to be held by the Board of Trustees is inconsistent throughout the application and the Bylaws. The Applicant states the Board will meet 6-9 times per year, (p. 99), will meet monthly (p. 100), and per Section 4.12 of the Bylaws, “Regular meetings of the Board of Trustees will be held at (Day and time to be determined) of each month when school is in session.” (p. 400) This internal inconsistency speaks to a lack of clarity in the governance of the school.
- The application identifies the role and responsibilities for the Chief Administrative Officer but does not provide for how the CAO will be evaluated. The Applicant states that the “Board of Trustees will evaluate the Chief Administrative Officer annually.” (p.122). The Applicant then supplies a list of 8 criteria for the annual evaluation which are included in teacher evaluation criteria. (Appendix P, p. 3)
- The Applicant includes a statement regarding community outreach goals (p. 42) and lists some ways community engagement will be assessed but does not specifically describe how the community will be involved in the charter school planning process aside from external working groups. These are mentioned as “meeting when necessary” (p. 100), but the Applicant fails to provide further detail regarding the creation, makeup or role of these groups.
- The Application includes one set of Bylaws for RefocusED, d/b/a Career Tech Charter High
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Governance

School, Makers Middle Charter School, and Innovations Elementary Charter School.

- The Bylaws prohibit a Trustee from being related to an employee, yet the application indicates two trustees will also be employees themselves until the charter is formed. (see above)
- The Bylaws in Sections 5.03-5.07 identify the Board Officers as President, Vice President, Treasurer and Secretary. (p. 402)
- The CAO is identified in the application as a non-voting member of the Board but not in the Bylaws. (see above)
- The Bylaws in Section 4.14 (p. 401) permit the CAO to call a Special Meeting of the Board in violation of the Sunshine Act.
- The Bylaws in Section 4.06 (p. 399) permit the Board size to increase by two members, one for each school, with the addition of Maker’s Middle School and Innovations Elementary School. This would still leave the Board with an even number of members, making majority voting problematic.

- The Application does not include an adequate understanding that Trustees are public officials, nor does it include an adequate understanding of the applicability of the Ethics Act or conflicts of interest thereunder.
- The Conflicts of Interest Policy included in the application is incomplete; it is missing page 2 and perhaps other pages also. (See Appendix O)
- Although incomplete, Article V of the Conflicts of Interest Policy permits Board members to be compensated as long as they abstain from voting on matters that involve this compensation. This is in violation of the Ethics Act and would likely constitute a conflict of interest.
- The statement of ethics for Board of Trustees proposed by the Applicant is the Code of Professional Practice and Conduct for Professional Educators (p. 105), which applies to certificated professionals and not to public officials. The Ethics Commission and not the Professional Standards and Practices Commission has jurisdiction over public officials who violate the Ethics Act. The Applicant demonstrates a lack of clear understanding of the role of public officials and their duties.
- The Applicant identifies Maureen Anderson and Angela Musto as employees of the School, (p. 105) yet it fails to provide the required background checks, clearances and employment history review forms required for charter school employees under the Section 1719-A (15) and (16) of the Charter School Law with the application.
- The Application fails to include the requirement of employment history reviews for charter school employees, as required by Section 111.1 of the School Code for school entities, which include charter schools. (p. 134)
- The Bylaws in Section 8.02 (p. 406) permits “contracts, leases or other instruments executed in the name of and on behalf of the Corporation will be signed by the Chief Administrative Officer and attested to by the Secretary. The execution of documents pursuant to this Section 8.02, except for those documents which are customarily executed in the ordinary course of the corporation’s business, must receive the prior approval of the Board of Trustees.
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Governance

- The CAO is not a member of the Board of Trustees of the Corporation, and as such, does not have the authority to bind the Corporation to any contracts, leases or other instruments. (p. 410)
Throughout the application a middle school and an elementary were referenced.

I. Mission, Purpose and Needs
Includes a vague statement of purpose that fails to articulate the school’s target audience and grade level

II. Management Plan
• Plan for maintaining non-discriminatory admissions.
• Clear understanding of Chapter 711- Charter School Services and Programs for Children with Disabilities is not evident

Page 94 and Page 95 the applicant states that an “LEA representative from the student’s home district will be invited”. The charter school would be the home district and the LEA for all of its students. This statement displays a lack of basic procedural understanding and a lack of an understanding of the charters school responsibilities towards students with disabilities.

Resubmission: In Appendix V the applicant stated that this language was removed and that it was included to be collaborative. However, the language is still in the application on page 185

Page 92, Under a section titled “Meeting the needs of at-risk, bilingual students and students with disabilities” the enrollment process is described as fill out an application, be interviewed, and attend an orientation. This is the first mention of an interview in the application process. It is a violation of the Charter Law to have a separate process to enroll students with disabilities, in the next paragraph the applicant states that they will enroll students with disabilities on the same basis. Their process is unclear.

Resubmission: The interview was removed

Page 31- The applicant states that they will be Full Inclusion.
Resubmission: An 11-12-18 Letter from the AIU states that they will be willing to work willing to work with the charter if approved and provide Vision, Hearing, Speech and Language, Autism, Emotional, Learning Support. Psychological Services and Supervision of professional and paraprofessional staff. The budget contains funds for the contracted special education services: Year 1- $100,000, Year 2- $200,000, Year 3- $300,000, Year 4- $325,000, Year 5- $325,000
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Special Education

The budget assumes an 18% Special Education enrollment

**Resubmission:** The application does not have a plan for providing Life Skills Instruction

The applicant has no plan for instruction for students who require access to Alternative Curriculum **Resubmission:** The application contains no plan for instruction aligned to Alternative Standards

The applicant did not describe expulsion procedures for students with disabilities

**Resubmission:** Provided

The applicant did not describe alternative placement procedures for students with disabilities

**Resubmission:** Provided

The applicant did not describe how its will accommodate students with special needs and how it will account for students with disabilities- Other than to provide City Charter High School Best Practice Brief on Special Education Full Inclusion

**Resubmission:** The City Charter High School Best Practice Brief was removed. The applicant plans for 1 special education per grade level and a contract with the AIU. The school is projected an 18% special education enrollment (based on budget). 18:1 ratio (special education students: teachers) After the 3rd year the special education teacher allotment in the budget remains the same. Which given their projected enrollment and 18% special education projection would give year 4- 24:1 (special education: teachers) year 5- 33: 1 (special education: teachers)

The applicant did not describe how it will meet the needs of students with disabilities, bilingual students and at risks students including a description of potential alternative placements, alternative testing, etc.

**Resubmission:** Language was included to discuss the requirements and philosophy for meeting the needs of students with disabilities, bilingual and at risk students. A plan for how this will work in practice was not included.

A description of alternative placement procedures and requirements was included

Alternative testing was not addressed in the application.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Name of School: Career Tech Charter High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name(s): Maureen Anderson, RefocusED, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Grade Levels: High School (9-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Team Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Individual Reviewer: Dr. Ann Fillmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Review: 11/26/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part IV: Education Plan (Curricula)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum:**
- Applicant did not include a full description of the school’s proposed curriculum, including an appropriate scope and sequence with course identification and skills, content to be mastered at each grade level.
- The applicant did not include a detailed explanation of how each grade level builds upon the knowledge and skill mastered at the previous levels academically.
- The curriculum model was not grounded in best pedagogical practices and validated research concerning how children learn. In addition, the model lists content standards, but the majority of the standards were not addressed within the model.
- There is little evidence of curriculum alignment with the PA and District Standards. The material provided did not explicitly describe formative or summative assessments used to determine student mastery of content.

**Assessments:**
- The demonstration of student understanding of content was vague.
- The use of assessment data to impact teaching and learning was not explained in the curriculum documents provided.
- The applicant does not discuss how the school will benchmark student progress through the formative assessments that it will use to inform instruction and to make mid-course corrections during the year.
- An assessment schedule was not provided and a rationale for administration of assessments was missing.
  - Assessment schedule provided only included Keystone assessments and did not include STAR Assessment Administration.
  - On page 22 (does not align with binder provided), “The STAR assessment can be completed in 20 minutes and will be issued on a quarterly basis with reports being provided to teachers, students and parents.”
- On page 90 of the application, the applicant explains that there are plans to work with consulting experts to create new surveys and evaluation tools for their students to better assess outcomes.
  - Working with City Charter High School. I am wondering if this is still the case with a new CEO at City Charter High School.
- On page 92, the applicant indicates that an assessment calendar will be developed and provided in the future.
- The applicant describes the use of the STAR assessment, but does not provide an action plan for administration and impact on instruction specific to the proposed charter school. The
Charter Application - Individual Review Scoring Sheet: Curriculum

appendix includes the research provided by the company.
  o Assessment schedule provided only included Keystone assessments and did not include STAR Assessment Administration.
  o On page 22 (does not align with binder provided), “The STAR assessment can be completed in 20 minutes and will be issued on a quarterly basis with reports being provided to teachers, students and parents.”
  o “…provides instant reports that are customizable in order to provide teachers, students, and parents data needed to meet the needs of every student at their level.”

Content Areas:
  • All subject areas required by the PA Department of Education were mentioned in the educational plan, however, the content of the subjects taught were not described in detail and the progression of content taught was not described or rationalized.
  • The applicant does not clearly define pedagogy and teaching methods describing the extent to which these are innovative and unique to the charter school.
    o There are schools in our district who have implemented comprehensive cross-curricular Project Based Learning (STAEM).
    o There are schools in our district that offer 1 to 1 computing, looping, post high school planning and workforce culture (CTE programming)
  • A full theory of action was not present. The applicant does not describe in detail how the curriculum will address student needs.
    o Justification provided, but evidence still insufficient.

Teacher Professional Development:
  • A plan for professional development/learning of educators was not included in the application.
    o Applicant added this information. Appendix S, however, this is not clearly explained and does not reflect best practices in adult learning.

Diverse Learners:
  • The applicant does not describe in detail how it plans to increase learning opportunities for students of diverse backgrounds.
    o Appendix J, p.338, as referenced as a rebuttal does not align.
    o Restorative Practices is described on p. 338. This is not unique to this charter school.
    o At Risk student supports listed on page 180.
  • The applicant explains that students with disabilities will be included but does not include how curriculum will be adapted to meet the needs of all learners.
    o What if the inclusion model does not work? The applicant describes a modified program on p. 181. What program will be utilized and how does this program align to PA standards?
  • A detailed plan of action/support for students who are bilingual or have limited English proficiency was absent as well.
    o School will provide a program but does not provide a detailed action plan or support plan for this program.
  • The applicant does not include an action plan to address specific instructional issues that cause students to fall behind, including strategies for AYP.

Technology:
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- The applicant does not describe in detail how instructional technology will be used in the classroom as appropriate to enhance its curriculum and to improve teaching and learning.
  - P. 53: “...explore real world challenges, analyze situations, and determine possible ways to address or remediate these problems. Technology will also be utilized in teaching the essentials of computer coding, which is a valuable skill, language, and way of logical analysis that will benefit all students as they pursue career success in the information age.

- A technology plan is absent.
  - City Charter High School’s Technology Plan included