AGENDA ITEM: NEW CHARTER APPLICATION – FOCUS EDUCATION SERVICES

Focus Education Services submitted a complete new charter application package to serve grades 9-12 for the Board's consideration. The revised application package did not meet the minimum scoring requirements set by the Board for the 2016-2017 application cycle. Focus Education Services has requested that the revised application package not meeting the scoring criteria move forward for Board consideration.

REPORT SUMMARY

Applicant Name: Focus Education Services

Authorized Representative Name: Robert Sterling Kellis

Proposed School Name: Focus High

Proposed School Location: Central Avenue between Camelback Road and Indian School Road in Phoenix

Mission Statement

Our mission is to provide motivated students the opportunity to achieve academic excellence and develop life skills in a technology-rich, career-focused, and safe learning environment taught by caring and knowledgeable educators.

Target Population

The target population includes students within a five mile radius of Phoenix's Central High School. The population includes students seeking flexible schedules, small class size and access to STEM-related content and careers. The students in this area come from low-socioeconomic status, are at risk for dropping out, are ELL students and are below grade level. On average, 76 percent of the students attending surrounding districts are eligible for free and reduced price lunch, as contrasted to the 49 percent state average. The rationale provided by the Applicant indicates, the target location serves an area with a higher level of violent crime and drug abuse and these factors are often symptoms of poor education, lack of community involvement and limited career and vocational opportunities. Focus High believes its program will improve these conditions within the community.

Student Count

Year	Grades Served	# of Students
1	9-10	100
2	9-11	300
3	9-12	500

School Calendar
Standard, 180 days

Target Start Date
August 10, 2016

Application Package Scoring

	Preliminary TRP Scores		Revised TRP Scores	
Any **Falls Below the Expectations** ratings?	No		No	
Any section in which more than one evaluation area scored **Approaches**?	Yes		Yes	
		Percent Meets		Percent Meets
Educational Plan Score ≥ 95% Meet standard?	No	45%	No	92%
Operational Plan Score ≥ 95% Meet standard?	No	44%	No	92%
Business Plan Score ≥ 95% Meet standard?	No	63%	Yes	97%

The Technical Review Panel (TRP) provided the Applicant with written technical assistance based on its review of the preliminary written application package and the Applicant submitted a revised written application package prior to the in-person interview.

In-Person Interview Summary

During the in-person interview the Applicant responded to the questions regarding each Plan (Educational, Operational, Business).

The capacity interview was attended by the two identified board members and founders, one of whom did not speak after introductions were made. The other board member, who will become the school's director of instruction if the application is approved, spoke knowledgeably about all parts of the application and answered all TRP questions, often by referring the TRP back to the application. Although the capacity interview did not serve to reverse the TRP's assessment of the written plan, the Applicant did provide a great deal of information in response to reviewer concerns.

The Applicant's description of how the school will scale up to three sites in three years and how leadership will be distributed across the three planned facilities was made much clearer during the interview (Focus Capacity Interview, 52:50). The detail that the director of instruction will serve as the founding school leader at all three schools, moving from one to the next as they open, was a matter of some confusion before the interview, but well-explained by the Applicant (Focus Capacity Interview, 1:00:40). This clarification, however, confirmed the TRP's judgment that the Applicant does not appear to have the capacity to implement this plan at the present time.

The TRP entered the interview unsure of how much student time would be spent in computer-based instruction and whether or not all classes, including electives, would be delivered online. The Applicant's description clarified that content for all courses, including STEM and electives classes, would be delivered online and that there was no guarantee that a qualified teacher would be present, as aides would be used in some cases (Focus Capacity Interview, 26:00). These responses confirmed to the TRP that the Applicant may need to consider adding additional supports if planning to serve the target population using the described platform.

Qualitative Analysis Summary

The TRP recommends that the application for Focus High School be denied because, although the Financial Plan meets the standard for approval, the other sections of the plan fall short of meeting that standard because they fail to describe how parents and students would have equitable access to the program and it is unclear that the targeted students would receive sufficient support to be successful. The plan to expand the school to three school sites in three years while simultaneously expanding within each school requires more careful planning, and the proposed founders did not demonstrate the capacity to implement the program as described.

It was unclear to the TRP when reading the application package and after the interview how students without resources to purchase technology and internet connectivity at home would not be disadvantaged in this program. Parents, also, would need computer and internet access to follow their children's progress, unless they were able to physically come to the school (Focus Capacity Interview, 28:15 – 30:00). This fact, coupled with the lack of planned parent conferences or any other intentional parental involvement raised serious concerns with the TRP (Focus Capacity Interview 29:00). As it was confirmed in the capacity interview that students would receive all primary instruction online and that untrained aides - rather than qualified teachers - might be available to assist, the TRP has grave concerns as to the level of support provided to struggling students through a system that is, essentially, "automated" (Focus Capacity Interview, 24:00).

The plan to open three schools on three different sites during the school's first three years, while clearly delineated in parts of the petition, is, in the TRP's estimation, too much for a new school to take on (Operational Plan, B.3, pp. 1-4; Business Plan, C.1, Facilities Acquisition Narrative). It is unclear from the plan and from discussion during the capacity interview how leaders with different foci managing different schools will maintain consistency and the integrity of the instructional program. Additionally, scaling up to open a new site each year does not allow enough time for data to be collected and analyzed indicating the success or failure of a specific program or approach.

Though the Applicant is passionate and has many relevant strengths, more information is needed about the support and additional capacity that will be added to facilitate the heavy lifting required to open even one school. A broader base of talented individuals is required to ensure additional necessary capacity.

A. EDUCATIONAL PLAN

The following summary was created from excerpts and summaries of the documents submitted for the Applicant's Educational Plan.

Plan Summary

Focus Education Services, Inc. proposes to open Focus High School, a high school that will prepare "students for careers in the fast-growing and high-paying fields of computer science and information technology." The school plans to open with grades 9 – 10 and add one grade each year, ultimately growing to serve grades 9 – 12. The school will have a focus on STEM subjects, on vocational training, and on increasing the computing workforce pipeline. All primary instruction will be online with live instructors and instructional aides available when needed.

Focus High School's pedagogy consists primarily of direct instruction, discovery learning, and project- based learning. Course content will be delivered using a blended model that incorporates direct instruction, classroom activities, and web-based video lectures and simulations. This approach will be augmented through discovery learning assignments, Socratic inquiry, and community outreach projects.

Focus High School's curriculum framework is based on Acellus Courseware. Acellus provides video instruction and modifies curriculum based on student responses and interactions. Students will use the Canvas platform to access Acellus Courseware and teachers and aides will be available to facilitate as needed. Focus High School will also offer "flipped" classrooms, in which students view instructional videos online and teachers will coach and correct students as they practice problems related to instructional content. Focus High School teachers will furnish discussion questions and facilitate Socratic seminars in-person and through discussion forums and video logs. Interventions will use the Response To Intervention (RTI) model.

All curriculum and assessments will be aligned to Arizona and Common Core Standards. Focus High School plans to use PARCC, AzMERIT, or other assessments in the future.

Academic Systems Plan

The Academic Systems Plan (ASP) for new Applicants is for the purpose of ensuring the school's essential systems are in place and appropriate for providing a quality education for each student it serves through the creation of a comprehensive, sufficiently detailed and implementable plan in the Areas of Curriculum, Assessment, Monitoring Instruction, and Professional Development. It is also intended to focus the school on meeting the Board's Academic Performance Expectations.

The Applicant submitted an ASP that met in all areas except for alignment to all sections within the application package. For more detailed information, see the Scoring Rubric (presented in the application portfolio: B. Scoring Results).

Curriculum Samples

Curriculum samples were provided for grades 9-12. The table below indicates which curriculum samples in the revised application package met all Board requirements (+), and which had deficiencies (-).

Grade	Math	Reading	Writing	Science
9	+	+	+	+
10	+	+	+	
11	+	+	+	
12	+	+	+	

Educational Plan Findings

	Preliminary TRP Scores		Revised TRP Scores	
Educational Plan Score ≥ 95% Meet standard?	No	23 of 51	No	47 of 51
Number of "Falls Below" ratings	0		0	
Number of "Approaches" ratings	28		4	

Analysis of Educational Plan

The Educational Plan approaches the standard for approval because, although it contains many elements needed in a strong plan, it has the following deficiencies: it does not explain how those living in poverty would receive equitable access to the parent platform; it insufficiently describes how STEM instruction will be offered with rigor; it fails to adequately describe how the multiple instructional strategies will be integrated into a program that delivers course content through a web-based platform; and may provide insufficient interventions and support for those who need it most.

Focus High School plans on serving a target area whose poverty rate, at 35 percent, is nearly double the state's 18 percent average and 10 percent above the average poverty rate in Phoenix (Educational Plan, A.2, p. 4). Students attending the school will have computer access on-campus, but it is not clear how those students lacking access to home computers would access the system from home. Of equal concern, the platform used to access the parent portal – parents' only access point to their child(ren)'s performance - requires internet connectivity. During the capacity interview, the TRP asked the proposed school leader whether or not he had plans to share student performance data with parents in any alternate method, to ensure equal access. His response was that there will be a computer in the lobby for parents and that "everyone has a smart phone" (Focus Capacity Interview, 29:40). Additionally, he mentioned that he currently had no plans for in-person conferences with parents (Focus Capacity Interview, 29:00). Although the written petition responses pertaining to these topics generally met the standard for approval, the interview responses gave the TRP concerns that the

Applicant may need to add additional support for students and parents living in poverty to ensure that no barriers exist to engagement.

Although Focus High School is presented as a STEM school and does offer math courses as part of its core programming and CTE Courses as electives (Educational Plan, A.3.2, Menu of Course Offerings) it is unclear whether the STEM course content offered is significant enough, or differentiated sufficiently from core programming to be considered a strong school focus. Additional evidence is required, showing how project-based learning, for example, reinforce STEM instruction, or evidence of STEM lessons spread across the curriculum and/or permeating school culture. One of the founding board members has experience in STEM-based instruction, but he did not actively participate in the capacity interview and it was unclear whether or not he might play a role in further developing Focus High School's STEM program.

Finally, though the application does describe how the RTI process is used to identify and support students, and though the program is described in the plan as a blended and hybrid program, it was unclear from the application and from Applicant responses during the capacity interview to what extent staff would interact with students (Focus Capacity Interview, 22:00). The TRP has concerns that students from the target area - which has a high incidence of poverty and ELL students - would not receive the personal attention they might require to overcome any gaps until they are able to benefit from what appears to be a largely self-directed course of study.

B. OPERATIONAL PLAN

The following summary was created from excerpts and summaries of the documents submitted for the Applicant's Operational Plan.

Plan Summary

Focus Education Services is a non-profit corporation, located in Gilbert, Arizona, that was created on May 29, 2013 for the purpose of operating a public charter school in accordance with the laws of the state of Arizona with two Directors: Brent Kellis (took office May 19, 2014) and Robert Sterling Kellis (took office May 29, 2013).

Focus Educational Services will have two boards: a corporate governing board and a school governing board; each will operate as a separate and distinct governing body, which may, but need not, share board members. The school governing board will be responsible for policy decisions as well as oversee the school's operations, finances, student growth, and achievement. The corporate governing board will oversee the school governing board.

Current members of both boards are identical: Mr. Robert Sterling Kellis and Mr. Brent Kellis. Other members of both boards are to be determined. After approval, board members will be sought with the following skill sets: academics, technology, management, community connections, marketing/public relations, fundraising, real estate, finance, and law. Current named board positions are chairperson (president), secretary, and treasurer.

Focus High School plans to open on one campus with a principal who will be the school's instructional leader. The school plans to add a second campus in year two and a third campus in year three. The instructional leader will move to the second site to open it in year two, at which point a second school leader, focusing on maintenance and operations (M&O), will be hired to head the initial site. In year three, the instructional leader will move to the new campus to open it and the M&O leader will move to the site opened in year two. A new leader will be hired with an emphasis on communications. This new leader will head the site opened in year one. All three school leaders will report to, and be evaluated by, the school's Governing Board.

School Governing Body Member Type	Number	Name
Organization Principal(s)	2	Robert Sterling Kellis, Steven Brent Kellis
Community	3	To Be Determined

Principal Background Information

Authorized Representative and Principal: *Robert Sterling Kellis*
Confirmed Education History: Master of Business Administration, University of Phoenix, 2013
Confirmed Employment History: Excalibur Charter Schools CEO/Interim Superintendent, December 2009 - April 2013; Apollo Education Group, Advisor/Education Specialist, April 2010 to present
Arizona FCC Expires: July 12, 2017
Current or Past Charter Affiliations[1]: Excalibur Charter Schools

Principal Name: *Steven Brent Kellis*
Confirmed Education History: Master of Science in Chemical Engineering, Brigham Young University, 1982
Confirmed Employment History: Mesa Public Schools, Teacher, August 2004 to present
Arizona FCC Expires: June 23, 2016
Current or Past Charter Affiliations[1]: None

Operational Plan Findings

	Preliminary TRP Scores		Revised TRP Scores	
Operational Plan Score ≥ 95% Meet standard?	No	11 of 25	No	23 of 25
Number of "Falls Below" ratings	0		0	
Number of "Approaches" ratings	14		2	

Analysis of Operational Plan

The Operational Plan approaches the standard for approval because, although it contains many elements necessary for a strong plan, the proposed plan of opening three school sites over the next three years with a different school leader over each building requires further support and clarification to be considered substantive. Additionally, although the board does plan to recruit additional members, the current evidence of capacity does not support the development of three new schools while expanding existing schools.

Although details are provided in the application regarding some aspects of Focus High School's plan to open multiple campuses, insufficient detail is provided to allay the TRP's concerns about scaling up too quickly and the Applicant's ability to open and operate a new site each year, while simultaneously expanding existing sites. It is unclear from the application and was not sufficiently clarified during the interview how Focus High School's first and second campus would fare in year three without the instructional leader in residence. It is not sufficiently clear how a school director with a focus on marketing will successfully oversee school staff and ensure quality instruction on a daily basis (Operational Plan, B. 3, pp 4-5). As all three directors report directly to the board, the TRP was uncertain how Focus High School will prioritize instruction over marketing and/or operations, particularly at those buildings led by those respective directors.

The application's board governance packet does contain the following information: a clear description of board roles and duties, a list of desirable qualifications for board members, and a clearly-described process for recruiting and onboarding board members (Operational Plan, B.2 p. 5 - 7). The TRP's concerns about governance

[1] *In this section, "Current or Past Charter Affiliations" refers to a leadership or decision-making role in an existing charter school operation, such as charter representative, charter principal, or school site leader.*

were raised during the interview where it was unclear how actively involved one of the board members would be and it was discovered that little to no active recruiting of board members has taken place in the interim.

Both founding principles currently serve as corporate and school governing board members. As organizational charts indicate (Operational Plan B.1, Applicant Entity, Narrative, p. 2), the governing board oversees the school board, which oversees the schools' principals. As one of the applicants plans to serve as the school's director of instruction, it is unclear how he will manage himself as board member, or as school leader. Additional capacity is required to ensure that this plan is properly supported and that all aspects of the school have proper oversight.

C. BUSINESS PLAN

The following summary was created from excerpts and summaries of the documents submitted for the Applicant's Business Plan.

Plan Summary

Facility Information

Proposed School Name:	Focus High
Proposed Locations:	Unconfirmed location: Focus High School plans to locate on or near Central Avenue between Camelback Road and Indian School Road in Phoenix, Arizona. No facility has been secured, but the Applicant has engaged a real estate broker who has provided a list of 95 potential facilities within three miles of the proposed location. A number of addresses were provided with the application: 2-52 E Camelback Road – Uptown Plaza, 702 W Camelback Road – Camelback Village Square, 1635 W Camelback Road - Park Lee Shopping Center, 2633 N Central Ave – Jordan's Mexican Restaurant, 3701 N Central Ave, and 3825 N Central Ave.
Facilities Requirements:	The target facility plans include a 3,156 square foot 2 classroom model that will accommodate 100 students with a one to one student to computer ratio. The model would expand to accommodate a four classroom model for 200 students in 6,209 square feet. The site would be equipped with a conference room, break room, teacher and staff work areas, a lobby, and a dining or food prep area. The six alternative school sites range from just over 2,500 square feet up to over 4,600 square feet in available space to lease.

Budget Summary

During the start-up period, the school will take out two verified loans, one for $50,000 and the other for $25,000; the purpose of the second loan is to cover any unexpected start-up costs. Both loans in the total amount of $75, 000 as stated by the Applicant are available as confirmed by the financial institutions. Loan payments are deferred until August of 2016. Expenses during the start-up period are related to: creation and maintenance of the school's website, marketing and advertising, building leases costs, insurance, utilities, furniture and equipment, and computers. The operation budget projects revenue based on state funding, assuming 15 percent of enrolled students will be ELLs and assuming that a disproportionate number of students will have moderate disabilities. The revenue calculation is at 85 percent of expected student enrollment. Salaries remain flat over three years, with the exception of the instructional leader, whose salary is budgeted to increase from $70,000 in year one, to $80,000 in year two, and to $90,000 in year three.

The table below presents a summary of the budget by year:

	Startup Period	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Projected Full Enrollment:		100	300	500
# Students Budget Based On:		85	255	425
Total Revenue:	$50,000.00	$707,324.00	$2,074,434.54	$3,436,664.92
Total Expenditures:	$38,660.00	$666,654.46	$1,929,892.00	$3,009,665.89
Ending Balance:	$11,340.00	$40,669.54	$144,542.92	$426,999.03

Business Plan Findings

	Preliminary TRP Scores		Revised TRP Scores	
Business Plan Score ≥ 95% Meet standard?	No	19 of 30	Yes	29 of 30
Number of "Falls Below" ratings	0		0	
Number of "Approaches" ratings	11		1	

Analysis of Business Plan

The Business Plan meets the standard for approval because it provides a detailed plan for facility acquisition and a balanced budget that reflects the requirements for implementing the school's academic and operational plans. The Financial Plan aligns with the Educational Plan in terms of instructional and technology costs and with the Operational Plan in terms of employee, facilities, and other related expenditures.

Although the applicant has not yet secured a facility, the submitted plan offers several options within the target area and the size requirements are modest, increasing the likelihood of locating a building and reducing the potential acquisition costs. The Applicant has already contracted with a broker and the package contains an acquisition timeline and a detailed description of the space needed and layout required for program implementation (Business Plan, C.1, Facilities Acquisition Narrative, pp. 4-5).

The proposed start-up activities will be funded through two loans totaling $75,000, to be repaid over 36 months at 15 percent APR (Business Plan, C.4, Start Up Budget Assumptions, p. 1). This funding allows Focus High School to lease a facility and purchase technology, marketing supplies, and other necessities far in advance of school opening. The Applicant has secured more funding than required to cover budgeted start-up costs, indicating an understanding of the importance of contingency planning and being prepared for unexpected expenses.

The Applicant has submitted a balanced budget that is conservative and establishes a reserve that increases for each year of operation. Revenue is calculated at 85 percent for each year of operation, allowing a considerable margin for attrition and establishing a hedge against low enrollment. The Applicant has budgeted for an expected 15 percent ELL population and 5 percent SPED students with moderate disabilities. These figures align with demographics at schools in the target zone. The school will have a positive fund balance each year of operation.

The Applicant improved this section extensively with revisions made during the resubmission process.

EVIDENCE OF CAPACITY

Applicant Summary

The table below describes the participation of the Applicant in the In-Person Interview:

Name	Role	Attended Interview?
Robert Sterling Kellis	Charter Principal / Authorized Representative, Proposed Principal and Director	Yes
Steven Brent Kellis	Charter Principal	Yes

Analysis of Applicant Capacity

The TRP finds that the Applicant does not have the range of knowledge, skills, and experience needed to open and operate a high quality high school because the individuals described in the plan and present at the capacity interview - though having some relevant experience - require additional capacity and more detailed planning to present a persuasive plan.

The two individuals named in the plan have experience working in schools, overseeing a charter school, working with technology, and delivering STEM instruction. Though these are valuable skills and experiences, a viable charter school plan requires involvement from a broad spectrum of individuals who bring expertise from numerous fields, provide important critical perspectives, and who can be counted upon to share the heavy lifting required for plan implementation. This broad spectrum of support is currently missing from this plan (Operational Plan, B.1, Applicant Entity Narrative, pp. 1-7). Even though the Applicant understands that more hands will be required and plans to recruit and hire board and staff members at a later date, the TRP can only make decisions based on what is presented in the plan and at the capacity interview. Although the planned schools are relatively small in size, opening multiple sites in successive years while expanding earlier sites is a complex and difficult process requiring more capacity than has been demonstrated here.

Mr. Robert Kellis spoke knowledgeably about the plan throughout the capacity interview and was completely conversant with what was on the printed page. He made a case for his own role as potential school leader (Focus Capacity Interview, 1:00:40). His experience also indicates strong understanding of the management and operations aspects of running a school.

Mr. Steven Kellis has a comprehensive resume and brings instructional experience to the Focus High School team. His background in STEM-related activities, in particular, makes him a valuable asset. However, during the capacity interview, other than his introduction, he did not speak. His lack of active participation in the capacity interview raised serious questions about his level of engagement in the planning process and in plan implementation.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Additional data is included below to provide information related to the Applicant's principals' experience, qualifications, and current and prior charter compliance as an indicator of the Applicant's ability to implement a charter or operate a charter school.

Charter Principal Affiliations
Principal Name: Robert Sterling Kellis
Current Affiliation(s): None
Past Affiliation(s) of Note: Excalibur Charter School, Inc.
Comments: Robert Sterling Kellis served as the CEO and Interim Superintendent for Excalibur Charter School (Focus Capacity Interview, 7:33), Inc. from December 2009 through April 2013. Excalibur Charter School, Inc.

operated a computer-based model at their high school campus. The academic performance of the schools affiliated with Robert Kellis is summarized with dashboards presented below:

- Avalon Elementary (opened 8/11/2004):
  - 2013 – Overall Rating 58.82 (Does Not Meet), C
  - 2012 - Overall Rating 46.88 (Does Not Meet), D
  - 2011 – Performing, D
  - 2010 – Performing Plus
  - 2009 – Performing Plus
- Excalibur Charter School (opened 7/1/2000):
  - 2013 – Overall Rating 58.82 (Does Not Meet), D
  - 2012 - No Rating, C
  - 2011 – Performing Plus
  - 2010 - Performing
  - 2009 - Performing

Excalibur Charter School

		2012 Small High School (9-12)			2013 Small High School (9 to 12)		
1. Growth		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
1a. SGP	Math	NR	0	0	28	25	15
	Reading	NR	0	0	47	50	15
1b. SGP Bottom 25%	Math	NR	0	0	NR	0	0
	Reading	NR	0	0	NR	0	0
2. Proficiency		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
2a. Percent Passing	Math	35 / 31.4	75	10	38.7 / 31.2	75	10
	Reading	69 / 59.7	75	10	76.5 / 69.5	75	10
2b. Composite School Comparison	Math	2.2	75	7.5	4.9	75	7.5
	Reading	10.2	75	7.5	3.9	75	7.5
2c. Subgroup ELL	Math	NR	0	0	NR	0	0
	Reading	NR	0	0	NR	0	0
2c. Subgroup FRL	Math	47 / 31.4	75	7.5	42.9 / 31.9	75	15
	Reading	64 / 58.8	75	7.5	NR	0	0
2c. Subgroup SPED	Math	NR	0	0	NR	0	0
	Reading	NR	0	0	NR	0	0
3. State Accountability		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
3a. State Accountability		C	50	5	D	25	5
4. Graduation		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
4a. Graduation		NR	0	0	NR	0	0
Overall Rating		Overall Rating			Overall Rating		
Scoring for Overall Rating 89 or higher: Exceeds Standard <89, but > or = to 63: Meets Standard <63, but > or = to 39: Does Not Meet Standard Less than 39: Falls Far Below Standard		NR		55	58.82		85

Avalon Elementary

		2012 Traditional Elementary School (K-8)			2013 Traditional K-12 School (K to 9)		
1. Growth		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
1a. SGP	Math	34	50	12.5	42.5	50	10
	Reading	34	50	12.5	48	50	10
1b. SGP Bottom 25%	Math	34	50	12.5	68	100	10
	Reading	36.5	50	12.5	68.5	100	10
2. Proficiency		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
2a. Percent Passing	Math	41 / 64.6	50	7.5	40.2 / 64.6	25	7.5
	Reading	62 / 76.9	50	7.5	72.3 / 78.4	50	7.5
2b. Composite School Comparison	Math	-22.2	25	7.5	-18.8	25	5
	Reading	-14.5	50	7.5	-2.6	50	5
2c. Subgroup ELL	Math	NR	0	0	25 / 40.2	50	2.5
	Reading	NR	0	0	83.3 / 52.6	75	2.5
2c. Subgroup FRL	Math	38 / 55.2	50	3.75	37 / 55.4	25	2.5
	Reading	61 / 69.3	50	3.75	71 / 71	75	2.5
2c. Subgroup SPED	Math	14 / 27.6	50	3.75	21.4 / 24.7	50	2.5
	Reading	14 / 36	50	3.75	35.7 / 39.3	50	2.5
3. State Accountability		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
3a. State Accountability		D	25	5	C	50	5
4. Graduation		Measure	Points Assigned	Weight	Measure	Points Assigned	Weight
4a. Graduation		N/A	N/A	N/A	NR	0	0
Overall Rating		Overall Rating			Overall Rating		
Scoring for Overall Rating 89 or higher: Exceeds Standard <89, but > or = to 63: Meets Standard <63, but > or = to 39: Does Not Meet Standard Less than 39: Falls Far Below Standard		46.88		100	58.82		85

In its analysis of the performance of schools affiliated with Robert Kellis, staff felt that the Excalibur Charter School, a high school computer-based model mirrors the model for this application. This high school was the primary responsibility of Mr. Kellis beginning in 2011 and up through his departure in 2013 (Focus Capacity Interview, 9:15 – 10:05). From 2012 to 2013, the high school's letter grade dropped from a C to a D, and remained a D the following fiscal year.

BOARD OPTIONS

Option 1: The Board may approve the application package and the charter. The following language is provided for consideration: Based upon review of the contents of the portfolio provided for this Applicant and the information provided by the representatives of the Applicant during consideration, , I move to approve the application package and grant a charter to Focus Education Services to operate Focus High charter school to serve grades 9-12.

Option 2: The Board may deny the application package and the charter. The following language is provided for consideration: Based upon a review of the contents of the portfolio provided for this Applicant and the information provided by the representatives of the Applicant during consideration, I move to reject the application package and deny the request for a charter of Focus Education Services to establish a charter school for the reason(s) that its application failed to meet the requirements of Title 15, Chapter 1, Article 8 due to: (member making the motion should select all that apply and complete the sentence where necessary).

- ❑ Lack of an Education Plan that meets the Board's criteria as stated in the scoring rubric and/or demonstrated through responses to interview questions,
- ❑ Lack of an Operational Plan that meets the Board's criteria as stated in the scoring rubric and/or demonstrated through responses to interview questions,

And/or I move to deny Focus Education Services' request for a charter for the reason(s) that:

- ❑ The Applicant is not sufficiently qualified to operate a charter school based on (insert the facts that form the basis for the determination [i.e., background/fingerprint/credit report of the specific Officers, Members, Directors, or Partners]).
- ❑ The Applicant is not sufficiently qualified to operate a charter school based on the (insert the facts from the financial, operational and/or academic performance of associated schools or affiliated schools that form the basis for the decision).