Omega Alpha Academy - Entity ID 79503
School: Omega Alpha Academy School

Renewal Executive Summary

I. Performance Summary

Area	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Academic Framework	☐	☒
Financial Framework	☒	☐
Operational Framework	Not Yet Rated See Section VII	Not Yet Rated See Section VII

During the five-year interval review of the charter, Omega Alpha Academy was required to submit a Performance Management Plan as an intervention because the school operated by the Charter Holder, Omega Alpha Academy School, did not meet the academic expectations set forth by the Board. At the time Omega Alpha Academy became eligible to apply for renewal, the Charter Holder did not meet the Academic Performance Expectations of the Board as set forth in the Performance Framework and was required to submit a Demonstration of Sufficient Progress as part of the renewal application package. The Charter Holder was unable to demonstrate the school is making sufficient progress toward the Board's expectations through the submission of the required information or evidence reviewed during an on-site visit. In the most recent fiscal year for which there is State assessment data available, Omega Alpha Academy School received an overall rating of "Does Not Meet" the Board's academic standards.

The Charter Holder meets the Board's Financial Performance Expectations.

The Charter Holder does have compliance matters, which are described in the "Adherence to the Terms of the Charter" section of this report.

II. Profile

Omega Alpha Academy operates one school, Omega Alpha Academy School, serving grades K-12 in Douglas. The graph below shows the Charter Holder's actual 100th day average daily membership (ADM) for fiscal years 2011-2015.



The academic performance of Omega Alpha Academy School is represented in the table below. The Academic Dashboard for the school can be seen in the portfolio: c. Academic Dashboard.

School Name	Opened	Current Grades Served	2012 Overall Rating	2013 Overall Rating	2014 Overall Rating
Omega Alpha Academy School	08/27/2001	K – 12	43.75 / D	49.38 / D	53.12 / C

The Charter Holder indicated that the district is considering closing two elementary schools at the end of the current school year which may impact the schools enrollment and the number of school options in the area. The minutes from the Douglas Unified School District meeting held on March 25, 2015 indicate that the closure of two schools was discussed and no action was taken, however the Douglas Unified School District Board agreed to revisit this as an agenda item in early fall.

The demographic data for Omega Alpha Academy School from the 2014-2015 school year is represented in the chart below.[1]



The percentage of students who were eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch, classified as English Language Learners, and classified as students with disabilities in the 2013-2014 school year is represented in the table below.[2]

Category	Omega Alpha Academy School
Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL)	90%
English Language Learners (ELLs)	42%
Special Education	7%

Omega Alpha Academy has not been brought before the Board for any items or actions in the past 12 months.

III. Additional School Choices

[1] Information provided by the Research and Evaluation Division of the ADE.
[2] Information provided by the Research and Evaluation Division of the ADE. If the percentage of students in a non-ethnicity-based demographic group is not reported to ADE, or is 0% or 100%, the percentage for that demographic group is redacted.

Omega Alpha Academy School is located in Douglas near 15th Street and North Washington Avenue. The following information identifies additional schools within a five mile radius of the school and the academic performance of those schools.

There are 12 schools serving grades K-12 within a five mile radius of Omega Alpha Academy School. The table below provides a breakdown of those schools. Schools are grouped by the A - F letter grade assigned by the ADE. For each letter grade, the table identifies the number of schools assigned that letter grade, the number of those schools that are charter schools, the number of the charter schools that are meeting the Board's academic performance standard for FY14, and the number of schools serving a comparable percentage of students (± 5%) in the identified subgroups.[3]

Omega Alpha Academy School				90%	42%	7 %
Letter Grade	**Within 5 miles**	**Charter Schools**	**Meets Board's Standard**	**Comparable FRL (± 5%)**	**Comparable ELL (± 5%)**	**Comparable SPED (± 5%)**
A	2	1	1	1	0	1
B	2	0	-	0	0	2
C	6	2	0	3	2	5
D	2	0	-	2	1	2

IV. Success of the Academic Program

For the past three years Omega Alpha Academy School has not met the Board's academic performance standards. The Overall Rating points have increased by 9.37 points from FY2012 to FY2014. Since FY2012 the school has increased its Overall Rating each year. The improvement in growth measures that occurred in FY13 has been maintained for FY14 with 3 of 4 measures staying at Meets and an improvement towards Meets for the measure that currently Does Not Meet. 2 of 4 measures that were evaluated as Falls Far Below for FY2013 improved to Does Not Meet, however one measure dropped to Falls Far Below from Does Not Meet.

The following is a timeline of activities that have occurred related to the academic performance of Omega Alpha Academy:

May, 2011: Omega Alpha Academy was notified that the Charter Holder was required to submit a Performance Management Plan on or before September 1, 2011 for the five-year interval review because Omega Alpha Academy School, a school operated by the Charter Holder, did not meet the Academic Expectations set forth by the Board.

September, 2011: Omega Alpha Academy timely submitted a Performance Management Plan (portfolio: g. Prior Academic Intervention Submissions and Evaluations – g. Prior Academic Intervention Submissions and Evaluations – iii. Performance Management Plan).

February, 2013: The Board released FY2012 Academic Dashboards; Omega Alpha Academy School received an overall rating of "Does Not Meet" the Board's academic standards and Omega Alpha Academy did not meet the Board's Academic Performance Expectations. The Charter Holder was assigned a Demonstration of Sufficient Progress (DSP) for Omega Alpha Academy School as part of an annual reporting requirement (portfolio: g. Prior Academic Intervention Submissions and Evaluations –ii. FY2012 DSP Submission).

[3] Information provided by the Research and Evaluation Division of the ADE. If the percentage of students in a non-ethnicity-based demographic group is not reported to ADE, or is 0% or 100%, the percentage for that demographic group is redacted.

September, 2013: The Board released FY2013 Academic Dashboards; Omega Alpha Academy School received an overall rating of "Does Not Meet" the Board's academic standards. Therefore, Omega Alpha Academy did not meet the Board's Academic Performance Expectations. The Charter Holder was not assigned a DSP as part of an annual reporting requirement because a final evaluation of the FY2012 DSP had not yet been completed.

February, 2014: Following a preliminary evaluation of the FY2012 DSP, Board staff conducted a site visit on February 28th to meet with the school's leadership and review all evidence provided by the Charter Holder. The Charter Holder was able to submit additional evidence for 48 hours after the site visit.

September, 2014: The Board released FY2014 Academic Dashboards; Omega Alpha Academy School received an overall rating of "Does Not Meet" the Board's academic standards. Therefore, Omega Alpha Academy did not meet the Board's Academic Performance Expectations. The Charter Holder was not assigned a DSP as part of an annual reporting requirement because the Charter Holder would become eligible for renewal within the fiscal year.

November, 2014: Board staff completed a final evaluation (portfolio: g. Prior Academic Intervention Submissions and Evaluations – ii. FY2012 DSP Evaluation) of the Charter Holder's FY2012 DSP and made the evaluation available to the Charter Holder. In that final evaluation of the FY2012 DSP, Board staff determined that the Charter Holder's Demonstration of Sufficient Progress was not acceptable in all areas. In areas that were evaluated as not acceptable, Board staff provided the Charter Holder with technical guidance. The findings contained in the final evaluation of the FY2012 DSP was grounded in a limited evaluation of the school's evidence as compared to the evaluation used in completing final evaluation of the FY2014 DSP submitted as part of the renewal application package.

November, 2014: Board staff provided the Charter Holder, through its authorized representatives, Steve Carvalho and Jose Frisby, with Renewal Notification Information, which included notification of the renewal process, the date on which the Charter Holder would become eligible to apply for renewal (November 28, 2014), the deadline date on which the renewal application package would be due to the Board (March 2, 2015), information on the availability of the Charter Holder's renewal application as well as instruction on how to access the renewal application, and notification of the requirement to submit a DSP as a component of its renewal application package because the Charter Holder did not meet the Academic Performance Expectations set forth by the Board.

V. Demonstration of Sufficient Progress

A renewal application package with a Renewal DSP for Omega Alpha Academy (portfolio: f. Renewal DSP Submission) was timely submitted by the Charter Representative on March 2, 2015. The Charter Holder was provided a copy of the initial evaluation of the DSP Report prior to the site visit and informed that areas initially evaluated as not acceptable must be addressed with additional evidence and documentation at the time of the visit.

Following a preliminary evaluation of the DSP, staff conducted a site visit to meet with the school's leadership, as selected by the school, to confirm evidence of the processes described in the DSP and review additional evidence to be considered in the final evaluation of the Charter Holder's DSP submission. The following representatives of Omega Alpha Academy were present at the site visit:

Name	Role
Ramon M. Perez	Finance Manager
Raquel Lis	Assistant Principal
Enrique Durón	Consultant
Jose Frisby	Executive Director/ Principal
Mercedes Figueroa	Galileo Specialist
Anna Frisby	Human Resources/ Test Coordinator

At the site visit, Board staff completed a document inventory for all evidence presented by the Charter Holder (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms). The Charter Holder was provided a copy of the document inventory at the end of the site visit. Following the site visit, Board staff completed a final evaluation of the DSP (portfolio: d. Renewal DSP Final Evaluation). The following is a summary of the final DSP Evaluation:

Evaluation Summary			
Area	DSP Evaluation		
	Meets	Does Not Meet	Falls Far Below
Data	☐	☐	☒
Curriculum	☐	☒	☐
Assessment	☐	☒	☐
Monitoring Instruction	☒	☐	☐
Professional Development	☒	☐	☐
Graduation Rate	☒	☐	☐

After considering information in the DSP Report and evidence provided at the time of the site visit, the Charter Holder did not demonstrate evidence of a sustained improvement plan that includes implementation of a comprehensive curriculum system and a comprehensive assessment system. Additionally, the data provided by the Charter Holder failed to show improvement year-over-year for the two most recent school years, in nine out of the ten measures required by the Board.

Based on the findings summarized above and described below, staff determined that the Charter Holder did not demonstrate sufficient progress towards meeting the Board's Academic Performance Expectations.

Data

The area of Data is evaluated as Falls Far Below. As evidenced at the DSP site visit, the data provided by the Charter Holder failed to show improvement year-over-year for the two most recent school years in nine out of the ten measures required by the Board. For more detailed analysis see Data Inventory (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms, i. Site Visit Inventory – Data).

Question	Valid and Reliable Data	Comparative Data provided for Current Fiscal Year	Comparative Data Demonstrates Growth	Document Inventory Item
Student Median Growth Percentile Bottom	Yes	No	No	D3

25% - Math				
Percent Passing - Math	Yes	No	No	D5
Percent Passing - Reading	Yes	No	No	D6
Subgroup, ELL - Math	Yes	No	No	D7
Subgroup, ELL - Reading	Yes	No	No	D8
Subgroup, FRL - Math	Yes	No	No	D9
Subgroup, FRL - Reading	Yes	No	No	D10
Subgroup, students with disabilities - Math	Yes	No	No	D11
Subgroup, students with disabilities - Reading	Yes	No	No	D12
High School Graduation Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes	D13

Curriculum

The area of Curriculum is evaluated as Does Not Meet. As demonstrated by the evidence provided at the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder has consistently implemented a limited curriculum approach. At the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder sufficiently demonstrated some of the components of these required elements, but failed to sufficiently demonstrate all of the components of the required elements. For more detailed analysis see Curriculum Inventory (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms, ii. Site Visit Inventory – Curriculum).

Question	Sufficient Evidence	Document Inventory Item
Evaluating Curriculum		
What is the Charter Holder's process for evaluating curriculum? How does the Charter Holder evaluate how effectively the curriculum enables students to meet the standards?	No	C1
How does the Charter Holder identify gaps in the curriculum?	No	C2
Adopting/Revising Curriculum		
What is the Charter Holder's process for adopting or revising curriculum based on its evaluation processes?	Yes	C3
Who is involved in the process for adopting or revising curriculum?	Yes	C4
When adopting curriculum, how does the Charter Holder evaluate curriculum options to determine which curriculum to adopt?	No	C5
Implementing Curriculum		
What is the Charter Holder's process for ensuring consistent implementation of the curriculum across the school(s) operated by the Charter Holder?	Yes	C6
What tools exist that identify what must be taught and when it must be delivered? How does the Charter Holder ensure that all grade-level standards are covered within the academic year?	Yes	C7
What is the expectation for consistent use of these tools? How are these expectations communicated?	Yes	C8
What evidence is there to demonstrate usage of these tools in the classroom and alignment with instruction?	Yes	C9
Alignment of Curriculum		
How does the Charter Holder know the curriculum is aligned to standards?	Yes	C10
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups		
How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	Yes	C11
How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	Yes	C12
How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	N/A	C13
How has the Charter Holder ensured that the curriculum addresses the needs of students with disabilities?	Yes	C14

Assessment

The area of Assessment is evaluated as Does Not Meet. As demonstrated by the evidence provided at the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder has consistently implemented a limited assessment approach. At the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder sufficiently demonstrated some of the components of these required elements, but failed to sufficiently demonstrate all components of the required elements. For more detailed analysis see Assessment Inventory (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms, iii. Site Visit Inventory – Assessment).

Question	Sufficient Evidence	Document Inventory Item
Assessment System		
What types of assessments does the Charter Holder use?	Yes	A1
What was the process for designing or selecting the assessment system?	No	A2
How is the assessment system aligned to the curriculum and instructional methodology?	Yes	A3
What intervals are used to assess student progress? How does the assessment plan include data collection from multiple assessments, such as formative and summative assessments and common/benchmark assessments?	Yes	A4
Analyzing Assessment Data		
How does the assessment system provide for analysis of assessment data? What intervals are used to analyze assessment data?	Yes	A5
How is the analysis used to evaluate instructional and curricular effectiveness?	Yes	A6
How is the analysis used to adjust curriculum and instruction in a timely manner? What intervals are used to adjust curriculum and instruction?	Yes	A7
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups		
How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	Yes	A8
How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	Yes	A9
How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	N/A	A10
How is the assessment system adapted to meet the assessment needs of students with disabilities?	Yes	A11

Monitoring Instruction

The area of Monitoring Instruction is evaluated as Meets. As demonstrated by the evidence provided at the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder has consistently implemented a comprehensive instructional monitoring system that addresses each of the following required elements. For more detailed analysis see Monitoring Instruction Inventory (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms, iv. Site Visit Inventory – Monitoring Instruction).

Question	Sufficient Evidence	Document Inventory Item
Monitoring the Integration of Standards		
What is the Charter Holder's process for monitoring the integration of standards into classroom instruction? How does the Charter Holder monitor whether or not instructional staff implements an ACCRS-aligned curriculum with fidelity?	Yes	M1
How does the Charter Holder monitor the effectiveness of standards-based instruction throughout the year?	Yes	M2
Evaluating Instructional Practices		
What is the Charter Holder's process for evaluating the instructional practices? How does this process evaluate the quality of instruction?	Yes	M3
How does this process identify individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs?	Yes	M4
Providing Analysis and Feedback to Further Develop Instructional Quality		
How does the Charter Holder provide feedback on strengths, weaknesses, and learning needs based on the evaluation of instructional practices?	Yes	M5
How does this Charter Holder analyze this information? What does the data about quality of instruction tell the Charter Holder? What has the Charter Holder done in response?	Yes	M6
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups		
How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	Yes	M7
How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	Yes	M8
How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	N/A	M9
How does the Charter Holder monitor instruction to ensure it is meeting the needs of students with disabilities?	Yes	M10

Professional Development

The area of Professional Development is evaluated as Meets. As demonstrated by the evidence provided at the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder has consistently implemented a comprehensive professional development system that addresses each of the following required elements. For more detailed analysis see Professional Development Inventory (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms, v. Site Visit Inventory – Professional Development).

Question	Sufficient Evidence	Document Inventory Item
Professional Development System		
What is the Charter Holder's professional development plan?	Yes	P1
How was the professional development plan developed?	Yes	P2
How is the professional development plan aligned with instructional staff learning needs?	Yes	P3
How does this plan address areas of high importance?	Yes	P4
Supporting High Quality Implementation		
How does the Charter Holder support high quality implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions?	Yes	P5
How does the Charter Holder provide the resources that are necessary for high quality implementation?	Yes	P6
Monitoring Implementation		
How does the Charter Holder monitor the implementation of the strategies learned in professional development sessions?	Yes	P7
How does the Charter Holder monitor and follow-up with instructional staff to support and develop implementation of the strategies learned in professional development?	Yes	P8
Adapted to Meet the Needs of Subgroups		
How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of students with proficiency in the bottom 25%/non-proficient students?	Yes	P9
How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?	Yes	P10
How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students?	N/A	P11
How does the professional development plan ensure that instructional staff receives the type of development required to meet the needs of students with disabilities?	Yes	P12

Graduation Rate

The area of Graduation Rate is evaluated as Meets. As demonstrated by the evidence provided at the DSP site visit, the Charter Holder has consistently implemented a system for ensuring students in grades 9-12 graduate on time that addresses each of the required elements. For more detailed analysis see Graduation Rate Inventory (portfolio: e. Renewal DSP Site Visit Inventory Forms, vi. Site Visit Inventory – Graduation Rate).

Question	Sufficient Evidence	Document Inventory Item
Ensuring Students in Grades 9-12 Graduate On Time		
How does the Charter Holder monitor and follow up on student progress toward completing courses to meet graduation requirements?	Yes	G1
How does the Charter Holder identify students that are not successfully progressing through required courses?	Yes	G2
How does the Charter Holder provide additional academic supports to remediate academic problems for struggling students?	Yes	G3
What data can the Charter Holder provide to demonstrate that these strategies are effective?	Yes	G4

VI. Viability of the Organization

The Charter Holder meets the Board's Financial Performance Expectations set forth in the Performance Framework adopted by the Board. Therefore, the Charter Holder was not required to submit a Financial Performance Response.

VII. Adherence to the Terms of the Charter

Does the delivery of the education program and operation reflect the essential terms of the educational program as described in the charter contract?
Yes. Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder's education program, in operation, reflects the essential terms as described in the charter contract.

Does the Charter Holder adhere with applicable education requirements defined in state and federal law?
Yes. Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder adheres with applicable education requirements defined in state and federal law.

Do the Charter Holder's annual audit reporting packages reflect sound operations?
Yes. As reported in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to the fiscal years 2012, 2013 and 2014 annual audit reporting packages, respectively.

Is the Charter Holder administering student admission and attendance appropriately?

Yes. Based on the available information and as reported in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to administering student admission and attendance.

Is the Charter Holder maintaining a safe environment consistent with state and local requirements?
Yes. Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to maintaining a safe environment.

Is the Charter Holder transparent in its operations?
Yes. Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to transparency of operations.

Is the Charter Holder complying with its obligations to the Board?
Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to its obligations to the

Based on the available information in the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to transparency of operations except that the Charter Holder's officers and directors as identified in information publicly available through the Arizona Corporation Commission did not align with its officers and directors as identified in the charter contract. Charter Holder Governance Notifications to align the Charter Holder's officers and directors as identified in information publicly available through the Arizona Corporation Commission with those in the charter contract are currently being processed.

Is the Charter Holder complying with reporting requirements of other entities to which the Charter Holder is accountable?
Yes. Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to operational requirements monitored by other entities to which the Charter Holder is accountable.

Is the Charter Holder complying with all other obligations?
Yes. Based on the available information in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and the current fiscal year, the Charter Holder complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter contract relating to all other obligations.

VIII. Board Options

Option 1: The Board may conditionally renew the charter with specific monitoring and reporting requirements to ensure the consistent and sustained implementation of the recent systemic changes identified in the DSP evaluation and that these changes result in improved academic performance. Staff recommends the following language provided for consideration: Having considered the statements of the representatives of the Charter Holder today and the contents of the renewal portfolio which includes the academic performance, the fiscal compliance, and legal and contractual compliance of the Charter Holder provided to the Board for consideration of this request for charter renewal, I move to deny the request for charter renewal and to not grant a renewal contract for Omega Alpha Academy on the grounds that the Charter Holder failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the Academic Performance Expectations set forth in the Performance Framework as reflected in the Renewal Executive Summary, the Inventory Documents, and the DSP Final Evaluation The Charter Holder does,

however, operate a school that has been designated with a letter grade of C in the current year and an average school (C by definition in statute) has the potential to improve its academic operations with the appropriate systemic changes and additional accountability. The Board, therefore, will grant a renewal contract to Omega Alpha Academy for the continuation of Omega Alpha Academy School on the conditions that the Charter Holder agrees to: (1) be subject to specific monitoring and reporting requirements to ensure the Charter Holder immediately creates and implements a Performance Management Plan to make systemic changes that will align with the Performance Management Plan evaluation criteria and that these changes result in improved academic performance in FY2016 and Fy2017; and (2) operation under the renewal contract contingent on meeting the terms of the monitoring and reporting requirements for FY2016 and Fy2017. The terms of the monitoring and reporting requirement must be reached within 60 days of today's date or it is the Board's decision that Omega Alpha Academy's request for renewal of its charter is denied for the reasons already specified.

Option 2: The Board may deny renewal with an opportunity for the Charter Holder to request review of the matter. The following language is provided for consideration: Having considered the statements of the representatives of the Charter Holder today and the contents of the renewal portfolio which includes the academic performance, the fiscal compliance, and legal and contractual compliance of the Charter Holder provided to the Board for consideration of this request for charter renewal, I move to deny the request for charter renewal and to not grant a renewal contract to Omega Alpha Academy on the basis that the Charter Holder failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations set forth in the Performance Framework as reflected in the Renewal Executive Summary, the Inventory Documents, and the DSP Final Evaluation. If upon release of the 2015 Dashboard, the charter school receives an Overall Rating that improves by at least once category as compared to the 2014 Dashboard (DNM to Meets), the Charter Holder may, within 30 days, request the Board review the Dashboard to consider whether conditions exist to grant a renewal.

Option 3: The Board may deny the renewal. The following language is provided for consideration: Having considered the statements of the representatives of the Charter Holder today and the contents of the renewal portfolio which includes the academic performance, the fiscal compliance, and legal and contractual compliance of the Charter Holder provided to the Board for consideration of this request for charter renewal, I move to deny the request for charter renewal and to not grant a renewal contract to Omega Alpha Academy on the basis that the Charter Holder failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the academic performance expectations set forth in the Performance Framework as reflected in the Renewal Executive Summary, the Inventory Documents, and the DSP Final Evaluation and currently operates a school that has received an overall rating of "Does Not Meet Standard" in both of the two most recent fiscal years for which there is State assessment data available.

Option 4: Notwithstanding staff's recommendation to deny the renewal and grant a conditional renewal, the Board may determine that there is a basis to approve the renewal. The following language is provided for consideration: Renewal is based on consideration of academic, fiscal and contractual compliance of the Charter Holder. In this case, the Charter Holder did not meet the academic performance expectations set forth in the Board's Performance Framework but was able to demonstrate sufficient progress toward the Board's expectations when it provided evidence that (1) it has implemented an improvement plan that includes a comprehensive curriculum system, comprehensive assessment system, comprehensive instructional monitoring system, and comprehensive professional development system, and (2): [*provide specific findings related to valid and reliable data that demonstrates improved academic performance*]. Additionally, the Board has adopted an academic Performance Framework that allows for additional consideration of the Charter Holder throughout the next contract period. With that taken into consideration, as well as having considered

the statements of the representatives of the Charter Holder today and the contents of the renewal portfolio which includes the academic performance, the fiscal compliance, and legal and contractual compliance of the Charter Holder provided to the Board for consideration of this request for charter renewal, I move to approve the request for charter renewal and grant a renewal contract to Omega Alpha Academy.