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THE SCHOOL BOARD OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA'S
RESPONSE TO RENAISSANCE CHARTER SCHOOL, INC.'S APPEAL OF THE DENIAL OF AN APPLICATION TO OPEN A CHARTER SCHOOL, RENAISSANCE CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL OF PALM BEACH

Appellee, the SCHOOL BOARD OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA ("School Board"), files this Response to the appeal ${ }^{1}$ of the denial of RENAISSANCE CHARTER SCHOOL, INC.'s ("the Applicant") application ("Application") to open a charter school, RENAISSANCE CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL OF PALM BEACH. As explained herein, the State Board of Education ("SBE") should uphold the School Board's denial of the Application, which was based upon good cause.

## I. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 3, 2015, the District's Department of Charter Schools received the Application. (Exhibit 2 to Notice of Appeal.) After District staff reviewed the Application, the Applicant was provided with the reviewers' comments and an interview was scheduled between the Applicant

[^0]and the reviewers. (Exhibit " A " at $2-12 .{ }^{2}$ ) The District then held an interview with the Applicant on September 22, 2015, in order to allow the Applicant to respond to questions and comments from District staff about the Application, a transcript of which is found at Exhibit 4 to the Notice of Appeal. After the interview, on September 24, 2015, James Pegg, Director of the Department of Charter Schools, sent the Applicant a letter providing seven days notification and the opportunity for the Applicant to provide non-substantive clarifications. (Id. at 33.)

Next, on October 28, 2015, Mr. Pegg sent the Applicant a letter informing it that the School Board would consider the Application at its Special Meeting on November 4, 2015. (Id. at 44-45.) In the letter, Mr. Pegg explained that "it was determined that substantive changes to the Application would be needed to cure the deficiencies in [the Application] and the School District does not accept substantive changes." (Id.) Specifically, the Section relating to Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose was rated as "Does Not Meet the Standard," while five other Sections (Exceptional Students ("ESE"); English Language Learners ("ELL"); Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Budget; and Action Plan) were rated as "Partially Meets the Standard." Mr. Pegg also informed the Applicant of the date of the School Board Special Meeting and how the Applicant could exercise its right to speak at the meeting. (Id)

At the Special Meeting on November 4, 2015, several people spoke on behalf of the Applicant, including a member of the Applicant's governing board, parents of students currently attending Renaissance-operated schools in Palm Beach County, and a student and teacher at a Renaissance school. (Exhibit 5 to Nofice of Appeal at 7-31.) Several of the speakers discussed programs and practices at Renaissance schools that they believed were "innovative." (See id.)

[^1]Several Board Members spoke about the issues raised by the speakers before a vote was taken. (See id at 49-53.) The Applicant asserts that these Members "acknowledged that RCS' charter schools were, in fact, more innovative than their own district schools[.]' Notice of Appeal at 5.) This is a mischaracterization of their comments. Rather, with respect to communication between school staff and parents and smaller school sizes, Board Member Dr. Debra Robinson stated that "of course, we want those things," and District-operated schools "have to do better." (Id. at 50.) Board Member Karen Brill simply "mirror[ed] Dr. Robinson's comments," while explaining that, for things like "personal learning plans, the daily reports to parents, I think the things that you're getting, yes, we do need to do better in our District as well." (Id. at 50.) These Members did not say that Renaissance schools were innovative, much less "more innovative" than District-operated schools. Instead, they said that the District needed to do a better job with respect to the programs and practices that parents enjoyed at Renaissance schools. (Id. at 49.)

The School Board unanimously denied the Application. ${ }^{3}$ (Id. at 55.) By letter dated November 13, 2015, the School Board notified the Applicant of the denial, and provided the specific reasons for the denial based upon good cause in compliance with section 1002.33(6)(b)3.a., Florida Statutes. (Exhibit 1 to Notice of Appeal.) The Applicant then filed its Notice of Appeal, which the District received on December 10, 2015. This Response follows.

## II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Charter School Appeal Commission ("CSAC") and SBE review the School Board's decision for whether it was based on good cause and supported by competent substantial evidence. See Sch. Bd. of Volusia Cty. v. Acads. of Excellence, Inc., 974 So. 2d 1186, 1189-92 (Fla. 5th DCA

[^2]2008) (reviewing decision by CSAC, which was adopted by SBE, that school board did not have competent substantial evidence and good cause for denying application). "[A] denial based on good cause contemplates a legally sufficient reason." Sch. Bd. of Osceola Cov. v. UCP of Cent. Florida, 905 So. $2 \mathrm{~d} 909,914$ (Fla. 5th DCA 2005). Competent substantial evidence, meanwhile, is "such evidence as will establish a substantial basis of fact from which the fact at issue can be reasonably inferred; that is, such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind would accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Washington v. State, 162 So. 3d 284, 289 (Fla. 4th DCA 2015) (quoting Pauline v. Lee, 147 So. 2d 359, 362 (Fla. 2d DCA 1962)).

## III. ARGUMENT

A. The School Board had good cause to deny the Application based on deficiencies in five sections.

The School Board adopted the findings of District staff who reviewed the Application and concluded that it was deficient in six sections: Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose; ESE, ELL; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Budget; and Action Plan. The first of these was rated "Does Not Meet the Standard" under the Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument ("Evaluation Instrument"), ${ }^{4}$ while the others were rated as "Partially Meets the Standard."

The Applicant does not specifically address the deficiencies in the sections that were rated as partially meeting the standard. Instead, the Applicant contends, without any citation to legal authority, that "the School Board cannot deny a charter application on grounds that it only partially meets a certain required legal standard[.]" (Notice of Appeal at 18.) The Evaluation Instrument, however, defines "Partially Meets the Standard" as a response that "addresses most" - and therefore not all - "of the criteria," but for which "the responses lack meaningful detail and

[^3]require important additional information." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012) (emphasis added ("e.a.")). In other words, it is deficient. As explained herein, the sections of the Application which only partially met the standard failed to satisfy all requirements of the Model Application or the Charter School Statute, meaning the School Board had good cause to deny the Application based on deficiencies in those sections. ${ }^{5}$ Cf. Sch Bd. of Volusia Cty, 974 So. 2d at 1191 (a district school board would have had good cause to deny an application on basis that is required by the application template, the standard application, or the Charter School Statute),

The Applicant also contends that issues with the sections that were rated as partially meeting the standard were clarified or refuted during the Applicant interview. While some issues were clarified at the interview, the majority were not clarified or would require substantive changes to the Application. ${ }^{6}$ The issues discussed below were not clarified during the interview and fully supported the reviewers' ratings and the School Board's denial of the Application.

## 1. Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose (Section 1)

Reviewer James Pegg found that Section 1 did not meet the standard because the Applicant failed to satisfy School Board Policy 2.57, specifically the Rubric for Charter School Application Review of Innovative Methods which is attached to the Policy. The Applicant contends that this basis for denial did not constitute good cause for several reasons, all of which lack merit.

[^4]First, the Applicant contends that the School Board adopted a definition of "innovation" (or "innovative") that contravenes the requirements of the Charter School Statute. ${ }^{7}$ The School Board's definition of the term "innovative" in School Board Policy 2.57 and the attached Rubric do not contravene the requirements of the Charter School Statute. Section 1002.33(2)(b), Florida Statutes, sets forth one of the mandatory purposes of a charter school as " $[\mathrm{e}]$ ncourag $[i n g]$ the use of innovative learning methods." In Section 1 of the Model Application, the applicant is required to "[d]escribe how the school will meet the prescribed purposes for charter schools found in section 1002.33(2)(b), F.S." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M1 (August 2015) (e.a.). The Model Application then quotes from section 1002.33 (2)(b), which provides that "charter schools shall fulfill the following purposes . . Encourage the use of innovative learning methods." Id. (quoting § 1002.33(2)(b), Fla. Stat.). Additionally, section 1002.33(5)(b)e requires the School Board to "ensure that the charter is innovative[. $]$ " 8

In the Policy,
[t] he School Board defines innovative as introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new ideas about how learning methods can be performed in this School District, Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currently done well, identifying the great ideas of yesterday and/or tomorrow and putting them into practice. True innovative learning methods are those products, processes, strategies and approaches that improve significantly upon the status quo within this

[^5]geographical area of the School District, and result in heightened qualities and outcomes of teaching and learning.

School Board Policy 2.57(3)(d)(ii)(D) (Exhibit "A" at 14-28). The Rubric, meanwhile, provides that an application that meets the standard will have evidence of "[t]he use of innovative teaching and learning goals and interventions targeting academic support to all students especially for historically low performing students" as well as being "[i]nclusive, deliberate, and a monitored process that measures innovative goals and practices within the school." Rubric for Charter School Application Review of Innovative Methods (Exhibit "A" at 26-28).

School Board Policy 2.57 validly defines the term "innovative," which is not defined in the Charter School Statute. Such policies are valid and enforceable. See Imhotep-Nguzo Saba Charter Sch. v. Depariment of Educ. and Palm Beach County Sch. Bd., 947 So. 2d 1279, 1284 (Fla. 4th DCA 2007) (upholding a School Board policy regarding criteria for charter applicants, and upholding the denial of a charter application based on requirements set forth in the School Board policy). The School Board's definition of "imnovative" is consistent with the Statute, as it tracks the dictionary definition": "innovative" means "introducing or using new ideas or methods; having new ideas about how something can be done." See "Innovative" at Merriam-Webster.com. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. (last accessed Nov. 20, 2015). Policy 2.57 and the Rubric then provide specific illustrations of what is required for a proposed charter school to be innovative.

The fact that the information required by School Board Policy 2.57 and the attached Rubric is not expressly contained in the Model Application does not prohibit the School Board from asking for this information in the Application. The Charter School Statute plainly allows a district school board to require additional information in an application to open a charter school: an

[^6]applicant "shall prepare and submit an application on a model application form prepared by the Department of Education which: . . Contains additional information a sponsor may reguire, which shall be attached as an addendum to the charter school application described in this paragraph."), ${ }^{10} \S 1002.33(6)(a) 6$, Fla. Stat. (2015) (e.a.). The information required to be in the Application by School Board Policy 2.57 and the Rubric is information the School Board may require as sponsor, in accordance with the Charter School Statute requirements that the school demonstrate how it will encourage the use of innovative learning methods and that the sponsor ensure the charter as a whole is innovative. ${ }^{11}$ See id. $\S 1002.33(2)(b) \&(5)(b) e$.

The courts have upheld such policies. For example, in Imhotep-Nguzo Saba, the applicants challenged the application of a School Board policy that looked to the academic and financial success of the applicant's existing school as a requirement for starting a new school, when that criteria was not required by the statute. The applicants argued that the School Board's adoption of the policy was ultra vires because the Charter School Statute generally exempts charter schools from School Board policies. 947 So. 2d at 1281. The court concluded that the challenged policy was valid and affirmed the denial of the applications. Id at 1285. The court explained that the exemption then in $\S 1002.33(5)(b) 4$ stating the "sponsor's policies shall not apply to a charter

[^7]school"12 was "aimed at giving charter schools some measure of academic and administrative freedom, [but] we do not read this provision to prohibit the School Board from adopting and enforcing policies related to the creation, renewal or termination of the charter schools they sponsor." 1 d. at 1282.

Undaunted, the Applicant also contends, in the alternative, that its Application did demonstrate innovation and proceeds to identify a series of "innovative" practices (Notice of Appeal at 11-17.) But the District reviewer, the Director of the Department of Charter Schools, reviewed these various practices and, applying his knowledge and expertise about education and what is already available to the students in Palm Beach County schools, concluded that the Application failed to satisfy the statutory criteria as clarified in School Board Policy 2.57 and its Rubric. (Exhibit 2 to Notice of Appeal \& Exhibit "A" at 30.)

Even looking at the statutory text alone, without looking to School Board Policy 2.57 or its attached Rubric, the Applicant still failed to meet the standard for Section 1 of the Application. As noted above, by its dictionary definition, "innovative" means "introducing or using new ideas or methods; having new ideas about how something can be done." See "Innovative" at MerriamWebster.com. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. Relying on this definition alone, the Applicant failed to demonstrate how its school would encourage the use of innovative learning methods. Encouraging the use of imovative learning methods plainly means encouraging the use of new learning methods. Learning methods that are already implemented or practiced in schools within the School District are not new and, therefore, not innovative.

[^8]Further, many of the practices identified by the Applicant were arguably not even learning methods, i.e., ways of learning. For instance, the Applicant discusses Personalized Learning Plans, but describes them as measurement tools in its Notice of Appeal. (See Notice of Appeal at 9.) The Data Chats, Ongoing Professional Development, and Quality Education for Students and Teachers, meanwhile, all concern professional development for instructors and administrators and are therefore also not innovative learning methods for students. The Freshman Academy is similarly not an innovative learning method, but rather an organizational support structure for ninth grade students. The same is true of the Senior Project and Volunteer Hours requirements, which may be beneficial for students, but are not innovative learning methods. The College Preparatory/Career Academies and Cambridge Program are likewise not innovative learning methods.

The purportedly innovative learning methods identified in the relevant section of the Application (pages 5 through 7), such as student-centered learning and blended learning, were also not innovative under the plain meaning of the term, while other practices, such as the school's grading philosophy, were again not learning methods at all. This is also true of the practices identified by Mr. Haiko during the Board Meeting, such as the school's celebratory summer summit and "value-driven decision-making process." (Exhibit 5 to Notice of Appeal at 8.) Those do not qualify as new, innovative student learning methods in this District.

Finally, while the parents who spoke at the Board Meeting explained why they wanted their children to be able to attend a Renaissance high school, they too failed to identify any innovative learning methods. In any event, this substantive information was required to be in the Application and could not be provided at the Board Meeting.

In sum, the School Board rightly concluded that the Application failed to meet the statutory standard for Section 1 of the Application. This is true under School Board Policy 2.57 and the

Rubric, which require information from the Applicant that the School Board, as sponsor, is permitted to require. But it is also true looking only at the statutory requirement that the Applicant "[d]escribe how the school will meet the prescribed purposes for charter schools found in section $1002.33(2)(b)$, F.S.," including how it will "[e]ncourage the use of innovative learning methods." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M1 (August 2015). The deficiencies in Section 1 alone provided good cause to deny the Application.

## 2. ESE (Section 6)

The Application was also deficient with respect to one of the requirements in Section 6 of the Model Evaluation Instrument and was therefore propenly rated as only partially meeting the standard. The Evaluation Instrument provides that a response that meets the standard will include "[a] realistic enrollment projection (SWD) and a staffing plan that aligns with the projection." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6a-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012). The Applicant projected that its population of students with disabilities would amount to approximately $10 \%$ of the student population. (Application at 100.) The District reviewer properly noted that this was "low" based on the District's percentage of ESE students, which she stated was approximately $14 \%$. The Evaluation Instrument unmistakably requires a realistic enrollment projection, which necessarily means a projection that is tied to the school district where the school would operate. Yet the Applicant based its projection on "other high schools in Florida that are managed by Charter Schools USA" and "the schools in Palm Beach that are already in existence" but which were "not high schools." (Exhibit 4 to Notice of Appeal at 5.) The Applicant failed to provide a realistic enrollment projection as required by the Evaluation Instrument.

## 3. ELL (Section 7)

"Students with disabilities and students served in English for Speakers of Other Languages programs shall have an equal opportunity of being selected for enrollment in a charter school." § 1002.33(10)(f), Fla. Stat. (2015). Accordingly, for Section 7 of the Application, a response that meets the standard must present, inter alia, "[d]emonstrated capacity to meet the school's obligations under state and federal law regarding the education of English language learner students." Fla. Admin. Code R, 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012).

The District reviewer rated Section 7 of the Application as partially meeting the standard because it failed to reference compliance with the Resolution Agreement between the School District of Palm Beach County and the United States Department of Justice, the purpose of which was to resolve a federal investigation into complaints about the District's policies and practices for registering and enrolling students in District schools and for administering student discipline. Under the Resolution Agreement, which was entered into on February 26, 2013, the School District is to ensure that students do not face bamiers to enrolling in or attending District schools on the basis of national origin, immigration status, or language status, and it is to administer discipline in a fair and non-discriminatory manner that does not lead to exclusion of students from the classroom on the basis of race, national origin, language status, or other impermissible ground. The reviewer explained at the interview that this is now required in the Application because the District had been audited in 2014 "and the charter schools didn't do well[.]" (Exhibit 4 to Notice of Appeal at 7.)

Thus, when the Applicant failed to reference compliance with the Resolution Agreement, it failed to demonstrate its capacity to meet all of the proposed charter school's obligations under federal law regarding the education of English language learner students. The section was appropriately rated as only partially meeting the standard.

## 4. Student Recruitment and Enrollment (Section 13)

In the Application, there is a minimum volunteer hour requirement for parents of students at the school. (Application at 153-54.) The Department of Education has opined that parent volunteer contracts are enforceable and that failure to satisfy the volunteer requirement is sufficient grounds for a charter school to deny admission to the student the following year. See Fla. Dep't of Ed., Memorandum Op. 13-01 (May 9, 2013). The Model Application, however, requires an applicant to explain "any student and/or family contracts that will be used as a requisite for initial and continued enrollment" and to describe "if and how the school will enforce such contracts." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M1 (August 2015). The Evaluation Instrument, meanwhile, requires " $[a] n$ enrollment and admissions process that is open, fair, and in accordance with applicable law." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012).

As the District reviewer noted, the Applicant failed to describe "if and how" the charter school would enforce the volunteer requirement because there was no information about what would occur when parents did not meet the required number of hours by the end of the school year. (Exhibit 2 to Notice of Appeal.) During the interview with District staff, the Applicant conceded that this information was not in the Application. (See Exhibit 4 to Notice of Appeal at 12 and 20.) Unquestionably, then, the Applicant failed to include information required to be in the Application. ${ }^{13}$ This section was appropriately rated as only partially meeting the standard.

[^9]
## 5. Budget (Section 17)

Section 17 of the Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument directs a reviewer to look for three things, two of which are:

- Budgetary projections which are consistent with all parts of the application.
- A realistic assessment of projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school.
Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012). Applying these criteria, the reviewer, the District's Budget Director, found that the proposed budget lacked consistency with parts of the Application and did not represent a realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenues and expenditures.

First, the Applicant budgeted the total number of ESE students at $10 \%$, but the District average is $20 \%$, which resulted in an understatement of revenue and a greater understatement of expenditures. (Exhibit 2 to Notice of Appeal.) As explained at the interview, applicants were informed of the District average of $20 \%$ at the training provided for new applicants, but the $10 \%$ figure was even below the previous year's figure, which was $15 \% .^{14}$ (Exhibit 4 to Notice of Appeal at 39.) As discussed above, the Applicant based its ESE projection only on other schools managed by Charter Schools USA, which was made up mostly of schools elsewhere in Florida and some schools in Palm Beach County that were not high sehools. (See id. at 5,40.) The District reviewer specifically explained, however, that the School District of Palm Beach County has a larger ESE population than other counties in the State of Florida. (ld. at 41-42.) By using figures based on schools in other areas, the Applicant understated its ESE population and therefore failed to provide

[^10]"[a] realistic assessment of projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012) (e.a.).

Second, the Applicant budgeted its average teacher salary as $\$ 37,000$, with the average benefits cost being between 17 and $17.7 \%$. The District reviewer observed, however, that the average teacher salary for charter schools operating in Palm Beach County was $\$ 2,500$ higher than the Applicant's projection. (Exhibit 2 to Notice of Appeal) More importantly, however, even the average teacher salary at other schools managed by Charter Schools USA was $\$ 1,670$ higher than the Applicant's projection. (Id) The average benefit rate for charter schools in Palm Beach County, meanwhile, was $25 \%$, over $7 \%$ higher than the Applicant's projections. (Id) The result of the low projections would be high teacher turnover and fewer certified teachers, (Id.) The District reviewer explained at the interview that, in particular, it was unlikely that the school would be able to obtain and retain the teachers it would need to instruct its gifted population. (Exhibit 4 to Notice of Appeal at 46.) The Applicant thus again failed to provide "[a] realistic assessment of projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school." Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012) (e.a.).

The Applicant contends that "the fact that the School Board might question the . . . projections of the proposed charter school because it would have used different numbers is not legally sufficient reasons [sic] to deny the Application," and cites School Board of Volusia Cty. v. Academies of Excellence, Inc., 974 So. $2 d 1186$ (Fla. 5th DCA 2008). (Notice of Appeal at 19.) The Applicant misapplies the holding of the case it cites. In Academies of Excellence, the Fifth District Court of Appeal affirmed a finding by the SBE that a school board lacked competent substantial evidence to support a finding that an application was statutorily deficient in the areas of finance/class size requirements. $I d$. at 1191 . Importantly, the court in Academies of Excellence
did not state that a disagreement about the appropriate numbers that should be used can never be a legally sufficient reason to deny a charter school application. Instead, it rejected the findings by the district school board in that case because they were either rebutted by the applicant or they were based on mere opinion or speculation $/ d$. at 1188, 1191. Here, by contrast, the Applicant did not sufficiently rebut the District reviewer's findings about deficiencies in its proposed budget. Furthermore, the District reviewer's findings were not based on her opinion, but were instead based on specific data about the School District of Palm Beach County and, with respect to teacher salary, other schools managed by Charter Schools USA. As noted above, the budget section of the Application must present a realistic assessment of projected sources of revenue and expenses. Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786, Form IEPC-M2 (June 2012). Because the Application did not do this, it was appropriately rated as only partially meeting the standard.

## B. The School Board's denial was not barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel.

The Applicant asserts that "basically" the same application has been approved seven times before and that the School Board is barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel with respect to its review of this Application. (Notice of Appeal at 19.) "Collateral estoppel is a judicial doctrine which in general terms prevents identical parties from relitigating the same issues that have already been decided. In addition, the particular matter must be fully litigated and determined in a contest that results in a final decision of a court of competent jurisdiction." State v. McBride, 848 So. 2d 287, 290-91 (Fla. 2003) (e.a.; internal quotes and citation omitted).

Setting aside the fact that the Applicant has not shown that the review of any past applications resulted in a final decision by a court of competent jurisdiction, ${ }^{15}$ this Application did

[^11]not involve the same issues as previous applications submitted by Renaissance Charter Schools, Inc., to the School Board of Palm Beach County. For instance, in the case cited by the Applicant, the doctrine of collateral estoppel barred a surety company from relitigating the issue of whether certain mortgages were subject to documentary stamp taxes, where the surety company failed to show that the mortgages in the case at bar "differ[ed] in their substance or that the legal issue presented [was] different in any way." Dep't of Revente v. Accredited Sur. \& Cas. Co., 690 So. 2d 614, 616 (Fla. 5th DCA 1997). Here, the Application was to open a high school, while the schools currently operated by Renaissance Charter School, Inc., in the School District of Palm Beach County are K-8. ${ }^{16}$ An application to open a high school is substantially different from applications to open schools serving younger age groups, even if the legal criteria in reviewing the various applications may have been the same. Cf. Sch. Bd. of Seminole Cty. v. Renaissance Charter Sch., Inc., 113 So. 3d 72, 75 (Fla. 5th DCA 2013) ("Common sense dictates that a middle school, which covers only grades 6 through 8 , is materially different from a K through 8 school."). Because review of the instant Application did not involve the same issues as past applications, that reason alone shows the doctrine of collateral estoppel is inapplicable.

## C. The administrative appeal process in the Charter School Statute is unconstitutional. ${ }^{17}$

Section 1002.33 (6)(c), Florida Statutes, is unconstitutional as it fails to include due process protections and allows the SBE to exceed its constitutional powers of oversight of the state system of education, and to infringe on the School Board's exclusive constitutional power to operate,

[^12]control, and supervise public schools.
First, substantive due process protects against arbitrary government action, See Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Butler, 770 So. 2d 1210, 1214-15 (Fla. 2000). Procedural due process requires reasonable notice and a fair and meaningful opportunity to be heard by an impartial decisionmaker, see Jennings v. Dade County, 589 So. 2d 1337, 1340-41 (Fla. 3d DCA 1991), as well as a defensible rationale or justification. As a federal appellate judge has explained, a constitutional hearing must afford 11 aspects of due process, including a tribunal that issues "[a] written statement of reasons" for its decision, which is "almost essential if there is to be judicial review." Hon. Henry J. Friendly, Some Kind of Hearing, 123 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1267, 1292 (1975).

Section 1002.33 (6)(c)3.a is vague as it provides no criteria or parameters for the SBE's decision. Although the SBE must "consider" a recommendation from the CSAC, it is not bound by that recommendation. $\$ 1002.33$ (6)(e)2, Fla. Stat. The statute merely says: "The State Board of Education shall by majority vote accept or reject the decision of the sponsor."18 Id. § 1002.33(6)(c)3.a. It provides no criteria or standards for the vote, nor any guidance for evaluating a recommendation from the CSAC. Although the "State Board of Education's decision is a final action subject to judicial review in the district court of appeal," id. $\S 1002.33(6)(\mathrm{d})$, this provision is illusory in light of the unconstitutionally flawed statutory process which fails to require any statement of any rationale or a procedure to demonstrate competent substantial evidence for the SBE's decision. These flaws frustrate the guarantee of judicial recourse and render the administrative appeal process invalid.

Second, the Constitution limits the powers of the appointed SBE, which has a general

[^13]supervisory role over the state educational system: "The state board of education shall be a body corporate and have such supervision of the system of free public education as is provided by law." Art. IX, § 2, Fla. Const. (e.a). It is anomalous that the SBE, which has general oversight of the statewide system of education under the Constitution, would be allowed to make binding decisions compelling local school boards to take on the substantial responsibility and impact of sponsoring a charter school whose application the school board has already determined to be deficient. The statute exceeds the SBE's constitutional power under article IX, $\S 2$, Fla. Const., which is focused on general oversight of the state system of education. Thus, the administrative appeal process in section 1002.33 (6)(c) is unconstitutional.

Finally, the administrative appeal process in section 1002.33(6)(c), (d), Florida Statutes, allows the SBE to override the School Board's denial of charter school applications, effectively allowing the SBE to authorize charter schools. This process undermines the School Board's power to establish, authorize, and operate public schools under article IX \& 4(b), Fla. Const.

Article IX, Section 4 of the Florida Constitution provides that school boards "shall operate, control and supervise all free public schools within the district." (e.a.). "All charter schools in Florida are public schools." § $1002.33(1)$, Fla. Stat. (2015) (e.a.). In violation of article IX, the administrative appeal process grants the authority to the SBE to accept a charter school application where the same application was previously denied by a school board exercising its "primary decision-making authority ... over these basic decisions." Cf. Imhotep-Nguzo Saba Charter Sch., 947 So. 2d at 1284. Thus, the administrative appeal process undermines a school board's ability to determine and meet the needs of children within its own district. The application appeal statute conflicts with the School Board's constitutional powers, as it allows the SBE to accept applications for Charter Schools over the authority of the School Board, which has the sole constitutional power
under article IX $\S 4(\mathrm{~b})$, Fla. Const, to authorize and operate public schools in this county. ${ }^{19}$ Further, the charter appeal statute conflicts with the SBE's general powers, which are limited to "recommend[ing] that a district school board take action consistent with the state board's decision relating to an appeal of a charter school application." § 1001.02(2)(q), Fla. Stat. (2015) (ea.).

## IV. CONCLUSION

The SCHOOL BOARD respectfully requests the SBE uphold the decision of the SCHOOL
BOARD based on good cause to deny the Application and deny the Applicant's appeal for reasons stated in this Response.

Respectfully submitted,

A.DENISE SAGERHOLM, ESQ. Assistant General Counsel
Florida Bar No.: 849200
PALM BEACH COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
Office of the General Counsel
3300 Forest Hill Blvd., C-323
West Palm Beach, FL 33406
Telephone: 561-969-5847
Fax: 561-434-8105
adenise,sagerholm@palmbeachschools.org


[^14]
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# RENAISSANCE CHARTER SCHOOL, INC., and RENAISSANCE CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL OF PALM BEACH <br> vs. <br> THE SCHOOL BOARD OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA 

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Exhibit \# | Bates Stamp \# | Description |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Exhibit A | $001-109$ | Attachments to School Board's November 13, 2015 <br> Letter of Denial of Charter Application - Renaissance <br> Charter High School of Palm Beach |

## ATHACHMIENTI

# Fwol: New Applicant Interview - Renailssance Charter HS 1 message 

The rescheduled New Applicants Interview for Renaissance Charter High School is

## Tuesday, September 22, 2015 @ 8:30am - 9;30am

Charter Department, 3300 Forest Hill Bivd, IBIS BIdg E
Please call Lyn Bryant with questions.

## Thanks

Lyn

On Thu, Sep 3, 2015 at 12:55 PM, Kelmanson, Derek [dkelmanson@charterschoolsusa.com](mailto:dkelmanson@charterschoolsusa.com) wrote:

Hilyn,

Since our team is in Tampa for the first part of the week and lim is out later in the week, he suggested that consider the next week. Please let me know if the afternoon on Monday $9 / 24$ is available?

Derek Kelmanson

Senior Manager of Business Development
Charter Schools USA
(954) $116-4056$
wwiw.charterschoolsusa,com
"Putting Stadents Firss"

From: Lyn Bryant [mailtolyn.bryant@palmbeachschools,org]
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 10:42 AM
To; Kelmanson, Derek [dkelmanson@charlerschoolsusa.com](mailto:dkelmanson@charlerschoolsusa.com)
Cc: Jim Pegg 〈jim.pegg@palmbeachschools.org>
Subject: New Applicant Interview - Renaissance Charter HS

Good Morning,

The New Applicant Interview for Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach has been scheduled for:

## Monday, September 14th, 8:30am to 9:30am <br> Charter School Department, 3300 Forest Hill Blvd, IBIS Building E

If you have any questions please contact Lyn Bryant at 561-434-8189. released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this enlity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

Lyn Bryant, Statistical Analyst<br>Department of Charter Schools<br>\section*{IBIS Building $E$}<br>3300 Forest Hill Blvd<br>West Palm Beach, FL 33406

Office: 561-434-8189
Fax: 561-434-7498
lyn.bryant@palmbeachschools.org

## Lyn Bryant, Statistical Analyst

Department of Charter Schools
IBIS Building $E$.
3300 Forest Hill Blvd
West Palm Beach, FL 33406
Office: 561-434-8189
Fax: 561-434-7498
lyn.bryant@palmbeachschools.org

## ATTACHMENT 1-A

Reviewers' Comments from Charter Tools (09/03/15)

# RENAISSANCE HIGH SCHOOL 

## Section 1

## Does Not Meet the Standard

Jim Pegg
No Notes on Charter Tools

## Section 6

Partially Meets the Standard
Cathy Weech (9/1/15 4:08 PM)
Clear description of the levels of service the school will provide to students with disabilities: Application states that "school will provide services to students with disabilities by offering a continuum of services including consultation and support facilitation in the regular classroom environment." Dropdown selection in section 6A indicates the school will be an "80/20" school, but provision for providing direct instruction (i.e., pullout) for up to $20 \%$ of the day could not be found in the document. For Gifted students, section 61 specifies that "...gifted students will receive enrichment through regularly scheduled gifted consultation provided by a gifted endorsed teacher," but section 6E implies direct services with, "Teacher of gifted students will collaborate with general education teachers..." A clear description of how the school will ensure that students with disabilities will have an equal opportunity of being selected for enrollment: Found in application. Section 6B specifies that the school's enrollment application does not request information on disability status and that students with disabilities will have an equal opportunity of being selected for enrollment. Marketing strategy materials are mentioned that will specify that the charter school serves students with "exceptionalities" and "disabilities." An understanding and commitment to collaborating with the sponsor to ensure that placement decisions for students with disabilities will be made based on each student's unique needs: Evident in application An appropriate plan for evaluating the school's effectiveness in serving exceptional students, including gifted: Evident. Strategies include progress toward IEP goals, promotion/retention rates, discipline data, and state mandated assessments. A realistic enrollment projection (SWD) and a staffing plan that aligns with the projection:Application states that $10 \%$ of students in the school are anticipated to be ESE, based on data of public schools in the market they are considering (i.e., area between Turnpike and I-95, along Southern Blvd). This is low, compared to the District percentage of ESE students of approximately $14 \%$. Section 6 H lists passing scores on Florida K-6, 1-6, $\mathrm{Pk}-3$ subject area exam as possibilities for staff qualifications. It is unclear why these subject areas would pertain'to a school serving only high school students. Subject Area exams are mentioned as well, however. Application under Section 6 H specifies school's instructional staff will include teachers who are Gifted certified/endorsed. It is not clear if such a position is supported by the budget, unless one of the teachers listed under Function 5100-Basic Instruction as "Classroom Teacher Salaries" is going to fulfill this role. It is also unclear as to where contracted therapists are funded in the budget, though they are referenced in the application.
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## Section 13

Partially Meets the Standard
Jason Link (9/8/15 9:06 PM)
Section 13 D states: Explain any student and/or family contracts that will be used as a requisite for initial and continued enrollment in the school. Describe if and how the school will enforce such contracts.-- Application states that parents will be required to volunteer a minimum of 20 or 30 hours per school year, depending on the number of children enrolled from the same household. If parents do not meet the required mandatory number of volunteer hours by the end of the school year, even after notification letters are sent, what then occurs?

## Section 17

Partially Meets the Standard
DOCUMENT IS IN SCHOOL'S FOLDER

## Section 19

Partially Meets the Standard
Ariel Alejo (10/28/15 2:23 PM)
Section \# 19 fails to provide flexibility for addressing unanticipated events.

# ATTACHMENT 1-B 

## Reviewer's Comments <br> Sections 17

Date: August 23, 2015
Application: Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach
Revicwer: Heather Knust
Section: 17 Budget
Rating: Does not meet Standards
Conclusion

The budget lacks consistency with parts of the application and does not represent a realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenues and expenditures. Florida Statute $1002.33(6)(a)(5)$ and (b)(2).

Refer to detailed analysis below:

## 1. Mission, Guiding Principles and Purpose

Applicant:
The mission of Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach (School) is to prepare students for college and careers by creating a learning environment that integrates a research-based curriculum, a culture of student safety and success, and concentration on academic rigor while focusing on citizenship and experiential learning through student engagement.

- Blended learning - Students will have the opportunity to experience various blended learning models (flipped, rotation, a la carte, individualized, etc.) to learn content in a new and innovative way. A unique aspect of being a part of the CSUSA network is that students will have the opportunity to take courses that are offered in other CSUSA schools, while physically being located in this School. To facilitate effective blended learning strategies, the School will use state-of-the-art technology resources, including interactive displays, tablets, laptops, document cameras, production rooms, and more.

District: The applicant sttesses blended leatning although does not include a budget for academic software or contracted services. Assuming $25 \%$ of the student population participate in blended courses representing 150 FTE in year 1 up to 300 in year 5 the additional cost is estimated at $\$ 60,000$ in year 1 up to $\$ 120,000$ in year 5 based on an estimate of $\$ 400$ per FTE for content. See below for budget impact.

## 4. Curriculum

Applicant: English Language Arts, Math, Social Studies (World History, US History, US Government, Economics), Science, foreign language, fine arts, other electives?)

District: The applicant budgeted for 4 books per student, no academic software, and no consumable books. Based on the curriculum the school will need 6 to 8 books (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies (at least two books), Arts, Foreign Language, others?). See below for budget impact of adding 2 additional books.

## 6. Exceptional Students

Applicant: Budgeted the number of ESE students at 10\%.
District: Palm Beach County ESE population is 20\% county-wide resulting in an understatement in revenue and even greater understatement of expenditures. See below for budget impact.

## 14. Facilities

Applicant: Regardless of whether an existing building is purchased or is built the facility layout will be based on previous plans that have been successfully deployed by the ESP for charter schools serving similar populations. The facility is expected to be $70,000-100,000$ square feet in size, occupying one to three floors. Regardless of the source of funds, the School will make rent payments for the facility adequate to cover the cost of servicing the associated debt/lease costs.

District: The budget for rent in year one is $\$ 7.09$ per sq. ft. for a $30,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . building increasing to $\$ 17.71$ per sq. ft. by year 5 . In accordance with GASB Codification L20 scheduled rent increases that are artificially low should be measured on a straight-line basis over the lease term or estimated fair value of the rental. No draft lease agreement is provided as supporting documentation. In addition, $70,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$ is on the low end for a high school if the school plans to offer athletic events as stated in the application at some point in the future.

## 17. Budget

Applicant: Average teacher wage is assumed at $\$ 37,000$ with average benefits offered of $17.7 \%$ in year one decreasing to $17 \%$ in year 5 .

District: Average teacher salary for Palm Beach County Charter Schools is $\$ 39,500$ (district average salary is $\$ 49,300$ ). Average teacher salaries for Charter School USA schools operated in Palm Beach County is $\$ 38,670$ based on teacher salary information reported to Palm Beach County for teachers paid over $\$ 18,000$. Proposed average salary is well below that of other charter schools in the area as well as Charter School USA Schools. Average benefit rate for charter schools in Palm Beach County is $25 \%, 17 \%$ is well below the average. The result will be high teacher turnover and the fewer certified teachers. See budget impact below based on an average salary of $\$ 38,670$.

No support provided for the donation in the planning year, as a result it was deducted from the budget. See budget impact below.

No support provided for loan for FFE and capital purchases in the first year, as a result it was deducted from the budget. Proposed Management Agreement with ESP does not address any loans. See budget impact below.

## Financial Impact of Adjustments

The original budget submitted has a net income ranging from $\$ 12,674$ to $\$ 364,860$. After making adjustments for the numerous issues noted above, the school would be operating at a cumulative deficit.

|  | Planning | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Revenue | - | 166,884 | 12,674 | 191,736 | 346,842 | 364,860 |
| ESE (6) |  | $(85,342)$ | (129,525) | $(175,458)$ | \{178,466\} | (181,533) |
| Books (4) |  | $(60,000)$ | (30,000) | $(30,000)$ | - | - |
| Salaries at \$38,670 (17) |  | $(61,731)$ | (100,005) | $(128,450)$ | $(131,019)$ | (133,640) |
| Benefit Rate at 17\% (17) |  | (10,494) | (17,001) | (21,857) | $(22,273)$ | (22,719) |
| Benefit Rate at 25\% (17) |  | (100,847) | $(167,029)$ | (217,522) | $(226,044)$ | $(234,737)$ |
| Academic Software (1) |  | $(60,000)$ | (90,000) | (120,000) | $(120,000)$ | (120,000) |
| Donation (17) | (117,988) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loan (17) |  | (868,184) |  |  |  |  |
| Loan (17) |  | 66,409 | 250,379 | 250,379 | 250,379 | 250,379 |
| Rent (14) |  | (497,085) | [175,039) | 202,117 | 223,902 | 246,106 |
| Total Annual lmpact | (117.988) | $(1,508,390)$ | $(445,546)$ | (49,036) | 143,320 | 168,717 |
| Total Cumulative Impart |  | $(1,626,378)$ | (2,071,924) | $(2,120,960)$ | $(1,977,640)$ | $(1,808,923)$ |

Excluding the adjustments for the loan, rent, and benefits also results in a deficit each year:

|  | Planning | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Revenue | - | 166,884 | 12,674 | 191,736 | 346,842 | 364,860 |
| ESE (6) |  | $(85,342)$ | (129,525) | (175,458) | (178,466) | (181,533) |
| Books (4) |  | (60, 000 ) | $(30,000)$ | $(30,060)$ | - | - |
| Salaries at \$58,670 (17) |  | $(61,731)$ | (100,005) | $(128,450)$ | (131,019) | $(133,640)$ |
| Benefit Rate at 17\% (17) |  | (10,494) | (17,001) | (21,837) | $(22,273)$ | $(22,719)$ |
| Benefit Rate at 25\% (17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academic Software [1] |  | (50,000) | (90,000) | (120,000) | (120,000) | (120,000) |
| Donation (17) | (117,988) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loan (17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loan (17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rent (14) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Impact | [117,988) | [110,683] | (353,857) | (284,009) | (104,916) | $(93,031)$ |
| Total Cumulative Impact |  | (228,671) | (582,528) | (866,538) | (971,454) | (1,064,485) |

# ATTACHMENT 1-C 

School Board Policy 2.57
With
Rubric of Innovative Methods

| Q4/2015 |  | BcardDocs © Policy: 2.57 C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Book | School Board Policies |  |
| Section | Ch. 2. General Administration |  |
| Title | Charter Schools |  |
| Number | 2.57 |  |
| Status | Active |  |
| Legal |  |  |
| Adopted | February 5, 1997 |  |
| Last Revised | May 27, 2015 |  |
| Last Reviewed | May 27, 2015 |  |

## 1. PURPOSE AND INTENT

The School Board of Palm Beach County ("School Board" or "Sponsor") shall sponsor charter schools to provide educational options in accordance with Forida law. The provisions within this policy shall be interpreted consistently with Florida and federal laws.

## 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION ("APPLICATION")

The School Board shall sponsor charter schoois within Palm Beach County that serve any of these grades: Pre-kindergarten (Exceptional Student Education Only) and from kindergarten through grade 12 or as otherwise allowed by Florlda law. To establish a charter school, an applicant must meet the criteria within Fla. Stat. $\$ \S 1002.33$ (2) (a) \& (b), (3), and (6) (a), the State approved evaluation instrument and any additional information required by the School Board as stated below. In addition, applicants can apply to open virtual charter schools, high-performing charter schools and blended-learning charter schools in accordance with Florida law as designated by the Commissioner of Education.

## 3. APPLICATION PROCESS AND REVIEW

a. Applicants: Applicants are encouraged to particlpate in the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) orientation webinar, if available, to review the charter school application process. In order for applicants to become familiar with District procedures, the School District ("District") strongly encourages applicants to also attend the applicant training provided by the District. Technical assistance from the District is available to interested applicants prior to the application deadines and may be obtained by contacting the Superintendent's designee. If the applicant is a management company or other nonprofit organization, if is strongly encouraged that the charter school principal and the chief financial officer or his or her equivalents also participate in the tralning.
b. Application Deadlines: Consistent with Fla. Stat. $\$ \S 1002.33$ (6) (b), all applications must be recelved In the Superintendent's designee's office (currently the District's Department of Charter Schools) no later than 5:00 p.m. EDST on May 1 (the draft application deadline) or August 1 for prospective charter schools intending to start operations by the beginning of the subsequent school year. All applications must be complete, containing all sections of the Model Florida Charter Schools Application and any necessary exhibits and addenda. Applications, Including the exhibits and additional information required by the School Board as an addendum, shall be submitted electronically to the Sponsor using the Sponsor's current application software and by submission of a flash/travel drive data storage device. If the applicant has dificulty downloading the documents to the Sponsor's system, It shall notify the District's Charter School Department for
assistance and/or timely submission by an alternative method. The software will indicate the date and time when the application is submitted and received by the District. To verlfy lts time of receipt, the appliciant will sign-In with the District upon submitting the flash/travel drive data storage device and the time and date will be reflected. If the District allows the submission by an alternative method, the application will be date and time stamped. All of these submissions must be recelved timely and no late applications or portions thereof will be accepted. If May 1 or August 1 occurs on a Saturday, Sunday, legal holiday, or other non-business day of the District, the deadine for application submission shall be extended to 5:00 p.m. EDST on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, legal hollday, or other non-business day of the District. No additlonal, supporting substantive documentation will be accepted after the deadline.

1. Applications must be submitted on the most current and appllcable DOE Model Florida Charter Schools Application form through the process described in Section 3, (b) above, in compliance with Florida State Board Rule of Education (SBER) 6A-6.0786(1) and Include any School Board required additional Information as an addenda. The Model Florida Charter Schools Applications can be found on the Florlda Department of Education's website.
ii. Charter schools shall not use or beard the name of an existing traditional public, charter, or private/parochlal school in Palm Beach County, Florida.
c. May 1 Application Reviews:

- Pursuant to Fla . Stat. $\$ \S 1002.33(6)(\mathrm{b})$, "an applicant may submit a draft charter school application on or before May 1 with an application fee of $\$ 500$. If a draft application is timely submitted, the sponsor shall review and provide feedback as to material deficiencles in the application by July 1. The applicant shall then have until August 1 to resubmit a revised and final application. The sponsor may approve the draft appilcation."

The application must be submitted using the software made avallable by the School District as referenced above in Section $3_{r}$ (b).
Additional information, as set forth in Section 3, d, il below, must also be submitted by the appllcant and consldered by the reviewers in their feedback.
d. August 1 Application Reviews;

1. The appllcation must be submitted using the software made avallable by the District as well as the flash/travel drive data storage device as stated above in Section 3, (b). The entire application will be accessible to varlous departments within the District or other qualiffed individuals who will review deslgnated component sections on behalf of the District. Applications will be evaluated using the most current and applicable Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument and consider the additional Information required by the School Board. The Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instruments can be found on the Florlda Department of Education's website. Each section of a properly submitted application will be rated as "Meets the Standard," "Partially Meets the Standard," or "Does Not Meet the Standard". Persons who review the sections on behalf of the District shall provide written commentary to explain the rating given to each particular section if that section is rated as partially or does not meet the standard. Atter evaluation, each reviewer shall provide to the Superintendent's designee all sections of the application he/she reviewed as well as completed evaluation instruments for those sections.
li. Pursuant to Fla. Stat. $\$ 51002.33$ ( 6 ) (a) 6 , the School Board may soliclt additional information from the charter school applicant. The School Board will sollit and require an applicant to provide information and/or documents for all of the additional items as an addendum to the charter application as follows:

A: A completed budget worksheet in the format prescribed by the District.
B. The name, academic (inchuding ESE complance) and prior charter schoolrelated and business-related financial history and background of a) individual
applicants, b) applicant entity, c) founding and governing boards and their Individual members, and d) ESP/management company. This information shall include, but not be limited to, a demonstration of the professional experience or competence of those individuals or organizations applying to operate the charter school and those hired or retained to perform professlonal services.
C. Information concerning whether the applicant, any of its founding/governing board members and/or ESP/management company, have had any management/ESP contract, position, or employment with any previously denied, failed, terminated, or voluntary terminated charter schools, or any other related charter schools. If they had this relationship, a description of the nature of that relationship, what were the circumstances of the closure and when it occurred, whether a final audit was performed, and whether all unencumbered public funds and property were returned reverted to the School District or the Department of Education.
D. A detailed and specific descriptlon of how it encourages and implements innovative learning methods and measurement tools that are innovative.

The School Board defines innovative as introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new ideas about how learning methods can be performed in this School District. Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currently done well, identifying the great ideas of yesterday and/or tomorrow and putting them into practice. True innovative learning methods are those products, processes, strategles and approaches that improve significantiy upon the status quo within this geographical area of the School District, and result in helghtened qualitles and outcomes of teaching and learning, The criteria for making this determination are set forth on the document that is attached hereto.
> ". E . The strength and clarity of policles, responsibilities and practices of effective management of the school. A description of internal audit procedures and establishment of controls to ensure that the financlal resources are properly managed must be included.
> The additional information shall be used by the School Board to evaluate the applicant's proposed governing board's and proposed management company's ability to operate a charter school and shall be considered when the Superintendent decides whether to recommend approval or denial of an application and the School Board acts on the recommendation,

The track record for success in prior operations of a charter school Include but not limited to compllance with the terms of the charter and provisions of applicable federal and State laws and regulations, demonstrating significant annual student learning gains, satisfactory school grades, and no significant financial issues,
iii. The applicant and School Board may mutually agree, in writing, to extend the statutory timeline for the Dlstrict to consider the charter application. Such agreement shall detall the extension date or timeframe.
iv. The Superintendent will recommend approval only if the application meets all the standards. Only applicants who have presented a quallty plan with no material - weaknesses and have demonstrated the capacity to operate a quallty charter school will be recommended for charter approval.
e. Applicant Notification: The Superintendent's designee shall in writing notify by email, with read receipt requested (if email address is known), and mall the applicant the results of the charter application evaluation, noting which sections have been rated "Partially Meets the Standard" "or "Does Not Meet the Standard", If it appears that technical or non-substantive correctlons and clarifications may cure the deficiencies in the application, the letter may notify the applicant, that upon recelpt of the letter, the applicant has (seven) 7 calendar days to make technical or non-substantive corrections and clarifications as per the Statute but that substantive
changes will not be accepted,
f. Limited Opportunlty to Cure: Within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of the District's written notice, an applicant may submit in writing, per Fla. Stat. 61002.33 (6) (b), technical and non-substantive corrections and clariflcations, including, but not limited to, corrections of grammatical, typographical, and Ilke errors or missing signatures, that relate to any deficiency noted by a reviewer on the application evaluation instrument, if such errors are identified by the District as cause to deny the application. Technical correctlons and clarifications cannot materially alter the application. Applicants may NOT submit this additional information after the seven (7) calendar day period expires and the District will NOT consider substantive changes.
g. Applicants shall not be provided with the opportunlty to make substantlve changes, but shall retain the right to reapply for a charter school in the subsequent school year without prejudice. Examples of substantive changes include, but are not Imited to, the school's mission, the students to be served, the ages and grade to be included, the focus of the ciurriculum, the instructional methods to be used, budgetary assumptions, and distinctive instructional techniques to be employed.
h. Optional Applicant Interview:

1. If sections of the application were rated as "Does Not Meet the Standards" or "Partally Meet the Standards" due to technical or non-substantive deficiencles in the evaluations, and an interview could be helpful in providing these clarifications to the application, the parties may mutually agree to schedule an interview.
ii. Reviewers for the District, who have rated any section of a charter application as "Partially Meets the Standard" or "Does Not Meet the Standard" shall be present during the interview. Should the District reviewer be unable to attend, a designee will attend. The applicant should have present at the interview person(s) knowledgeable about the contents of the appfication and who have authority to act and speak on behalf of the applicant.
iii. At the interview, NO ADDITIONAL WRITTEN INFORMATION WILL BE ACCEPTED FROM THE APPLICANT OR ON THE APPLICANT'S BEHALF and no substantive changes will be considered.
iv. The Superintendent's designee will attempt to electronically record the interview but the District is not required to have it transcribed.
2. Reviewer(s) on behalf of the District will evaluate deficient sections considering the applicant's written non-substantive or technical corrections/clariflcations if the applicant submits any and any interview responses, The revlewers will then submit their results to the Superintendent's designee. The District will request that an applicant undergoing this review agree to an extension of the statutory time for application approval or denlal by the School Board for at least thirty (30) days.
j. Non-substantive Application Review Notification: After the technical and non-substantive revlews described above in Section (3)(f), (g) \& (i), the Superintendent's designee shall contact each applicant in writing to inform the applicant of the results of the interview and application evaluations. This written notification will include the Superintendent's recommendation that will be made to the School Board, as well as notice of the time and date of the School Board meeting for action on the application. Applicants may also be asked if they want to withdraw their application.
k. For applicants that did not submit any changes to their application, if they did not meet standards, the Superintendent's designee may also ask them if they want to withdraw their appilcation. If the application is not withdrawn, a written notification from the District to the applicant will include the evaluation results and the Superintendent's recommendation that will be made to the School Board, as well as notice of the time and date of the School Board meeting for action on the application.
I. In determining whether to approve or deny an application for a charter school (except for an application filed by a high-performing charter school or system), the School Board shall consider whether the application meets the criteria set forth in Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$, the applicable State Board of Education approved DOE Application form, the applicable Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument as required by SBER 6A-6.0786(2) and the additional Information required by the School Board In Section (3), (d) (il).
m . The School Board shall by majority vote, approve or deny the application. During the public meeting where the vote is taken, the applicant shall have the opportunity to be heard by the Board if the applicant makes the appropriate and timely request as required by the Board's public comment procedures or If Board Members have questions to ask the applicant.
n. Notice and Appeal: Within ten (10) calendar days after the School Board's decision to deny an application, the School Board shall provide written notice to the applicant, per the provisions of SBER 6A-6.0781, of the specific reasons, based upon good cause, for the denial of any application along with supporting documentation. The letter shall also state the procedure to appeal and shall be sent to the Florida Department of Education. Pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 1002.33(6) (c), an applicant may appeal to the Florlda State Board of Education a denial of the application or the School Board's fallure to timely act on an appllcation pursuant to the procedure as set forth in SBER 6A-6.0781. The applicant must also flle a copy of its appeal notice and supporting documents with the School Board's clerk or as otherwise provided by statute or rule.

## 4. SPECIAL APPLICATION PROCEDURES FOR HIGH-PERFORMING CHARTER SCHOOLS

Applications submitted by a high-performing charter school are governed by Fla. Stat. 35 1002;33(6) and 1002,331. The application process for a charter school that is defined as a high-performing charter school is determined by the Commissioner of Education per the provisions of Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.331$ (3) (a)

## 5. CHARTER SCHOOL CONVERSION PROCESS

a. Per the provisions of SBER 6A-6.0787(1), the [S]chool Board, the princlpal, teachers, parents, and/or the school advisory council at an existing public school that has been woperation for at least two (2) years may submit a request in writing to the school administrator to conduct a vote for conversion. The request shall be submitted no later than ninety (90) days prlor to the August 1 deadline for charter applications. The administrator shall initiate the ballot process within sixty (60) days of receipt of the written request and the ballot process shall be completed no less than thirty (30) days prior to the charter application deadine.
b. The secret ballots proposing to convert an existing public school to a charter school must demonstrate the support of teachers and a majority of the teachers employed at the school and a majority of the voting parents in accordance with Fla. Stat, $\S 1002.33$ (3) (b) and SBER 6A$6.0787(2)$, A majorlty of parents eligible to vote must participate in the ballot process. See SBER 6A-6.0787(5)(d).
c. "If a majority of teachers employed at the school and a majority of voting parents support the charter proposal, the conversion charter application must be submitted by the application deadine that follows the ballot. The ballot results may not carry over to another school year or application period. If a majority of parents and/or teachers do not support the charter proposal, the application may not be submitted to the sponsor." See SBER 6A-6.0787(3).

## 6. CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS, LAPSE, AND AMENDMENTS

a. Pursuant to Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$ (6) (h): Within thirty (30) days after approval of an application by the School Board, District staff shall forward to the charter school applicant a contract proposal that is consistent with Florida and federal laws and, the standard State-approved charter with strike-throughs and underlines of changes to the standard chatter as proposed by the Sponsor, as an initial proposed charter. Within forty (40) days after receipt of the District's Initlal proposed charter, the charter school and District staff shall negotiate the terms of the charter contract (based upon the District's proposed Charter) and the agreed upon contract shall be noticed to the School Board for final approval.
An extension of this time period is possible upon the agreement of the charter school and District
staff. The decision not to extend the negotiation perlod shall be at the sole discretion of the Sponsor: The application, absent medlation within Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$ (6) (h), shall be automatically rescinded, without further actlon by the Sponsor, if the applicant does not enter into or conclude contract negotiations within the timeframe specified by law or the date of extension for negotiations which has been mutually agreed upon in writing by both parties.
b. The initial contract shall be for a term of four (4) or five (5) years, although it may be longer If allowed by law, subject to negotiations.
c. An existing charter contract may be amended in writing upon mutual agreement between the charter school and the School Board. 1 Pursuant to Fla. Stat. §§. 1002.33(7) (c), "[m]odification may include...consolidation of multiple charters into a single charter if the charters are operated under the same governing board and physically located on the same campus, regardless of the renewal cycle."

1. All contract amendment requests from charter schools shall be submitted in writing to the District's Charter School Department by an authorized agent of the charter school. The charter schooi shall provide evidence of governing board approval for all proposed amendments (e:gr, governing board resolution, governing board meeting minutes).
ii. The School Board reserves the right to deny any such proposed amendment if the proposed amendment does not contaln appropriate documentation or the amendment or the remaining charter do not conform with existing federal or State law or rules or the standard charter agreement.
ili. Requests for amendments involving an increase in student enrollment will also require, unless otherwise provided by Florida law, at minimum, updated budget information and documented facility capacity to accommodate the increase in student enrollment.
iv. Charter schools requesting the addition of grades, l.e. elementary schools requesting to add middle school grades, unless otherwise provided by Florida law, must also submit detailed plans, including but not limited to, those involving budget, facility, curriculum, transpertation and food service.
d. New and renewal charter agreements must contain provisions, pursuant to the February 26, 2013 Resolution Agreement between the U.S. Department of Justice and the School Board, that the charter school will mplement the District's enrollment and discipline policies consistent with the Agreement.
e. New, amended and renewal charter agreements, subject to negotiations, will contain provision that at least fify-one percent of the Governing Board members must reside In Palm Beach County, Florida.
f. Additionally, these agreements, subject to negotiations, shail contain a provision that the charter school faclity cannot be located In the vicinity of a District-operated school that has the same grade levels and programs.
g. The agreements shall also provide that the chatter school will provide services to ELL students and students with disabilities as required by Federal and State laws.
h. Charter contract negotiations between the District and a ilgh-performing charter school and amendments to its charter are governed by Fla. Stat: $\S \S 1002.33(6) \& 1002$.
2. Delegation of Authority: As set forth below, the School Board has delegated authority to the Superintendent/Superintendent's designee performing the following functions:
i. negotiating the terms of the charter contract for presentation to the School Board.
II. granting extensions of time to negotiate charter contracts up to an additional six
months.
iii. granting a one year deferral for the start-up of a charter school for good cause shown.

## 7. ONGOING MONITORING AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE

a. All appllcants must particlpate in the applicant training provided by the Florlda Department of Education ("DOE") pursuant to SBER 6A-6.0785, Fallure to participate in the trainlng shall be considered a violation of Florida law and may constitute grounds for termination of the charter contract. This training occurs after the approval of the application but at least 30 days before the first day of classes at the chatter school. Dates for such DOE-sponsored training will be posted when available on the Florida Department of Education's Charter School website. The District shall provide notification of the applicant training requirement by sending written or electronic notification to all approved charter school applicants for the most recent application cycle. The notification shall Include the Florida Department of Education's Charter School website.
b. All charter schools shall submit to the District certificates of occupancy, Inspection reports, Insurance premiums and other documentation listed on the Opening of Schools Checklist ("Checklist") PBSD 2414 prior to or at the beginning of each school year of the term of its contract. Pursuant to Fla. Stat. $\$ 51002.33$ (7) (a) (13), "The sponsor may not require a charter school to have a certificate of occupancy or a temporary certificate of occupancy for such a facility eariler than 15 calendar days before the first day of school." Fallure to present certain of these items, such as a certificate of occupancy, will prevent the school from opening. The Checklist will be provided to all charter schools by the Superintendent's designee and must be timely completed and returned to the District. Each document must be submitted by the corresponding due date on the Checklist. This checklist is incorporated hereln as part of this policy and can be found on the District's forms website.
c. All charter schools are subject to monitoring through software andor Sponsor personnel who are subfect matter experts pursuant to applicable law. Visits, as deemed necessary by the District, may be made by the District personnel to observe operations and to provide technical assistance when appllcable. The District shall at all times have access to the School's student records for legitimate educational purposes, including for FIE audits. A mid-year and/or end-of-year review as determined by the Superintendent's designee shall be completed. The mid-year and/or end-ofyear reviewers will review the academic, operations, governance and compliance of each charter school as well as its revenuies, expenditures and financial status. Monitoring will occur to determine whether the school is meeting the goals and standards stated within its charter contract. These reviews will monitor compliance requirements including those legally mandated and those that are essential to fulfilling the District's oversight responsibility,
The charter school's failure to timely submit complete requisite documentation to the District may constitute good cause for non-renewal or termination of the charter school's charter.
d. If a charter school has a deflient mid-year or end-of-year review or repettive and/or an unresolved compliance issue, absent a decision to non-renew or terminate the charter ${ }_{i}$ a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) must be jointly developed by the District and the charter school based on the following factors:

1. evidence exists of the school's willingness and ability to correct the deficiencles within a reasonable period of time;
ii. the serlousness of the deffclencles which constltute good cause as set forth in the charter; and
iii. Whether the school within the last few years was under a corrective action plan for similar issues and whether it was in compliance thereof.

The charter school must then satisfy all of the CAP compliance issues as reasonably determined by the District. The District will approve, monitor, and redress sald corrective action plans, as well as provide technical assistance to the charter school. Charter schools are also subject to expedited reviews and corrective action plans under Fla. Stat. §
e. All charter schools must submit all reports as required by Florida Statutes or State Board of Fducation Rules, as amended from time to time, including SBER 6A-1.0081, in a timely fashion. All charter schools must submit timely reports and/or documentation as required by the District and/or the charter agreement in order for the District to perform its oversight functions. Examples of these required reports and/or documents that are required to be timely submitted include, but are not limited to the following: school improvement plan, facility certification, annual accountability report, and financial statements.
f. Charter schools are required to timely and fully comply with and respond to additional audit, revlew and investigation requests from the District, Including its Inspector General that are belng conducted for a legittmate purpose; comply with all applicable District pollcies and procedures that are applicable per their charter or by law; comply with the provislons of fla. Stat. $\varsigma 1002.33$ (11) (f) to have certified teachers under contract prior to the start of the school year; comply with the requirements for governing board meetings, and timely submission of governing board meeting minutes to the Superintendent's designee. A Foundation for the benefit of the charter school and the management company/ESP for the charter school in relation to the school's activities also have the responsibility to timely and fully comply with and respond to additional audit, review and investigation requests from the District, including its Inspector General. The District may also refer nvestigations of complaints it recelves relating to the charter school to its governing board, uniless it involves governing board or governing board members activity or requires immediate action relating to the health, safety or welfare of the students, and the governing board will report its findings to the District. Investlgations involving governing board members may be referred to appropriate legal authorities. Fallure to comply with these requirements may constitute good cause for non-renewal or termination of a charter contract.
g. In the event there are outstanding or existing issues impacting the operation of the charter school, or when a charter is deficient in academic performance, governance, or finances, or is in a financlal emergency, the School Board will be notified in writing by the Superintendent or designee at the time the District is aware of the Issue.
h. If the District or the State concludes that a charter school has significant financial, governance or academic issues, the director and a representative of the governing body of a charter school shall appear before the School Board at a public meeting at least once a year to present information regarding the corrective strategies that are being implemented to address the isstues. The School Board shall communicate at the meeting, and in writing to the director, the services and/or recommendations provided to the school to help the school address its deficiencies.

## 8. RENEWAL OF CHARTER CONTRACTS

a. When a charter school seeks renewal of its charter, the following process shail apply.
b. During the final year of a charter schools contract term, deslgnated District staff will conduct a comprehensive program review in order to determine whether a charter school meets the criterta for renewal as set forth in Fla. Stat. § 1002.33(7)(a) \& (b), that none of the grounds for non-renewal under Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$ (8) (a) exist, as well as compliance with the existing charter provisions. The District's staff will revlew the identified innovative learning methods of the school and if they are the same as stated within the School's prior charter application and charter, they will be deemed compliant as meeting the statutory innovative requirement.
c. The charter school principal and/or governing board chair will be scheduled and appear before the School Board at a pubiic meeting to answer questions from the Board and address issues including:

1. the needs of their students and types of programs offered; and
il. the kinds of interventions and strategies they have used or intend to use to improve their students' achlevement.
d. If a charter school does not meet the criteria for a renewal charter contract and the existing charter provisions, the Board shall vote whether to approve non-renewal of the charter.
e. If a charter school meets the criteria for a renewal charter contract and the existing chatter provisions, the Board shall vote whether to approve the renewal.
f. If the Board votes to approve the renewal, the District will provide the charter school a proposed charter and negotiations for a renewal chater shall then commence within the timelines provided by State law. Untll the State Board of Education develops a format for a renewal charter contract, the District's standard charter proposal, as modiffed for a renewal, wlll be used. If the State Board of Education develops a format for a renewal charter contract, the parties shall use that format. The negotiations must address the term of the renewal contract, any updates/changes to the goals and objectives of the school, budget updates, and any other changes based upon the current District proposal or State Board of Education approved model chater format.
g. If a renewal charter agreement has not been approved by both partles and the term of the current charter agreement is about to expire, District staff will attempt to obtain approval from the charter school and present to the School Board an amendment to the existing charter agreement for a short extension of time. The extension would be untll an agreement has been reached and approved by the school's governing board and School Board or after the statutory procedures for mediation or a hearing have been completed and the renewal charter terms are determined.

## 9. NON-RENEWAL OR TERMINATION OF CHARTERS

a. The District shall adhere to Fia. Stat. $\S 1002.33(8)$ and State Board of Education Rules when considering the nonrenewal or termination of any charter contract. Pursuant to Fla. Stat. §§ 1002.33 (8) (a), the School Board:
i. shall make student academic achievement for all students the most important factor when determining whether to renew or terminate the charter. The School Board may also choose not to renew or may terminate the charter for any reason set forth in the law and/or in the charter contract including any of the following grounds:
A. Fallure to participate in the state's education accountability system created in s. 1008.31, as required in this section, or failure to meet the requlrements for student performance stated in the charter.
B. Fallure to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management.
C. Violation of law.
D. Other good cause shown.
b. At least 90 . days prior to the District's intent to non-renew or terminate a chater (except for immedlate terminations), the Superintendent/designee, following a School Board vote, shall notify in writing the governing board of the charter school. This notice shall state in reasonable detail the grounds for the proposed action and inform the charter school that its governing board, within 14 calendar days after recelving the notice, may request a hearing by filing a legally sufficient written request with the School Board's Clerk. Thls would require a written petition or a hearing request that is legally sufficient under Fla. Stat. $\S \S 120,569$ (2) (c) and 120.54 (5) (b) and Fla. Admin. Code R. 28-106.201 and 28-106.104, filed by the charter school's governing board with the Clerk of the School Board within fourteen (14) calendar days after the school's receipt of the notice.

## c. Hearings.

i. The School Board hereby delegates to its General Counsel the function of ruling, prior to the submission of the case to DOAH, on any pre-hearing motions such as a request for extension of time, and determining if the petition or request for hearing is
legally sufficient or timely.
ii. If the General Counsel, on behalf of the School Board, determines that the petition/request for hearing is not legally sufficient or timely, the School Board (through its General Counsel) may deny/dismiss the petition or request for a hearing pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 120.569(c) and the Uniform Rules of Procedure. A petition shall be dismissed if it is not in substantial compliance with these requirements or it has been untimely filed. Dismissal of a petition timely filed shall, at least once, be without prejudice to petitioner's filling a timely amended petition/request for hearing curing the defect, unless it conclusively appears from the face of the petition/request for hearing that the defect cannot be cured, The School Board (through its General Counsel) shall promptly give written notice to all parties of the action taken on the petition/request for hearing, shall state with particularity its reasons if it is not granted, and shall state the deadline for fling an amended petition/request for hearing if applicable. Any further amendments of the petition/request for hearing shall follow Fla. Admin. Code R. 28-106.202.
iil. If the General Counsel, on behalf of the School Board, determines that the pettion/request for hearing is legally sufficient, he/she shall submit the charter school's petition or request for a hearing to the Dlvision of Administrative Hearings (DOAH) for a hearing to be conducted by an administratlve law judge under DOAH.
iv. The hearing shali be conducted within 60 days (unless extensions are mutually agreed to by the charter school and counsel for the District) after receipt of the request for a hearing and in accordance with chapter 120. The procedures within Fla. Stat. $\S \S$ 120.569 and 120.57 and relevant Unlform Rules of Procedure shall apply to the prehearing and hearing procedures. See Chapter 28-106 Declsions Determining Substantlal Interests.
$v$. The administrative law judge's Recommended Order shall be submitted to the School Board. Once the Recommended Order is received by the School Board, per Fla. Stat. $\S 120.66$, no ex parte communication relative to the merits, threat, or offer of reward shall be made to any School Board Member by any persons specified within Fla, Stat. $\S 120.66$ (1), If a Board Member receives an ex parte communication in violation of this provișion, the process set forth within Fla. Stat. § 120.66 (2) will apply.
yi. Following the entry of a Recommended Order by the adminlstrative law judge, the procedures within Fla. Stat, chapter 120 will apply as to the filing of Exceptions and entry of a Final Order.
vii. A majority vote by the School Board shall be required to adopt or modify the administrative law judge's Recommended Order. The School Board shall issue a Final Order.
vili. The Final Order shall state the specific reasons for the School Board's decision The School Board shall provide its Final Order to the charter school's governing board and the Department of Education no later than 10 calandar days after its issuance. The charter school's governing board may, within 30 calendar days after receiving the School Board's Final Order ${ }_{r}$ appeal the decision pursuant to Fla, Stat. § 120.68.
d. Immediate Terminations of Charter Contracts

1. If the School Board determines to terminate a charter contract immediately, upon recelving witten notice thereof, the charter school's governing body has ten (10) calendar days to file a petition or request for hearing by filing the request with the Clerk of the School Board. The petition must be legally sufficlent and timely as stated within subparagraph $9(\mathrm{c})$ above.
ii. The pre-hearing and hearing procedures set forth above in sub-paragraph $9(c)$ apply to hearings following immediate terminations of charters under Fla. Stat. § 1002.33 (8) (d). This hearing will be conducted after the immedlate termination occurs.
e. Process when Charter School is closing:
i. The District shall develop a comprehensive closing school checklist and school closure plan. The plan shall include timelines and procedures to follow to protect the District's and student's interests.
2. The District's representative will schedule an intial transition meeting with the School's Governing Board, Administrator(s) and/or Operator(s) of the Charter School upon issuance of the Sponsor's notice of termination/non-renewal or if the School notifies the Sponsor of an intent to close. The School shall cooperate with the District employees in the transition. This transition meeting should clearly outline the objectives of the Closure Plan and the timeline associated with the closure of the School. Upon notice of the closing of a charter school. District employees will meet with the school officials and go over the items in a closing school checklist.
iil. The School shall provide the Sponsor sufficient notice of the final governing board meeting so that the Sponsor's representative may attend to ensure appropriate dissolution of the legal entlyy, proper closure of business records, and proper-authorization and timeline on all post-closure matters.
IV. Furthermore, the District's representative will schedule a final closure meeting with the Schiool to ensure that all of the components of the Closure Plan have been timely addressed and completed. The School shall cooperate.
v. A Final Closure Report shall be completed and provided to the School Board that informs and memorializes the outcome of the Implementation of the Closure Plan with the Charter School. Sald Report should be signed by appropriate District Staff as well as the Governing Board Chalr of the Charter School and identify the final status of the various areas addressed in the Closure Plan.

## 10. DISTRICT'S ASSISTANCE TO LOW PERFORMING CHARTER SCHOOLS

a. The District will offer reasonable technical assistance to assist students at low-performing graded charter schools as well as non-graded charter schools with low-performing students. The technical assistance shall be made available to cure deficiencies and remediate academic concerns of students. To the extent any of the services provided by the District to the charter school are beyond those required by Fla. Stat. § 1002.33 (20) or as stated in the school's charter, the District may charge the school reasonable fees to cover the costs of the services as allowed by law. Failure by a charter school to cooperate in the resolution of such performance issues may constitute good cause for non-renewal or termination of a charter contract.
b. Per Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$ (9) (p), the director and a representative of the governing body of a graded charter school that has submitted a school improvement plan or has been placed on probation under Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33(9)$ (0) shall appear before School Board at a public meeting at least once a year to present information regarding the correctlve strategies that are being implemented by the school pursuant to the school Improvement plan. The School Board shall communlcate at the meeting, and in writing to the director, the services provided to the school to help the school address its deficlencies.

## 11. DISTRICT' S SUPPORT SERVICES TO CHARTER SCHOOLS

The District will provide specifled administrative and educational services to charter schools as provided by Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$ (20). To the extent the District provides any services to the charter school that are beyond those required by Fla. Stat. $\S 1002.33$ (20) or as stated in the school's charter, the District may charge the school reasonable fees to cover the costs of the services as allowed by law.

## 12. INTERPRETATION

In the event that an existing charter school contract provision is found to be inconsistent with this policy, the contract provision prevalls, unless the contract provision is no longer consistent with the law and the
contract indicates that its terms change based on changes in the law.

## 13. PROCEDURES

The Superintendent's designee may establish internal operating procedures as deemed necessary for the efficient and effective administration of the District's activities relating to charter schools.

## STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

LAWS IMPLEMENTED:
HISTORY:

Fia. Stat. $\bar{\xi} ; 1001.41$ (1) \& (2); 1001. 42 (25)
Fla. Stat. $5 \S 1002.33 ; 1002.331 ; 1001.332 ; 1002.345$
02/05/97; 10/01/97; 10/07/98; 10/20/99; 10/25/00; 7/25/2012; 05/27/2015

TThe Charter Contract may also provide that the Charter is modified by changes in the law.

## RUBRIC FOR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION REVIEW OF INNOVATIVE METHODS

Innovative: introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new ideas about how learning methods can be performed in this School District. Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currently done well, identifying the great ideas of yesterday and/or omorrow and putting them into practice. True innovative learning methods are those products, processes, strategies and approaches that improve significantly upon the status quo within this geographical area of the School District, and result in heightened qualities and outcomes of teaching and learning

Mem Meets the Standard Whtal

Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose The application has evidence of

- The use of innovative teaching and learning goals and interventions targeting academic support to all students especially for historically low performing students.
- Inclusive, deliberate, and a monitored process that measures innovative goals and practices within the school.

Educational Program Design
The application has evidence of

- The use of innovative programs to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students.
- Flexibility in classroom structure and organization to involve restructuring of grouping of students to meet the assessed needs of all students.
- Connections of one innovation to another innovation so that information, technology, implementation, etc. do not sit alone as isolated innovative strategies.
- Learning opportunities that provide a flexible program proto-

Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose
The application has some evidence of

- The use of innovative teaching and learning goals and interventions targeting academic support to all students especially for historically low performing students.
- Inclusive, deliberate, and a monitored process that measures innovative goals and practices within the school.


## Educational Program Design

The application has some evidence of

- Innovative programs to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students.
- Flexibility in classroom structure and organization to involve restructuring of grouping of students to meet the assessed needs of all students.
- Connections of one innovation to another innovation so that information, technology, implementation, etc. do not sit alone as isolated innovative strategies.
- Learning opportunities that provide a flexible program proto-

Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose The application has no evidence of

- The use of innovative teaching and learning goals and interventions targeting academic support to all students especially for historically low performing students.
- Inclusive, deliberate, and a monitored process that measures innovative goals and practices within the school.


## Educational Program Design

The application has no evidence of

- Innovative programs to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students.
- Flexibility in classroom structure and organization to involve restructuring of grouping of students to meet the assessed needs of all students.
- Connections of one innovation to another innovation so that information, technology, implementation, etc. do not sit alone as isolated innovative strategies.
- Learning opportunities that provide a flexible program proto-


## RUBRIC FOR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION REVIEW OF INNOVATIVE METHODS

Innovative: introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new ideas about how leaming methods can be performed in this School District. Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currently done well, identifying the great ideas of yesterday and/or tomorrow and putting them into practice. True innovative learning methods are those products, processes, strategies and approaches that improve significantly upon the status quo within this geographical area of the School District, and result in heightened qualities and outcomes of teaching and learning

| type-to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students. | type to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students. | type to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curriculum Plan <br> The application has evidence of <br> - Innovative practices and approaches in the classroom with teaching methods based on students' needs especially for meeting the instructional needs of historically low performing students. <br> - Curricular integration of thinking and learning skills that connect the rigor of instruction to applied concepts and outcomes. <br> - Use of thematically organized classrooms and school to foster high levels of interest and motivation in students for integrated learning and studentcentered outcomes. | Curriculum Plan <br> The application has some evidence of <br> - Innovative practices and approaches in the classroom with teaching methods based on students' needs especially for meeting the instructional needs of historically low performing students. <br> - Curricular integration of thinking and learning skills that connect the rigor of instruction to applied concepts and outcomes. <br> - Use of thematically organized classrooms and school to foster high levels of interest and motivation in students for integrated learning and studentcentered outcomes. | Curriculum Plan <br> The application has no evidence of <br> - Innovative practices and approaches in the classroom with teaching methods based on students' needs especially for meeting the instructional needs of historically low performing students. <br> - Curricular integration of thinking and learning skills that connect the rigor of instruction to applied concepts and outcomes. <br> - Use of thematically organized classrooms and school to foster high levels of interest and motivation in students for integrated learning and studentcentered outcomes. |
| Student Performance, Assessment \& Evaluation <br> The application has evidence of <br> - Research-based formative assessments providing instructional use of how well students have learned, or are prepared to learn key content and skills. | Evaluation <br> The application has some evidence of <br> - Research-based formative assessments providing instructional use of how well students have learned, or are prepared to learn key content and skills. | Student Performance, Assessment \& Evaluation <br> The application has no evidence of <br> - Research-based formative assessments providing instructional use of how well students have learned, or are prepared to learn key content and skills. |

## RUBRIC FOR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION REVIEW OF INNOVATIVE METHODS

Innovative: introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new ideas about how learning methods can be performed in this School District. Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currently done well, identifying the great ideas of yesterday and/or tomorrow and putting them into practice. True innovative learning methods are those products, processes, strategies and approaches that improve significantly upon the status quo within this geographical area of the School District, and result in heightened qualities and outcomes of teaching and learning

- Data analysis of research-based formative assessments to make adjustments in instruction to promote success in learning.
- Engaging students in collaborative assessment conferencing to support and develop skills in creating their own learning pathways.
- Data analysis of research-based formative assessments to make adjustments in instruction to promote success in learning.
- Engaging students in collaborative assessment conferencing to support and develop skills in creating their own learning pathways.
- Data analysis of research-based formative assessments to make adjustments in instruction to promote success in learning.
- Engaging students in collaborative assessment conferencing to support and develop skills in creating their own learning pathways.


## ATTACHMENT $\mathbb{1 - D}$

## Affidavit of James T. Pegg

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared James T. Pegg, the undersigned affiant, who, after being by me first duly sworn, deposes the following and states,

1. As Director of the Department of Charter Schools, 1 had phone conversations and a meeting with Derek Kelmanson of Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) regarding the approval status of the charter school application for Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach. Mr. Kelmanson is the identified contact person on the application for thls charter school.
2. Following the applicant interview of September 22, 2015, a letter of 7-Day Notification was sent to Mr. Kelmanson on September 24, 2015, (exhibit 1) which included the first revisions to the initial evaluations of the application. I spoke with Mr. Kelmanson on the phone on September 25,2015 , regarding the revised evaluations. In that conversation, i shared that Section 1 was to be revised as the content of the application was further reviewed and determined that this section had not satisfied the conditions of the School Board Policy 2.57 Rubric for Charter School Application Review of Innovative Methods (Review Rubric)(exhibit 2). Mr. Kelmanson requested andl agreed to continue to review using clarifications he would send in response to the 7-Day Notification. We determined It was necessary to mutually agree to an extension of application review time in order to include the application on the November 4, 2015, School Board Meeting agenda. Mr. Kelmanson and I signed the extension letter dated October 5, 2015, (exhibit 3).
3. After receiving the clarifications in response to the 7-Day Notification (exhlibit 4), further review of application was conducted. It was my professional perspective in using the Review Rubric, that Section 1 would require substantive revisions in order to rate the section as "Meets the Standards." The content of the application and the clarifications did not provide evidence to, "improve significantly upon the status quo...of the School District." Nor was there evidence in this section of "innovative teaching and learning goals and interventions targeting academic support to all students." Therefore, the final evaluation for Section I was rated as "Does Not Meet the Standard."
4. A meeting was conducted with Mr. Kelmanson and Mr. Ralph Arza on October 28, 2015, to discuss the status of the evaluation of the application. At that meeting, the evaluation for Section 1 was discussed and it was shared with the parties present at the meeting how the Review Rubric was used to contribute to the evaluation of Section 1. It was also discussed that Sections 6, 7, 13, 17, and 19 would remain rated as "Partially Meets the Standard," as no clarifying information would impact these sections, but Section 15 would be revised to be rated as "Meets the Standard." Mr. Kelmanson and Mr. Arza were made aware that the application would be moved forward for School Board action at the November 4, 2015, meeting with a recommendation of Denial for Approval.
5. The Notice of the Special School Board Meeting (exhibit 5) was sent to CSUSA on October 28,2015 , following the meeting of the same date, including the Overall Assessment, that provided the final ratings of the application.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.


STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF PALM BEACH
The foregoing instrument was sworn to and subscribed before me this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2015, by JAMES T. PEGG, who is personally known to me, and dild/did not take an oath.


## JEXHIBITT 1

## To Affidavit of James T. Pegg



THE SCHODI.DISTRICTO: PALMBEACI GOUNTY, FI.

INMEST, PEGG Dhector

DAVID W, CIBISTIANSEN, ED,I) Depury Suptantenditit/Chef of Schools

DEPAMTMIENT OF CHARTER SCIOOLS
REITII OSWALD
Cher Academic officela

JOSIPHM, IEE, LED.D.
Assistant Suparthiendent

VA EMALLL: atelmanson@clartersehoolsusncom

Saplember 24, 2015
Mr. Kelmaison:
Renalssunce Charler School, inc.
Remalssance Chatler High School of Paim Beach
6278 Norlh Federal Highway, |/384
Fl. Lavderdalo, FL 33300
Dear Mi. Kemanson:
Thank you for submilting an applicatlon to the Daparmentor Chater Schoofs to open a Char lar School in Paim dianch Coundy in 2015. The Application Interviev was hald on Soptombar 22,2015.

District reviowers orighally faled the following applicallon sections as "Partially Meets the Standard" or "Doos not Moet the Standaril" according to the critella oullined in the Motel Florita Chater Sehool Applicalion.

- Section O6 - Pallally Meels lie Slandard
- Seclion 07 - Parthally Meets he Standard
- Section 13-Parlially Meets the Slandard
- Seetion 15-Parlially Maets the Slandard
- Sectlon 17 - Does Nol Meel the Standard
- Section 19-Partially Meels Hie Standard

The Distict will NOT consider subslantive changes and will NOT consider fale submultad responses fo this folter. However, the reyiewers will consider non-sulsstantive clarificalions belore re-evalualing the sections listed.

This letter is your 7 day notincallon. For the Distict to consider any non-substantwe and lechnical correcllons and claifications from you, your response must be fecelved by lisis office no laler lhan $1: 30$ pm on October 1, 2015, which is 7 calentar tlays from the dale of his teller.

Should you haye any queslions, please conlac: He Dapartheen of Chater Schools at (561) 434-0681.


JTPIW

## Allachments

c: Joseph M. Lee, Ed.D, Assistanl Superintendent

EXHHLBIT 2
To Affidavit of James T. Pegg

RUBRIC FOR Charter school appleaton peven of innovatme methoos
mnovetive: introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new ideas about how leaming methocis can be performed in inis School District. Seing innovative is about jooking beyond what is currently done weli, identifying the great ideas of yesterciay ancicr tomorrow and puting them into practice. Trie imovative learning methods are those products, processes, stategies and approaches that improve significantly upon the status auo within this gecgraphical area of the School District, and result in heightened qualities and outcomes of teaching and learning

| ests the Stendard | S Parially Meets the Standard: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose The application has evidence of <br> - The use of innovative teaching and learning goals and interventions targeting academic support to all students especially for historically low performins students. <br> - inclusive, deliberate, and a monitored process that measures innovative goals and prectices within the school. | Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose Tha appification has some evidence of <br> - The use of innovative teacining and learning goais and interventions targeting academic support to all students especially for historiceily low periorming students. <br> - Inclusive, delfberzte, and a monitored process that measures innovative goals and practices within the school. | The application has no evidence of <br> - The use of imovative teaching and iearning goals and interventions targeting academic support to al! students espectally for historically low periorming students. <br> - Inclusive, cleliberate, and a monitoreci process that measures innoverive goals and practices within the school. |
| Equational Prosram Design <br> The application has evidence of <br> - The use of innovative progrems to respond to the varying needs, abilities, and interests of students. <br> - Fiexibility in classroom structure and organization to involve restructuring of grouping of students to meet the assessed needs of all students. <br> - Connections ofi one innovation to another innovation so that information, technology, implementation, etc. do not sit alone as isolated innovative strategies. <br> - Leaming opportunities shat provide a flexible program proto- | Educational Program Designt <br> The application has some evidence of <br> - Innovative programs to respond to the varying neecs, abilities, and interests of students. <br> - Flexibility in classroom structure and organizetion to involve restructuring oí grouping of students to meet the assessed needs of all students. <br> - Connections of ore innovation to another innovation so that iniormation, technology, implementetion, etc. do not sit zlone as isolated innovative strategies. <br> - Learning opportunities that provice a flexible program proto- | Ediuational Prostam Design <br> The application has no evidence of <br> - Innovative progrems to respend to the varying needs, abilttes, and interests of students. <br> - Flexibilty in classroom structure and orgenization to involve restructuring of grouping of students to meet the assessed neads of all students. <br> - Conmections of one imovation to enother innovetion so that: information, technology, implementation, ate co not sit alone as isolatea innovative strategies. <br> - Learning opportunities thet provide a flexible program proto- |

RUSRLC EOR CHARTER SCHOOLAPPLCATION REVEN OF MNOVAHVE MTHODS
innorativa: introducing or using new ideas or methods or having new iceas ebout how leaming methods can be periormed in this School District. Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currenty done well, identifying the great ideas of yesterciay andor tomorrow and puting them into practice. True innovative leaming methods are wose products, processes, strategies and epproaches that improve significantly upon the status quo within this geographical area of the School District, and itsult in heightened cualities and outcomes of teaching and leaming

| type to respond to the varyins needs, abilities, and interests of students. | type to respond to the varyins needs, abilities, and interests oí students. | type to respond to the varying needs, abilties, and interests of stucents. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curiculum Pion <br> The application has evidence off <br> - Innovative practices and epproaches in the classroom with teaching methods based on students' needs especially for meeting the mistructional needs of historically low periorming students. <br> - Curricular integretion of thinking and learning skills that connect the rigor of instruction to appiied concepts and outcomes. <br> - Use of thematically organized classrooms and school to foster high levels of interest and motivation in students for integrated learning and stucientcentered outcomes. | Curiculum P!an <br> The application has some evidence of <br> e innovative practices and approaches in the ciassroom with teaching methods based on students' needs especially for meeting the instuctional needs of historically low performins students. <br> - Curricuiar integration ofthinking and learning skills that connect the rigor of instruction to applied concepts and outcomes. <br> - Use of thematicaliy organized classrocms and school to fosier high levels oi interest anc motivation in students for integrated learning and studentcentered outcomes. | Curricutum Piza <br> The epplication hes mo evidence of <br> - innovative practices and approeches in the classroom with teaching methods based on sudents' needs especially for meeting the instuctional neect of historicaliy low perfoming students. <br> - Curricular integration oí thinking and learning skills that connect the rigor of instruction to applied concepts mid outcomes. <br> - Use of thematically organized ciassrooms and school to foster: high levels of interest anc monevation in students for integrated learning and studentcentered outcomes. |
| Stucient Penionance, Assessment \& Evatuation <br> The application has evidence ot <br> - Research-based formative assessments providing instructional use of how well students have learned, or are prepared :o leam key content and skills. | Sindent Periormance, Assessment 3: Evaluation <br> The application hes some evicence of <br> - Research-based formative assessments proviting instructiona! use of how wel! stucients have leamed, or are prepered to learn ikey content and skills. | Student Perionnance, Assessment 2 Evaluetion <br> The application has no evidence of <br> - Research-based formative essessments proviaing instructional use of now well stucents nave learnect, or are prepered $\ddagger 0$ learr kev content and skills. |

RUERIC FOR CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION REVEM OF MNOVATVE MEFFODS
lmovative: introducing or using new iceas or methods or heving new icees about how learning methods can be periormed in this School District. Being innovative is about looking beyond what is currenty done well, identifying the great iceas of yesterday and/oi fomorow and puiting them into practice. True innovative leaming meinods are those products, processes, strategies anc approaches thai improve significantly upon the staius quo within this geographical area of the School District, and resuft in heightened qualfies and outcomes of teaching and learning $\qquad$

- Data analysis of research-based formative assessments to meke adjustmenes in instruction to promote success in leaning.
- Engaging students in collaborative assessmert conterencing to support anai develog skills in creating their own leamins pathways.
> - Data analysis of research-based formative assessments to make atijustments in instruction to promote success in learming.
> - 'Engaging stucients in collaborative assessment conferencingto support and develop skills in ereating their own learning pathways.


## EXHHBIT 3

## To Affidavit of James T. Pegg



TIESCHOOL, DISTMETOR
JAMES Ti PEgG pinecton
david w. cimistinnstim, eb,d
PALMBEACH COUNTY, FI miphet Superimendmen/Chiefor Schoots

DEPAITMEATH OF CHARTER SCHOOLS
3300 Forest Hili Boulevaro, luss Blog. F
reithoswaid
Chier Acabemicomiter
Wert Mumbeach, FL $33406-5869$
PHOME: 561-434-8681 / FAx: 561-434-7498.

10SEPHM, LEFS, ED.D.
Assisfantsuperiminile it

## VIA EMALL didelionnsonaichartorschoolusibota

October 5, $2015^{\circ}$
Renaissumea Chatler \$elfoot, Ine.
Remilesance Chatter High School ortata Bead
6778 North Federal Higluẅny, 11384
FI. Lauderdile, PL, 33308
Deár Ienalssance Chariter Sctivol Inc,
 cousideration for an extension mufl 'Hovenber 4, 2015. The reconmendation for aution of your gupliuntion will be pheed on the Schoo Board of Palm Beach Connty's Miceshig agoudn and wo will notlfy you of ho dnto in writing.

By siguing and dating below, you ate nerculy to the above-requested oxfonsion. Kindly fix a signed copy of the exteasion



$9:$
Josephic M. Lee, Ea, D, Absistgut Superintendeal

EXHHIBITT 4
To Affidlavit of James T. Pegg



Bonks For New Students / Alditional Enrollment

| New Sturdent Seals (by Grode Level) |  | 600 | 300 |  | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 600 | 300 | 300 |  |  |
| $\cdots \mathrm{C}$ | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | d |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacemant Books |  |  |  | 0 | 720 | 720 |
|  | S0,0 | \$0.10 | Som | 5 mon | \$3S, 21320 | $538,365.9$ |
| New Yexthook Adoption |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 |  |  | $\cdots$ |  | 720 |
|  | 50,00 | (0.00 | stam | 5010 | 5 Stat | \$35,965, 19 |
| Customilxpenses Pupe |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consumble fintrueilomi (reachers ond Stivents) | $0 \times 7000000$ |  | \$-107,100,00 | \$ 44095.40 | \$ 146,977,31 | +149.916.85 |
| Instructional Techmology (lusturimonal icenses included)* | Phatr | Yatie | Ynira | Yoin 3 | Yoart | Yoar6 |
| Cosf PER CLASSROOM | 1\% | 313,65910 | \$ 3,991,20 | \$ 3,630.40 | 3 3 3099,10 | \$ 3.693.40 |
| Number of Chassrooms |  | $\square 10$ |  | $\cdots 10$ |  |  |
|  | So.03 | \$136,59, 00 | 539,017,00 | S36, 384.109 | \$35.944,000 | \$35,834.64) |
| Addillanal ANNUAL Insiructionil Tech Money | \% $10.1000 .00 \$ 25,000.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$ 25,000,60 | $425.000,00$ | \$ 35,000,00 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$200,000.00 | \$193,300,00 | \$231.519.40 | \$248,303.71 | \$252.849.65 |

## Recup of InsirucionalEwpenses

Books/ consumables $/$ Xinstructional Softrane

| Budgat cross refereme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consutnale Insiructional (Teachers and Sturenils) |  | (20),040,00 | S10730n,0 | S9\%4,495.00 | \$146,97.a4 | \$ $100,016.63$ |
| Insiructionailucenses |  | SOMOCO | siscouco | \$35,000.00 | \$25.000.00 | \$25, 21000 |
| Texibooks (\$200/student + Replenisli Yr 403 ) |  | \$170.000.00 | 563,20000 | S62, | \$76, 105.40 | \$77,932, 50 |
| TOTAL |  | S200,fino.ex | \$193,300.ey | \$72t,519.60 | S240,303.70 | 3.1528 .849 .63 |
| Per Studind elfolmat |  | \$1073 | S24s.7d | \$102,9 | 570.ss | \$214.7 |

Reallocation of lnstructional expenses (Per Student Allotment)






| PUnCHASING Armili. Computers | Plag Yf | Yeary | Yeat2 | Year 3 | $\therefore$ Yedt 4 | Year 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AdminPuechase - Nombrio of Mochives | 0 | - 101 | $\pm 40$ | $\cdots 40$ | $\because \because \because 30$ | . 20 |
| Admin Pur - Estimateil Cost Per Hachine/SIalion |  | \$ 1,50000 | \$ 1,50000 | \$ 1,500,00 | 4:-1,50400 | \$ : 7, 500000 |
|  | Sobot | S(11, Sfmed | sionten $0^{2}$ | 50,6iono | Snspout 0 | \$30,860.00] |



| Instructional Teclmology | $\cdots \mathrm{Pan} 8$ | Yout 4 | Your2 | Year3 | Year 4 | Yeats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost PERCLASSROOA | 3 | \$-13659,40 | \$ 3, 49120 | 4 $\therefore 3.638 .40$ | \$ $\quad 3.594 .40$ | \$ 3,503,40 |
| Nunber of Classrooms | - $\div-$ | $\ldots 10$ | $\because 10$ | $\because 10$ | 10 | 10 |
|  | S0.00 5193, 59.1001 |  | 539,912.f9 | \$36,384,00 | \$35,94146 | \$35,83409 |
| Additoral ANMUAt. Inslickiliom! Tecli Roney | 1 |  | - |  |  |  |
| Softerare | Ping Vr . | Yoart 1 | $\because 8$ Yent 2 | $\bigcirc{ }^{\text {Yoays }}$ | Yoal 4 | - Yoan ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| AHNUAL amount for sof heme rech year | \% | \% 11,600,00 | \$ 11,60000 | $\$ 11,60000$ | \$ 1160000 | t. 1160000 |
| Tatal Combined Tecinotogy | \$0.00 | \$635,694.00 | \$252,012.00 | \$273.404.00 | \$205,044,60 | \$204,934.00 |

Recap of Technology Expenses

| Infrosiruciure |
| :---: |
| Hardiore |
| Audio/Visul |
| Total Computer Hardirara |
| Sotiwas |
| Instruesional literses |
| Combinad Total |


| Budgat cross reference |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yostructional Tectrolyy | + 126,594,100 | \$ 9.917.04 | \$ 11,314.90\% | \% 10,944,014 | * 10, 134.68 |
| accis sdith Corpules | \% 454,500,60 | \$205,500,00 | \$ 226,509000 | \% 15\%,500.00 | 4 5157.30000 |
| Asosif Adin Coyguter | - 33.000 .00 | 古 | \$ | \$ | 3 |
|  | \$644.091.00 | 5215.412.00 | S0,37, A8S.64 | \%160, 144.60 | 3160, 3, m. 00 |
| SoIthara | \$ 11.660 .00 | \$ 11.600 .00 | \% 11.400 .103 | * 11.600 .00 | \$ 11.600 .00 |
| Instueciovil Tetheregy | \$ $10,160.00$ | 7 7 25,000,00 | 5 $26,000,00$ | 23,000.00 | \% 25,00000 |
|  | \$6936.614.00 | \$252,01200 | \$274,404.6n | \$205.044.60 | \$204,934, 00 |

EXHHBITT 5

## To Affidavit of James T. Pegg



THE SCHOOL DISTALCT OF
PALMBEACHCOUNTY, FI.
DEPARTMENT OF CIAARTER SCIIOOI.S
3300 Forest HIL Bouevard, Ias Blda.
WES7 PALPABEACH, FL 33406-5869
PIOIE: 561-434-8681/Fix: 561434-7698


JAMES PEGG
Dinecton

DAVID W. CIIDISTIANSERE, EOD Deruiv Superntenineat/Chefof Schools

KEITHOSWALD
Chief Acadthatc Officelt

JOSEPIMM. I.EE, ED.D.
Assistant Superintendent


October 28, 2015
Mr. Derek Kelmanson
Renaissance Charter School, Inc.
6278 Noth Federal Hwy, \#384
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
Re: Notice of Special Boad Mecthy on Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach - New Application

## Dear Mr. Kelmanson:

Your 2015 Application for Remaissance Chater High School of Palm Beach hats been reviewed. Your interview, on September 22, 2015, included your responses to questions and references to the wrillen comments submitted by the evaluators had submitted. Based on the applicarion roview and confrmed during your interview with the District, it was delemined that substantive changes to the appliention would be needed to cure the deficioncies in your application and the School District does not atecpt substantive changes.

School Districe evaluators have determined that the following sections according to the Flotida Charter School Application Evaluation Instroment and the Model Florida Chater School Application criteria "Partinlly Micets the Standard" or "Does Not Meet the Standard:"

Five sections received a rating of "Partially Meets the Standard:"

- Section 6-Exceptional Students (ESE)
- Section 7 - Eaglish Language Leatners
- Section 13-Student Recruitment and Enrollment
- Section 17 - Budget
- Section 19-Action Plan

One section received a rating of "Does Wot Meet the Standard."

- Seciom 1-Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose

Please see the attached evaluation instruments with their notes for the specific reasons for these ratings. The Superintendent's recommendation to the Board is to deny your application for the reasons stated in the evaluations and, as a result, the overall assessmen that the application did not meet the standards and the related statulory criteria for these sections as set forth within the cvaluations,

Tho Setool Board will take nction in regards to Renuissnice Charter High Schoot of Palm Bench on Novernher 4, 2015, at the Special School Board Meeting. There is a Workshop that will begin at 2:00 p.m, with the Special Meeling immedtacly following. The Workshop may hast from $1 / 2$ hour to $1 / 2$ hours; there is no detinite time limit. The Board report for this item will be found on the agendn for this


You are invital to attond the above-referenced meeting in the Fulton Hollame Educational Services Center at 3300 Forest Hill Boulevard, West Palm Beach, FL 33406 in the Winona W. Jordan Board Roon. Por Sctool Board Policy, 1.03, paragraph 7, if you and/or others would like to speak at the Board Meeting, you/they may call ( 561 ) $434-8136$ to sign up by noon of the meeting date, or youthey may fill in a public comment "blue card" bofore the start of the meeting and each speaker has three minutes.

Sinceraly,


Director
1TP/pis
c: Joseph M. Lee, Ed.D., Assistam Superintendent
Enclosures

[^16]
## ATTACHIMIENTT 2

THESCHOOL DISTRICT OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.

DEPARTMENT OF CHARTER SCHOOLS
3300 Foresf Hile Boumevard ibis Bldg.
WeSt Palm beach, FL 33406-5869
Phone: 561-434-8681 / Fax: 561-434-7498
WWW PAMMEACHSCHOOLS ORG/CHARTEA

JAMES PEGG
Director

DAVID W, CHRISTIANSEN, ED.D Deputy Superimtendent/Chief of Schools

KEITH OSWALD Chief Academic Officer

JOSEPHM.LEE, ED.D.
Assistant Superintendent

## Sent Yia Email: alkelmanson@charterschoolsusa.com

October 28, 2015
Mr. Derek Kelmanson
Renaissance Chatter School, Inc.
6278 Noith Federal Hwy., \#384
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
Re: Notice of Special Board Meeting on Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach - New Application

## Dear Mr. Kelmanson:

Your 2015 Application for Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach has been reviewed. Your interview, on September 22, 2015, included your responses to questions and references to the written comments submitted by the evaluators had submitted. Based on the application review and confirmed during your interview with the District, it was deternined that substantive changes to the application would be needed to cure the deficiencies in your application and the School District does not accept substantive changes.

School District evaluators have determined that the following sections according to the Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument and the Model Florida Charter School Application criteria "Partially Meets the Standard" or "Does Not Meet the Standard:"

Five sections received a rating of "Partially Meets the Standard:"

- Section 6-Exceptional Students (ESE)
- Section 7 - English Language Learners
- Section 13 - Student Recruitment and Enrollment
- Section 17-Budget
- Section 19-Action Plan

One section received a rating of "Does Not Meet the Standard."

- Section 1 - Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose

Please see the attached evaluation instruments with their notes for the specific reasons for these ratings. The Superintendent's recommendation to the Board is to deny your application for the reasons stated in the evaluations and, as a result, the overall assessment that the application did not meet the standards and the related statutory criteria for these sections as set forth within the evaluations.

The School Board will take action in regards to Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach on November 4,2015 , at the Special School Board Meeting. There is a Workshop that will begin at 2:00 p.m., with the Special Meeting immediately following. The Workshop may last from $1 / 2$ hour to $1 / 1 / 2$ hours; there is no definite time limit. The Board report for this item will be found on the agenda for this meeting and be located on the District's website at: www.palnbeachschools.org/agenda/agendatoc/htm.

You are invited to attend the above-referenced meeting in the Fulton Holland Educational Services Center at 3300 Forest Hill Bonleyard, West Palm Beach, FL, 33406 in the Winona W. Jordan Board Room. Per School Board Policy, 1.03, paragraph 7, if you and/or others would like to speak at the Board Meeting, you/they may call (561) 434-8136 to sign up by noon of the meeting date, or youthey may fill in a public comment "blue card" before the start of the meeting and each speaker has three minutes.

Sincerely,
(
James T. Pegg
Director
JTP/pjs
c: Joseph M. Lee, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent
Enclosures

## I. Educational Plan

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

## 1. Mission, Guiding Principles and Putpose

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

## Statutory References:

s. $1002.33(2)($ a) ; s. $1002.33(2)(\mathrm{b}) ;$ s. $1002.33(2)(\mathrm{c}) ;$ s. $1002.33(6)(\mathrm{a})(1)$; s. $1002.33(7)(\mathrm{a})(1)$

## Evaluation Criteria:

A responise that meets the standard will present:

- A compelling mission statement that defines the purpose and values of the school.
- A set of priorities that are meaningful, manageable and measurable, and focused on improving student outcomes.

| Meets the Standard | Partially Meets the Standatd | Does Not Meet the Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | $\square$ | $X$ |


| Strengths | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Concertns and Additional Questions | Reference |
|  |  |

## Section 1

DOES NOT MEET THE STANDARD
James Pegg (10/2/15 2:16 PM)
The applicant failed to meet indicators of School Board Policy 2.57 innovative rubric.

## 6. Exceptional Students

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

Statutory Reference(s):
s. $1002.33(16)(\mathrm{a})(3)$

## Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

* Clear description of the levels of service the school will provide to students with disabilities.
- A clear description of how the school will ensure that students with disabilities (SWD) will have an equal opportunity of being selected for entollment.
* An understanding and commitment to collaborating with the sponsor to ensure that placement decisions for students with disabilities will be made based on each student's unique needs.
* An appropriate plan for evaluating the school's effectiveness in serving exceptional students, including gifted.
* A realistic enrollment projection (SWD) and a staffing plan that aligns with the projection.

| Meets the Standard | Partially Meets the Standard | Does Not Meet the Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\square$ |


| Strengths | Referënce |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |


| Concetrns and Additional Questions | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## Section 6

Partially Meets the Standard
Cathy Weech ( $9 / 1 / 15$ 4:08 PM)
Clear description of the levels of service the school will provide to students with disabilities: Application states that "school will provide services to students with disabilities by offering a continuum of services including consultation and support facilitation in the regular classroom environment." Dropdown selection in section 6A indicates the school will be an " $80 / 20$ " school, but provision for providing direct instruction (i.e., puilout) for up to $20 \%$ of the day could not be found in the document. For Gifted students, section 61 specifies that ${ }^{\prime}$...gifted students will receive earichment through regularly scheduled gifted consultation provided by a gifted endorsed teacher," but section 6E implies direct services with, "Teacher of gifted students will collaborate with general education teachers..." A clear description of how the school will ensure that students with disabilities
will have an equal opportunity of being selected for enrollment: Found in application. Section 6B specifies that the school's enrollment application does not request information on disability status and that students with disabilities will have an equal oppottunity of being selected for enrollment. Marketing strategy materials ate mentioned that will specify that the charter school serves students with "exceptionalities" and "disabilities." An understanding and commitment to collaborating with the sponsor to ensure that placement decisions for students with disabilities will be made based on each student's unique needs: Evident in application An appropriate plan for evaluating the school's effectiveness in serving exceptional students, including gifted: Evident. Strategies include progress toward IEP goals, promotion/retention rates, discipline data, and state mandated assessments. A realistic enrollment projection (SWD) and a staffing plan that aligns with the projection: Application states that $10 \%$ of students in the school are anticipated to be ESE, based on data of public schools in the market they are considering (i.e., area between Turnpike and $\mathrm{I}-95$, along Southern Blvd). This is low, compared to the District percentage of ESE students of approximately $14 \%$. Section 6 H lists passing scores on Florida $\mathrm{K}-6,1-6, \mathrm{Pk}-3$ subject area exam as possibilities for staff qualifications. It is unclear why these subject areas would pertain to a school serving only high school students. Subject Area exams are mentioned as well, however. Application under Section 6H specifies school's instructional staff will include teachers who are Gifted certified/endorsed. It is not cleat if such a position is supported by the budget, unless one of the teachers listed under Function 5100-Basic Instruction as "Classtoom Teacher Salaries" is going to fulfill this role. It is also unclear as to where contracted therapists are funded in the budget, though they are referenced in the application.

## 7. English Language Learnets

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

Statutory Reference(s):
s. $1002.33(10)$

## Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- Demonstrated understanding of state and federal requirements regarding the education of English language learner students.
- Sound plans for educating English language learner students that reflect the full range of programs and services required to provide all students with a high quality education.
- Demonstrated capacity to meet the school's obligations under state and federal law regarding the education of English language learner students.

| Meets the Standard | Partially Meets the Standard | Does Not Meet the Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | X | $\square$ |


| Strengths | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |


| Concerns and Additional Questions | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## Section 7

Partially Meets the Standard
Stephen Byrne (8/24/15 12;29 PM)
Schools must reference compliance with the District agreement with the United States Department of Justice which was signed by the Superintendent on February 26, 2013.

## 13. Student Recruitment and Entollment

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

Statutory Reference(s):
s. $1002.33(7)(\mathrm{a})(7)$; s. $1002.33 .(7)(\mathrm{a})(8) ;$ s. $1002.33(10)$

## Evaluation Criteria:

A response that meets the standard will present:

- A student rectuitment plan that will enable the school to attract its targeted population.
- An entollment and admissions process that is open, fait, and in accordance with applicable law.

| Meets the Standard | Partially Meets the Standard | Does Not Meet the Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\square$ |


| Strengths | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |


| Concerns and Additional Questions | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## Section 13 <br> Partially Meets the Standard <br> Jason Link (9/8/15 9:06 PM)

Section 13 D states: Explain any student and/or family contracts that will be used as a requisite for initial and continued entollment in the school. Describe if and how the school will enforce such conttacts.--- Application states that parents will be required to volunteer a minimum of 20 or 30 hours per school year, depending on the number of children enrolled from the same household. If parents do not meet the required mandatory number of voluntecr hours by the end of the school year, even after notification letters are sent, what then occurs?

## 17. Budget

The Budget section should provide financial projections for the school over the term of its charter.
Statutory Reference(s):
s. $1002.33(6)(\mathrm{a})(5)$; s. $1002.33(6)(\mathrm{b})(2)$

Evaluation Criteria:
A response that meets the standard vill present:

- Budgetary projections which are consistent with all parts of the application, including the school's mission, educational program, staffing plan and facility.
- A realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the school.
- A sound plan to monitor the budget and make adjustments as necessary.

| Meets the Standard | Partially Meets the Standatd | Does Not Meet the Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\square$ |


| Strengths | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |


| Concerns and Additional Questions | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

See attached.

Date: October 9, 2015
Application: Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach Reviewer: Heather Knust
Section: 17 Budget
Rating: Partially Meets Standards
Conclusion
The budget lacks consistency with parts of the application and does not represent a realistic assessment of the projected sources of revenues and expenditures. Florida Statute 1002.33(6)(a)(5) and (b)(2).

Refer to detailed analysis below:

## 6. Exceptional Students

Applicant: Budgeted the number of ESE students at 10\%.
District: Palm Beach County ESE population is $20 \%$ county-wide resulting in an understatement in revenue and even greater understatement of expenditures. See below for budget impact.

## 17. Budget

Applicant: Average teacher wage is assumed at $\$ 37,000$ with average benefits offered of $17.7 \%$ in year one decreasing to $17 \%$ in year 5 .

District: Average teacher salary for Palm Beach County Charter Schools is $\$ 39,500$ (district average salary is $\$ 49,300$ ). Average teacher salaries for Chatter School USA schools operated in Palm Beach County is $\$ 38,670$ based on teacher salary information reported to Palm Beach County for teachers paid over $\$ 18,000$. Proposed average salary is well below that of other chatter schools in the area as well as Charter School USA Schools. Average benefit tate for charter schools in Palm Beach County is $25 \%, 17 \%$ is well below the average. The result will be high teacher turnover and the fewer certified teachers. See budget impact below based on an average salary of $\$ 38,670$.

## Financial Impact of Adjustments

The original budget submitted has a net income ranging from $\$ 12,674$ to $\$ 364,860$. After making adjustments for the issues noted above, the school would be operating at a cumulative deficit.

|  | Planning | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Revenue | - | 166,884 | 12,674 | 191,736 | 346,842 | 364,860 |
| ESE (6) |  | $(85,342)$ | $(129,525)$ | (175,458) | (178,466) | $(181,533)$ |
| Salaries at \$38,670 (17) |  | $(61,731)$ | $(100,005)$ | $(128,450)$ | $(131,019)$ | (133,640) |
| Benefit Rate at 17\% (17) |  | $(10,494)$ | [17,001) | $(21,837)$ | $(22,273)$ | $(22,719)$ |
| Total Annual impact | - | 9,317 | $(233,857)$ | $(134,009)$ | 15,084 | 26,969 |
| Total Cumulative Impact |  | 9,317 | $(224,540)$ | $(358,550)$ | $(343,466)$ | $(316,497)$ |

## 19. Action Plan

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

Statutory Reference(s):
s. $1002.33(7)(\mathrm{a})(16)$

## Evaluation Criteria:

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

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

| Meets the Standard | Partially Meets the Standard | Does Not Meet the Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\square$ |


| Strengths | Refcrence |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |


| Concerns and Additional Questions | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## Section 19

Partially Meets the Standard
Ariel Alejo (10/28/15 2:23 PM)
Section \# 19 falls to provide flexibility for addressing unanticipated events.

## Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument

Each section presents criteria for a response that meets the standard and these criteria should guide the overall rating for the section. The Strengths and Weaknesses boxes provide space to identify data and other evidence that supports the rating. The rationale for each rating is important, especially if some of the data or evidence does not fit neatly into the criteria provided.

The following definitions should guide the ratings:

Meets the Standard:

Partially Meets the Standard:

Docs Not Meet the Standard;

The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues and demonstrates capacity to open and operate a quality charter school. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation and presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

The response addresses most of the criteria, but the responses lack meaningful detail and require important additional information.

The response lacks meaningful detail; demonstrates lack of preparation; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the applicant's understanding of the issue in concept and/or ability to meet the requirement in practice

## OVERALL ASSESSEMENT/CHECKLIST

Evaluation Summary of Reviewers' Comments as of September 22, 2015

| STANDARDS | Section 1 Mission | Section 2 Population | Section 3 Education | Section 4 Curriculum | Section 5 Assessment | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Section } 6 \\ & \text { ESE } / 504 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Section 7 <br> ELL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meet Standards |  | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| Partially Meet Standards |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| Does Not Meet Standards | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Section 8 Climate | Section 9 Governance | Section 10 Management | $\begin{gathered} \text { Section } 11 \\ \text { ESP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Scetion 12 Employment | Section 13 Parent | Section 14 Facilities |
| Meet Standards | X | X | X | X | X |  | X |
| Partially Meet Standards |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Does Not Mcet Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Section 15 Transportation | Section 16 Food Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section } 17 \\ & \text { Budget } \end{aligned}$ | Scetion 18 Financial Management | Section 19 Action Plan |  |  |
| Meet Standards | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| Partially Meet Standards |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |
| Does Not Meet Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# ATTACHMENT 2-A 

## BUDGET

## Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projections

## Complete Budget - Palm Beach County



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Wh Year 1 althearlz |  |  |  | Wh Year3\% Year 4 \% |  |  |  | 4, Year 5, mith |  |
| FFEP Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3310 | FEFP - Base Funding |  | \$ | 2,520,529 | \$ | 3,856,410 | \$ | 5,244,717 | \$ | 5,349,611 | \$ | 5,456,604 |
| 3310 | FEFP - ESE Gurantee |  | \$ | 51,102 | \$ | 78,386 | \$ | 106,333 | \$ | 108,460 | \$ | 110,629 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Supplemental Academic Instruction |  | \$ | 116,892 | \$ | 178,845 | \$ | 243,229 | \$ | 248,093 | \$ | 253,055 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Class Size Reductions |  | \$ | 577,716 | \$ | 872,925 | \$ | 1,187,178 | \$ | 1,210,921 | \$ | 1,235,140 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Other FEFP (WFTE Share) |  | \$ | 12,979 | \$ | 19,858 | \$ | 27,007 | \$ | 27,547 | 5 | 28,098 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Discretionary Local Effort |  | \$ | 321,366 | \$ | 491,690 | \$ | 668,699 | \$ | 682,073 | \$ | 695,714 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Proration to Funds Available |  | \$ | (887) | \$ | $(1,357)$ | \$ | $(1,846)$ | \$ | $(1,883)$ | \$ | $(1,920)$ |
| 3310 | FEFP - Discretionary Lottery |  | \$ | 5,724 | \$ | 8,757 | \$ | 11,909 | \$ | 12,148 | \$ | 12,391 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Instructional Materials Allocation |  | \$ | 46,192 | \$ | 70,674 | \$ | 96,117 | \$ | 98,039 | \$ | 100,000 |
| 3310 | FEFP - Digital Classroom Allocation |  | \$ | 5,680 | \$ | 8,059 | \$ | 10,960 | \$ | 11,179 | \$ | 11,403 |
| 3492 | Transportation (All Riders) |  | \$ | 19,855 | \$ | 20,153 | \$ | 20,455 | \$ | 20,762 | \$ | 21,073 |
| Other Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3261 | School Lunch Reimbursements | \$ | \$ | 44,705 | \$ | 68,418 | \$ | 93,038 | \$ | 95,155 | \$ | 96,970 |
| 3397 | Capital Outlay Funds | \$ | \$ | 375,408 | \$ | 563;112 | \$ | 750,816 | \$ | 750,816 | \$ | 750,816 |
| 3440 | Gifts, Grants and Bequests | \$ 117,988 | \$ | - - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| 3451 | School Lunch Collections | \$ | \$ | 38,952 | \$ | 59,594 | \$ | 81,014 | \$ | 82,310 | \$ | 83,866 |
| 3720 | Financing / Loan Proceeds | \$ | \$ | 866,184 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | 5 | - |
|  | Total Income | \$ 117,988 | \$ | 5,002,397 | \$ | 6,295,323 | \$ | 8,539,627 | \$ | 8,695,232 |  | 8,853,837 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Function 5100- Basic Instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5100 | 120 | Classroom Teacher Salaries | \$ | - | \$ | 1,167,448 | \$ | 1,901,433 | \$ | 2,429,225 | \$ | 2,477,809 | \$ | 2,527,366 |
| 5100 | 140 | Substitute Teachers | \$ |  | \$ | 21,700 | \$ | 34,650 | \$ | 43,400 | \$ | 43,400 | \$ | 43,400 |
| 5100 | 160 | Other Support Personnel | \$ | - | \$ | 25,800 | \$ | 26,316 | \$ | 26,842 | \$ | 27,379 | \$ | 27,927 |
| 5100 | 220 | FICA | \$ | - | \$ | 91,283 | \$ | 147,473 | \$ | 187,889 | \$ | 191,647 | \$ | 195,480 |


| 5100 | 240 | Worker's Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 12,768 | \$ | 20,627 | \$ | 26,280 | \$ | 26,806 | \$ | 27,342 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5100 | 250 | Unemployment Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 8,256 | \$ | 13,158 | \$ | 16,254 | S | 16,254 | \$ | 16,254 |
| 5100 | 290 | Other Emplovee Benefits | \$ | - | \$ | 103,200 | \$ | 162,863 | \$ | 203,175 | 5 | 203,175 | \$ | 203,175 |
| 5100 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | 5 | 12,500 | \$ | 75,000 | \$ | 38,250 | \$ | 38,250 | \$ | 12,500 | \$ | 12,500 |
| 5100 | 350 | Repairs and Maintenance | \$ | - | \$ | 102,732 | \$ | 155,598 | 5 | 216,923 | \$ | 221,321 | \$ | 225,807 |
| 5100. | 510 | Supplies | \$ | - | \$ | 16,200 | \$ | 16,524 | \$ | 16,850 | \$ | 17,196 | \$ | 17,532 |
| 5100 | 520 | Textbooks | \$ | - | \$ | 1.29,000 | \$ | 74,970 | \$ | 81,144 | \$ | 95,510 | \$ | 97,421 |
| 5100 | 590 | Other Materials and Supplies | S | - | \$ | 70,000 | \$ | 107,100 | \$ | 144,095 | \$ | 146,977 | \$ | 149,917 |
| 5100 | 621 | AV Materials-Capitalized | \$ | - | \$ | 136,594 | \$ | 34,912 | \$ | 36,384 | \$ | 35,944 | \$ | 35,834 |
| 5100 | 641 | Furniture, Fixtures-Capitalized | \$ | - | S | 96,000 | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | 48,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 5100 | 643 | Computer Hardware-Capitalized | \$ | - | \$ | 336,000 | \$ | 145,500 | \$ | 166,500 | \$ | 112,500 | \$ | 127,500 |
|  |  | $\therefore 5100$ Sub Total: | 5 | 12,500 | \$ | 2,391,981 | \$ | 2,939,373. | \$ | 3,681,221 | \$ | 3,628,419 | \$ | 3,707,454 |

## Function 5200 - Exceptional Education

| 5200 | 130 | Other Certified Staff Member | \$ | - | \$ | 112,979 | \$ | 172,858 | \$ | 235,086 | \$ | 239,788 | \$ | 244,584 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5200 | 140 | Substitute Teachers | \$ | - | \$ | 2,100 | \$ | 3,150 | \$ | 4,200 | \$ | 4,200 | \$ | 4,200 |
| 5200 | 160 | Other Support Personnel | \$ | - | \$ | 5,000 | \$ | 5,100 | \$ | 5,202 | \$ | 5,306 | \$ | 5,412 |
| 5200 | 220 | fica | \$ | - | \$ | 9,025 | \$ | 13,614 | \$ | 18,382 | \$ | 18,750 | \$ | 19,125 |
| 5200 | 240 | Worker's Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 1,262 | \$ | 1,904 | \$ | 2,571 | \$ | 2,623 | \$ | 2,675 |
| 5200 | 250 | Unemployment Compensation | 5 | - | \$ | 774 | \$ | 1,290 | \$ | 1,548 | \$ | 1,548 | \$ | 1,548 |
| 5200 | 290 | Other Employee Benefits | \$ | - | \$ | 9,675 | \$ | 14,513 | \$ | 19,350 | \$ | 19,350 | \$ | 19,350 |
| 5200 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | \$ | - | \$ | 101,016 | \$ | 153,180 | \$ | 207,000 | \$ | 211,140 | \$ | 215,280 |
|  |  | , , 5200 Sub Total : $:$ : | \$ | - | \$ | 241,832. | \$ | 365,608 | \$ | 493,339 | \$ | 502,704 | \$ | 512,173 |

## Function 6100 - Pupil Services

| 6100 | 130 | Other Certified Staff Member | 5 | - | \$ | 45,000 | \$ | 137,700 | \$ | 140,454 | \$ | 143,263 | \$ | 146,128 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6100 | 160 | Other Support Personnel | \$ | - | \$ | 35,000 | \$ | 35,700 | \$ | 36,414 | \$ | 37,142 | \$ | 37,885 |
| 6100 | 220 | FICA | \$ | - | \$ | 6,120 | \$ | 13,265 | \$ | 13,530 | \$ | 13,801 | \$ | 14,077 |
| 6100 | 240 | Worker's Compensation | \$ | - | S | 856 | \$ | 1,855 | \$ | 1,892 | \$ | 1,930 | \$ | 1,969 |
| 6100 | 250 | Unemployment Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 516 | \$ | 1,032 | 5 | 1,032 | \$ | 1,032 | \$ | 1,032 |
| 6100 | 290 | Other Employee Benefits | \$ | - | \$ | 6,450 | \$ | 12,900 | \$ | 12,900 | \$ | 12,900 | \$ | 12,900 |
|  |  | 6100 Sub Total | \$ | - | \$ | 93,942 | 5 | 202,452 | i | 206,223 | \$ | 210,069 | \$ | 213,991: |

Function 6200 - Instructional Media Services


## Function 6300 - Instructional/Curriculum Development

| 6300 | 130 | Other Certified Staff Member | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 68,600 | $\$$ | 69,972 | $\$$ | 71,371 | $\$$ | 72,799 |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6300 | 220 | FICA | $\$$ | 74,255 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 240 | Worker's Compensation | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 5,248 | $\$$ | 5,353 | $\$$ | 5,460 | $\$$ | 5,569 |


| 6300 | 250 | Unemployment Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 516 | \$ | 516 | \$ | 516 | \$ | 516 | 516 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6300 | 290 | Other Employee Benefits | \$ | - | \$ | 6,450 | \$ | 6,450 | \$ | 6,450 | \$ | 6,450 | \$ | 6,450 |
|  |  | 6300 Sub Total | \$ | - | \$ | 81,548 | \$ | 83,040 | \$ | :84,561 | \$ | 86,113 | \$ | 87,696 |


| Function 6400 - Instructional Staff Training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6400 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | \$ | - | 5 | 8,000 | \$ | 8,160 | \$ | 8,323 | \$ | 8,490 | \$ | 8,659 |
|  |  | 6400 SubTotal | \$ | - | 5 | 8,000 | \$ | 8,160 | S | 8,323 | \$ | . 8,490 | \$ | 8,659 |


| Function 6500 - Instructional-Related Technology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6500 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | \$ | - | \$ | 66,500 | \$ | 89,800 | \$ | 113,260 | \$ | 115,300 | \$ | 117,340 |
|  |  | 6500 Sub Total | \$ |  | 5 | 66,500 | \$ | 89,800 | \$ | 113,260 | \$ | 115,300 | \$ | 117,340 |

## Function 7100 - Board

| 7100 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | \$ | - | \$ | 7,500 | 5 | 9,080 | \$ | 9,262 | \$ | 9,447 | \$ | 9,636 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7100 | 320 | Insurance and Bond Premiums | \$ | - | \$ | 21,000 | \$ | 32,130 | \$ | 43,697 | \$ | 44,571 | \$ | 45,462 |
| 7100 | 330 | Travel | \$ | - | \$ | 6,000 | \$ | 6,120 | \$ | 6,242 | \$ | 6,367 | \$ | 6,495 |
|  |  | 7100 Sub Total |  |  | \$ | 34,500 | \$ | 47,330 | \$ | 59,201 | \$ | 60,385 | 5 | 61,593 |
| Function 7200-General / District Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7200 | 730 | Dues and Fees | 5 | - | \$ | 76,607 | \$ | 77,836 | \$ | 79,320 | \$ | 80,906 | \$ | 82,523 |
|  |  | , 7200 Sub Total | \$ | - | \$ | 76,607 | \$ | 77,836 | \$ | 79,320 | \$ | 80,906 | \$ | 82,523 |


| 7300 | 110 | Administrator Salaries | \$ | 53,333 | \$ | 235,000 | \$ | 295,800 | \$ | 301,716 | \$ | 307,750 | \$ | 313,905 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7300 | 160 | Other Support Personnel | \$ | 4,992 | \$ | 39,552 | \$ | 60,515 | \$ | 61,725 | \$ | 62,959 | \$ | 64,219 |
| 7300 | 220 | FICA | \$ | 4,462 | \$ | 21,003 | \$ | 27,258 | \$ | 27,803 | \$ | 28,359 | \$ | 28,926 |
| 7300 | 240 | Worker's Compensation | \$ | 624 | \$ | 2,938 | \$ | 3,813 | \$ | 3,889 | \$ | 3,967 | \$ | 4,046 |
| 7300 | 250 | Unemployment Compensation | \$ | 1,197 | \$ | 1,548 | \$ | 2,064 | \$ | 2,064 | \$ | 2,064 | \$ | 2,054 |
| 7300 | 290 | Other Employee Benefits | \$ | 3,601 | \$ | 19,350 | \$ | 25,800 | \$ | 25,800 | \$ | 25,800 | \$ | 25,800 |
| 7300 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 24,600 | \$ | 51,921 | \$ | 661,466 | 5 | 673,176 | \$ | 685,107 |
| 7300 | 360 | Rentals | \$ | - | \$ | 20,000 | \$ | 20,400 | \$ | 20,808 | \$ | 21,224 | \$ | 21,649 |
| 7300 | 370 | Communications | \$ | 6,500 | \$ | 1,590 | \$ | 2,385 | \$ | 3,121 | \$ | 3,184 | \$ | 3,247 |
| 7300 | 390 | Other Purchased Services | \$ | - | \$ | 6,702 | \$ | 6,831 | \$ | 6,972 | \$ | 7,116 | \$ | 7,248 |
| 7300 | 510 | Supplies | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 7300 | 641 | Furniture, Fixtures-Capitalized | \$ | - | \$ | 105,520 | \$ | 35,000 | \$ | 32,000 | \$ | 20,000 | \$ | 15,000 |
| 7300 | 643 | Computer Hardware-Capitalized | \$ | - | \$ | 151,500 | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | 45,000 | \$ | 30,000 |
| 7300 | 690 | Computer Software | \$ | - | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 |
|  |  | 7300 Sub Total | \$ | 78,709 | \$ | 640,903 | \$ | 603,386 | \$ | 1;218,964 | \$ | 1,212,200 | \$ | 1,212,811 |


| Function 7500 - Fiscal Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7500 | 310 | Professional and Technical Services | \$ | - | \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 10,200 | \$ | 10,404 | 5 | 10,612 | \$ | 10,824 |
| 7500 | 720 | Interest Payment / Debt Service | \$ | - | \$ | 66,409 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 |
|  |  | 7500 Sub Total | \$ | - | \$ | 76,409 | \$ | 260,579 | \$ | 260,783 | \$ | 260,991 | \$ | . 261,203 |

## Function 7600 - Food Services

| 7600 | 160 | Other Support Personnel | \$ | - | \$ | 47,040 | \$ | 47,981 | \$ | 78,904 | \$ | 80,482 | \$ | 82,092 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7600 | 220 | FICA | \$ | - | \$ | 3,599 | \$ | 3,671 | \$ | 6,036 | \$ | 6,157 | \$ | 6,280 |
| 7600 | 240 | Worker's Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 503 | \$ | 513 | \$ | 844 | \$ | 861 | \$ | 878 |
| 7600 | 250 | Unemployment Compensation | \$ | - | \$ | 774 | \$ | 774 | \$ | 1,290 | \$ | 1,290 | 5 | 1,290 |
| 7600 | 290 | Other Employee Benefits | \$ | - | \$ | 9,675 | \$ | 9,675 | \$ | 16,125 | \$ | 16,125 | \$ | 16,125 |
| 7600 | 510 | Supplies | \$ | - | \$ | 2,400 | \$ | 2,448 | \$ | 2,497 | \$ | 2,547 | \$ | 2,598 |
| 7600 | 570 | Food | \$ | - | \$ | 69,638 | \$ | 106,564 | \$ | 144,893 | \$ | 147,701 | \$ | 150,509 |
|  |  | 7600 Sub Tot | \$ |  | \$ | 133,629 | \$ | 171,625 | \$ | 250,589 | \$ | 255,163 | \$ | 259,772 |



| Function 7900-Operation of Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7900 | 320 | Insurance and Bond Premiums | \$ | - | \$ | 60,075 | \$ | 61,277 | \$ | 62,502 | \$ | 63,752 | \$ | 65,027 |
| 7900 | 350 | Repairs and Maintenance | \$ | " | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 3,000 |
| 7900 | 360 | Rentals | \$ | 13,648 | \$ | 496,346 | \$ | 818,392 | \$ | 1,195,548 | \$ | 1,217,333 | \$ | 1,239,537 |
| 7900 | 370 | Communications | \$ | 1,516 | \$ | 40,002 | \$ | 40,797 | \$ | 41,616 | \$ | 42,444 | \$ | 43,296 |
| 7900 | 380 | Public Utilities | \$ | - | \$ | 56,874 | \$ | 58,005 | \$ | 59,172 | \$ | 60,348 | \$ | 61,560 |
| 7900 | 390 | Other Purchased Services | \$ | - | \$ | 107,120 | \$ | 172,992 | \$ | 211,634 | \$ | 215,836 | \$ | 220,043 |
| 7900 | 430 | Electricity | \$ | 11,615 | \$ | 76,095 | \$ | 108,135 | \$ | 158,598 | \$ | 161,802 | 5 | 165,006 |
| 7900 | 510 | Supplies | \$ | - | \$ | 22,428 | \$ | 22,878 | \$ | 23,340 | \$ | 23,808 | \$ | 24,276 |
|  |  | : 7900 Sub Total |  | 26,779 | \$ | 861,940 | \$ | 1,285,476 | \$ | 1,755,410 | 5 | 1,788,323 | \$ | 1,821,745 |

Function 9100 - Community Service


Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projections Planning Year Cash Flow Estimates



















Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Prajections
Year 1 Cash Flow Estimates















## naissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projectio. General Budget Summary

Fiorida Charter Support Unit Budget Template - Summary HI


## Expenses



| Academic Supplies | $\$$ | 1,000 | $\$$ | 180,030 | $\$$ | 121,824 | $\$$ | 128,845 | $\$$ | 144,065 | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Services and Contracts | $\$$ | 23,516 | $\$$ | 448,030 | $\$$ | 583,596 | $\$$ | $1,311,308$ | $\$$ | $1,309,245$ | $\$$ |
| Facilities Costs | $\$$ | 13,648 | $\$$ | 496,346 | $\$$ | 818,392 | $\$$ | $1,195,548$ | $\$$ | $1,217,333$ | $\$$ |
| Insurance | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | $81,239,537$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utilties | $\$$ | 11,615 | $\$$ | 132,969 | $\$$ | 93,407 | $\$$ | 106,199 | $\$$ | 108,323 | $\$$ |
| Maintenance | - | $\$$ | 105,732 | $\$$ | 156,140 | $\$$ | 217,770 | $\$$ | 222,150 | $\$$ | 226,566 |


| Furniture | \$ | - | \$ | 240,240 | \$ | 132,400 | 5 | 80,000 | \$ | 20,000 | \$ | 15,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AV/Computer Equipment | \$ | - | \$ | .624,094 | \$ | 240,412 | \$ | 262,884 | \$ | 193,444 | \$ | 193,334 |
| Software | \$ | - | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,500 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 |
| Other Equipment | \$ | - | \$ | 99,000 | \$ | 125,980 | \$ | 152,500 | \$ | 155,549 | \$ | 158,661 |
| Travel Costs | \$ | - | \$ | 6,000 | \$ | 6,120 | \$ | 6,242 | \$ | 6,367 | \$ | 6,495 |
| Food | \$ | - | \$ | 69,638 | \$ | 106,564 | \$ | 144,893 | \$ | 147,701 | \$ | 150,509 |
| Transportation | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - - | \$ | - | \$ | - - | \$ | - - |
| Other Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 136,409 | \$ | 357,479 | \$ | 394,474 | \$ | 397,356 | \$ | 400,296 |


| District Administrative Fees | \$ | - | \$ | 76,607 | \$ | 77,836 | \$ | 79,320 | \$ | 80,906 | \$ | 82,523 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reserve Fund | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |


| Total Expenses | $\$$ | 117,988 | $\$$ | $4,835,513$ | $\$$ | $6,282,650$ | $\$$ | $8,347,891$ | $\$$ | $8,348,391$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Net Revenue | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 166,884 | $\$$ | 12,674 | $\$$ | 191,736 | $\$$ | 346,842 |

naissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projectio. Detailed Budget Summary

Florido Charter Support Unit Buiget Template - Summary H2

|  | Planining Year |  | Whanem |  | Th Year Two ma |  | Chtyear |  | Wherar, Four |  | fry Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FEFP State Revenue | \$ | - | \$ | 3,657,293 | \$ | 5,584,046 | \$ | 7,594,303 | \$ | 7,746,189 | \$ | 7,901,113 |
| Federal Revenue | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| IDEA Funds | \$ | - | \$ | \% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Capital Outlay | \$ | - | \$ | 375,408 | \$ | 563,112 | \$ | 750,816 | \$ | 750,816 | \$ | 750,816 |
| Title 1 Funds | \$ | - | \$ | r | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| NSLP Funds | \$ | * | 5 | 83,657 | \$ | 128,012 | \$ | 174,053 | \$ | 177,466 | \$ | 180,835 |
| Transportation Funds | \$ | - | \$ | 19,855 | \$ | 20,153 | \$ | 20,455 | \$ | 20,762 | \$ | 21,073 |
| Interest on Investments | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Interest on Loans | \$ | - | 5 | 866,184 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Other Revenue | \$ | 117,988 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Revenue | \$ | 117,988 | \$ | 5,002,397 | \$ | 6,295,323 | \$ | 8,539,627 | \$ | 8,695,232 | \$ | 8,853,837 |



| Food | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdot$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 70,000 | \$ | 107,100 | \$ | 144,095 | \$ | 146,977 | \$ | 149,917 |
| al Academic Expenses | \$ | 12,500 | \$ | 2,932,524 | \$ | 3,730,837 | \$ | 4,591,932 | \$ | 4,556,099 | \$ | 4,652,317 |



| Employee Totals | \$ | 68,209 | \$ | 319,391 | \$ | 415,249 | \$ | 422,997 | \$ | 430,900 | \$ | 438,960 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Services | \$ | 9,500 | \$ | 42,892 | \$ | 71,337 | \$ | 681,963 | \$ | 694,088 | \$ | 706,426 |
| Insurance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Supplies and Materials | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Maintenance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Utilities | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computers | \$ | - | \$ | 151,500 | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | 45,000 | \$ | 30,000 |
| Software | \$ | - | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 |
| Equipement | \$ | - | \$ | 20,000 | \$ | 20,400 | \$ | 20,808 | \$ | 21,224 | \$ | 21,649 |
| Furniture | \$ | - | \$ | 105,520 | \$ | 35,000 | \$ | 32,000 | \$ | 20,000 | \$ | 15,000 |
| Travel | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Food | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Other Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 66,409 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 |
| al Administrative Exp | \$ | 78,709 | \$ | 717,312 | \$ | 863,965 | \$ | 1,479,747 | \$ | 1,473,191 | \$ | 1,474,014 |




| Food Services Expenses |
| :--- |
| Employee Totals |
| Services |



| Services | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| insurance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Supplies and Materials | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Maintenance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Utilities | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computers | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | " | \$ | * | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Software | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - - |
| Equipement | \$ | - | \$ | 79,000 | \$ | 105,580 | \$ | 131,692 | \$ | 134,325 | \$ | 137,012 |
| Furniture | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Travel | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Food | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | S | - | \$ | - |
| Other Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - | \$ | 131692 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | \$ | - | \$ | 79,000 | \$ | 105,580 | \$ | 131,692 | \$ | 134,325 | \$ | 137,012 |

Total Transportation Services


| Employee Totals | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Services | \$ | $\sim$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | \$ | - |
| Insurance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | S | - |
| Supplies and Materials | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - |
| Maintenance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | * | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Utilities | \$ | - | \$ | * | \$ | + | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computers | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | * | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Software | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Equipement | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\sim$ | \$ | - |
| Furniture | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Travel | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Food | 5 | - | \$ | $+$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Other Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| tal Community Services | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |


| District Administrative Fee | \$ | - | 5 | 76,607 | S | 77,836 | \$ | 79,320 | s | 80,906 | S | 82,523 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reserve Fund | \$ | - | s |  | 5 |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | s |  |
| al Other Expenses | \$ |  | \$ | 76,607 | \$ | 77,836 | \$ | 79,320 | \$ | 80,906 | \$ | 82,523 |


| Total Expenses | $\$$ | 117,988 | $\$$ | $4,835,513$ | $\$$ | $6,282,650$ | $\$$ | $8,347,891$ | $\$$ | $8,348,391$ | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Net Revenue | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 166,884 | $\$$ | 12,674 | $\$$ | 191,736 | $\$$ | 346,842 | $\$$ |

## znaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projection. Accounting Codes Summary

Florido Chorter Support Unit Budget Yemplate - Summary $\$$

|  |  | nning rear |  | Year One |  | Year |  | Year <br> Three |  | Yëaŕ <br> Four: |  | Year ${ }^{\text {Fivel }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenue |  |  |  | 4-4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3300 -State Funding | \$ | - | \$ | 4,032,701 | \$ | 6,147,158 | \$ | 8,345,119 | \$ | 8,497,005 | \$ | 8,651,929 |
| 3400-Transportation | \$ | 117,988 | \$ | 58,807 | \$ | 79,747 | \$ | 101,470 | \$ | 103,072 | \$ | 104,939 |
| 3200 - NSLP | \$ | - | 5 | 44,705 | \$ | 68,418 | \$ | 93,038 | \$ | 95,155 | \$ | 96,970 |
| 3700-Interest on Loans | \$ | - | \$ | 866,184 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Revenue | \$ | 117,988 | \$ | 5,002,397 | \$ | 6,295,323 | \$ | 8,539,627 | \$ | 8,695,232 | \$ | 8,853,837 |


| Expenses <br> 5000, Functions-Academic Programs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100s - Salaries | \$ | - | \$ | 1,335,026 | 5 | 2,143,507 | \$ | 2,743,956 | \$ | 2,797,883 | \$ | 2,852,888 |
| 2005 - Employee Costs | \$ | - | \$ | 236,244 | 5 | 375,441 | \$ | 475,449 | \$ | 480,152 | \$ | 484,948 |
| 3005 - Services and Contracts | 5 | 12,500 | \$ | 278,748 | \$ | 347,028 | \$ | 462,173 | \$ | 444,961 | \$ | 453,587 |
| 400 s - Power Services | S | . | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 500 - Supplies and Materials | \$ | - | \$ | 215,200 | \$ | 198,594 | \$ | 242,099 | \$ | 259,684 | \$ | 264,870 |
| 600s - Capitalized Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 558,594 | \$ | 240,412 | \$ | 250,884 | \$ | 148,444 | \$ | 163,334 |
| $700 s$ - Other Miscellaneous Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total 5000's Academic Programs | \$ | 12,500 | \$ | 2,633,812 | \$ | 3,304,981 | \$ | 4,174,561 | \$ | 4,131,123 | \$ | 4,219,627 |




| 100s-Salaries | \$ | 58,325 | \$ | 321,592 | \$ | 404,295 | \$ | 442,345 | \$ | 451,192 | \$ | 460,216 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 - Employee Costs | \$ | 9,884 | S | 59,390 | \$ | 73,568 | \$ | 83,851 | \$ | 84,623 | \$ | 85,410 |
| 3005-Services and Contracts | \$ | 9,500 | \$ | 176,392 | \$ | 244,647 | \$ | 893,664 | \$ | 910,022 | 5 | 926,680 |
| 400s- - Power Services | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 500 s - Supplies and Materials | S | 1,000 | 5 | 72,038 | \$ | 109,012 | \$ | 147,390 | \$ | 150,248 | \$ | 153,107 |
| 600 s - Capitalized Expenses | \$ | - | 5 | 268,620 | \$ | 106,600 | \$ | 103,600 | \$ | 76,600 | \$ | 56,600 |
| 7005 - Other Miscellaneous Costs | \$ | - | \$ | 143,016 | \$ | 328,215 | \$ | 329,699 | \$ | 331,285 | \$ | 332,902 |
| o's Administrative Services | \$ | 78,709 | \$ | 1,041,048 | \$ | 1,266,337 | \$ | 2,000,549 | \$ | 2,003,969 | \$ | 014,914 |


| 100 s - Salaries | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 - Employee Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 300 - Services and Contracts | \$ | 15,164 | \$ | 763,417 | \$ | 1,154,463 | \$ | 1,573,472 | \$ | 1,602,713 | \$ | 1,632,463 |
| 400s - Power Services | \$ | 11,615 | \$ | 76,095 | \$ | 108,135 | \$ | 158,598 | \$ | 161,802 | \$ | 165,006 |
| S00s - Supplies and Materials | \$ | - | \$ | 22,428 | \$ | 22,878 | \$ | 23,340 | \$ | 23,808 | \$ | 24,276 |
| 600s - Capitalized Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 7005 - Other Miscellaneous Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 900 Facilities Operations | \$ | 26,779 | \$ | 861,940 | \$ | 1,285,476 | \$ | 1,755,410 | \$ | 1,788,323 | \$ | 1,821,745 |


| 1005 - Salaries | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 - Employee Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 300 - Services and Contracts | 5 | - | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 400s - Power Services | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | 5 | - | \$ | - |
| 500 - Supplies and Materials | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 500s - Capitalized Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 7005 - Other Miscellaneous Costs | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - |
| Total 9000 Community Services | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |



| Total Expenses | $\$$ | 117,988 | $\$$ | $4,835,513$ | $\$$ | $6,282,650$ | $\$$ | $8,347,891$ | $\$$ | $8,348,391$ | $\$$ | $8,488,977$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Net Revenue | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 166,884 | $\$$ | 12,674 | $\$$ | 191,736 | $\$$ | 346,842 | $\$$ | 364,860 |

Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projections Modified Accural Cash Flow Summary

Florida Charter Support Unit Budget Template . Summory tha

|  | (planning Ma |  | Hatorern |  | Thyeary Yo |  | Wearit Mret |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| District Funding (Oct FTE) | \$ | - | \$ | 1,838,574 | \$ | 2,802,099 | \$ | 3,807,379 | \$ | 3,883,475 | \$ | 3,961,093 |
| District Funding (Feb FTE) | \$ | - | \$ | 1,838,574 | \$ | 2,802,099 | \$ | 3,807,379 | \$ | 3,883,475 | \$ | 3,961,093 |
| Capital Funds | \$ | - | 5 | 375,408 | \$ | 563,112 | \$ | 750,816 | \$ | 750,816 | \$ | 750,816 |
| Florida School Recognition Funds | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - | 5 | - |
| Title! | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | * |
| Interest Earned | \$ | - | \$ | 866,184 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| National School Lunch Program | \$ | - | \$ | 83,657 | 5 | 128,012 | \$ | 174,053 | \$ | 177,466 | \$ | 180,835 |
| Grants and Gifts | 5 | 117,988 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Other Income Sources | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | * | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Revenue | \$ | 117,988 | \$ | 5,002,397 | \$ | 6,295,323 | \$ | 8,539,627 | \$ | 8,695,232 | \$ | 8,853,837 |

## Expenses

 100's-Salaries

| Administrative Staff | \$ | 53,333 | \$ | 235,000 | \$ | 295,800 | \$ | 301,716 | \$ | 307,750 | 5 | 313,905 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instructional Staff | \$ | - | \$ | 1,394,026 | \$ | 2,281,963 | \$ | 2,876,137 | \$ | 2,933,659 | \$ | 2,992,333 |
| Substitute Teachers | \$ | - | \$ | 23,800 | 5 | 37,800 | \$ | 47,600 | \$ | 47,600 | \$ | 47,600 |
| Paraprofessionals / Teacher Asst | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | 65,800 | \$ | 67,116 | \$ | 68,458 | \$ | 69,827 | \$ | 71,224 |
| Office Staff | \$ | 4,992 | \$ | 39,552 | \$ | 60,515 | \$ | 61,725 | \$ | 62,959 | \$ | 64,219 |
| Lunch Staff | \$ | - | \$ | 47,040 | \$ | 47,981 | \$ | 78,904 | \$ | 80,482 | \$ | 82,092 |
| Transportation Staff | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Maintenance Staff | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Community Services Staff | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - |
| 210, 230, 290-Employee Benefits. | \$ | 3,601 | \$ | 154,800 | \$ | 232,200 | \$ | 283,800 | \$ | 283,800 | \$ | 283,800 |
| 220, 240, 250, 750-Employer Costs | 5 | 6,283 | \$ | 167,724 | \$ | 258,928 | \$ | 318,045 | \$ | 323,952 | \$ | 329,977 |
| Total Salaries and Benefits | \$ | 68,209 | \$ | 2,127,742 | \$ | 3,282,302 | \$ | 4,036,385 | \$ | 4,110,030 | \$ | 4,185,149 |



| 310-Professional / Technical Services | \$ | 15,500 | \$ | 292,616 | \$ | 360,591 | \$ | 1,047,965 | \$ | 1,040,665 | \$ | 1,059,346 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 320-Insurance and Bond Premiums | \$ | - | \$ | 81,075 | \$ | 93,407 | \$ | 106,199 | \$ | 108,323 | \$ | 110,489 |
| 330 - Travel | \$ | - | \$ | 6,000 | \$ | 6,120 | \$ | 6,242 | \$ | 6,367 | \$ | 6,495 |
| 350-Repairs and Maintenance | \$ | - | \$ | 105,732 | \$ | 158,598 | \$ | 219,923 | \$ | 224,321 | \$ | 228,807 |
| 370-Communications | 5 | 6,500 | \$ | 1,590 | \$ | 2,385 | \$ | 3,121 | \$ | 3,184 | \$ | 3,247 |
| 380-Utilities | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdots$ |
| 390-Other Purchased Services | \$ | - | \$ | 6,702 | \$ | 6,831 | \$ | 6,972 | \$ | 7,116 | \$ | 7,248 |
| urchased/Contract Services | \$ | 22,000 | \$ | 493,715 | \$ | 627,932 | \$ | 1,390,421 | \$ | 1,389,976 | \$ | 1,415,633 |

Facilites

| 360 - Rent | \$ | 13,648 | \$ | 496,346 | \$ | 818,392 | \$ | 1,195,548 | \$ | 1,217,333 | \$ | 1,239,537 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 360-Rentals | \$ | - | \$ | 99,000 | \$ | 125,980 | \$ | 152,500 | \$ | 155,549 | 5 | 158,661 |
| 370-Communications | \$ | 1,516 | \$ | 40,002 | \$ | 40,797 | \$ | 41,616 | \$ | 42,444 | \$ | 43,296 |
| 380-Utilties | \$ | 12,615 | \$ | 132,969 | \$ | 166,140 | \$ | 227,770 | \$ | 222,150 | \$ | 226,566 |
| 390-Other Services | \$ | - | \$ | 107,120 | 5 | 172,992 | \$ | 211,634 | \$ | 215,836 | \$ | 220,043 |
| 720 - Debt Service / Acquisition | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Rent and Utilities | \$ | 26,779 | \$ | 875,437 | \$ | 1,324,301 | \$ | 1,819,068 | \$ | 1,853,312 | \$ | 1,888,103 |



| 730 - Dues and Fees | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 730 - District Adminstrative Fees | \$ | - | \$ | 76,607 | \$ | 77,836 | \$ | 79,320 | \$ | 80,906 | \$ | 82,523 |
| 720 - Debt Service / Interest Expense | \$ | - | \$ | 66,409 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 | \$ | 250,379 |
| 790 - Miscellaneous Expense | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Reserve Fund | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Other Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 143,016 | \$ | 328,215 | \$ | 329,699 | \$ | 331,285 | \$ | 332,902 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Expenses (without Capitalized Items) | \$ | 117,988 | \$ | 3,830,579 | \$ | 5,823,268 | \$ | 7,512,263 | \$ | 8,027,836 | \$ | 8,171,622 |
| SubTotal (Net Income Before Depreciation) | \$ | - | \$ | 1,171,818 | \$ | 472,056 | \$ | 627,364 | \$ | 667,396 | \$ | 682,215 |
| Depreciation | ! $\because \quad \therefore \quad \therefore \quad \cdots$ |  | \% 51 |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Income After Depreciation (Accrual Basis) | \$ | - | \$ | 1,171,818 | \$ | 472,056 | \$ | 627,364 | \$ | 667,396 | \$ | 682,215 |


| Add Depreciation | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 520-Textbooks | \$ | - | \$ | 129,000 | \$ | 74,970 | \$ | 81,144 | \$ | 95,510 | \$ | 97,421 |
| 620,630-Equipment and Materials | \$ | - | \$ | 136,594 | \$ | 34,912 | \$ | 36,384 | 5 | 35,944 | \$ | 35,834 |
| 640 - Furniture | \$ | - | \$ | 240,240 | \$ | 132,400 | \$ | 80,000 | \$ | 20,000 | \$ | 15,000 |
| 640-Computers | 5 | - | \$ | 487,500 | \$ | 205,500 | \$ | 226,500 | \$ | 157,500 | \$ | 157,500 |
| $680-$ Remodeling and Renovations | 5 | * | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 690 -Software | \$ | - | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 | \$ | 11,600 |
| Total Capitalized Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 1,004,934 | \$ | 459,382 | \$ | 435,628 | \$ | 320,554 | \$ | 317,355 |

# Penaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach's Five Year Budget Projection: Detailed Budget Summary 

Florida Charter Support Unit Budget Templote-Summary Hs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten through 5th Grade |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6th Grade through 8th Grade |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9th Grade through 12th Grade |  | 600 | 900 | 1200 | 1200 | 1200 |
| Total Enrollment at 100\% |  | 600 | 900 | 1200 | 1200 | 1200 |

## Revenue

| State Sources | $\$$ | - | $\$ 4,052,556$ | $\$$ | $6,167,311$ | $\$$ | $8,365,574$ | $\$$ | $8,517,767$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Federal Sources | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 44,705 | $\$$ | 68,418 | $\$$ | 93,038 | $\$$ |
| Local Sources | $\$ 5,155$ | $\$$ | 96,970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Sources | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |

## Expenses

Instruction

| Salaries (Includes all teachers and assistants) | \$ | - | 5 | 1,571,270 | \$ | 2,518,947 | \$ | 3,219,405 | \$ | 3,278,034 | \$ | 3,337,836 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fringe Benefits \& Employer Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Contracted Professional Services | 5 | 12,500 | \$ | 176,016 | \$ | 191,430 | \$ | 245,250 | \$ | 223,640 | \$ | 227,780 |
| Classroom Supplies \& Equipment. | \$ | - | \$ | 86,200 | \$ | 123,624 | \$ | 160,955 | \$ | 164,173 | \$ | 167,449 |
| Teacher Supplies | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - - | \$ | - |
| Textbooks | \$ | - | \$ | 129,000 | \$ | 74,970 | \$ | 81,244 | \$ | 95,510 | \$ | 97,421 |
| Student Activities | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computer - Equipment \& Repairs For Instruction | \$ | - | \$ | 336,000 | \$ | 145,500 | \$ | 166,500 | \$ | 112,500 | \$ | 127,500 |
| Software For Instruction | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Furniture | \$ | - | S | 134,720 | \$ | 97,400 | 5 | 48,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Other | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdots$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |


| Pupil Personnel Services <br>  $\qquad$ <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries (Includes Counselor, School Nurse, Health Assistant) | \$ | - | S | 93,942 | - | 202,452 | 5 | 206,223 | S | 210,069 | \$ | 213,991 |
| Fringe Benefits \& Employer Costs | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| Contracted Professional Services | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| Total Pupil Personnel Services | \$ | - | \$ | 93,942 | \$ | 202,452 | \$ | 206,223 | \$ | 210,069 | \$ | 213,991 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries (Includes Librarian) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Fringe Benefits \& Employer Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Library Books | \$ | * | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Audio Visual Materials | \$ | - | 5 | 146,596 | \$ | 39,916 | \$ | 41,388 | \$ | 40,948 | \$ | 40,838 |
| Total Media Services | \$ | - | \$ | 146,596 | \$ | 39,916 | \$ | 41,388 | \$ | 40,948 | \$ | 40,838 |




| InstructionRelatedTechnologytat, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries (Includes Technology Personnel) | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| Fringe Benefits \& Employer Costs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Instructional Networks | \$ |  | \$ | 66,500 | \$ | 89,800 | \$ | 113,260 | \$ | 115,300 | \$ | 117,340 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computer Learning Labs | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | 5 | - |
| Total Instruction Related Technology | \$ | - | \$ | 66,500 | \$ | 89,800 | \$ | 113,260 | \$ | 115,300 | \$ | 117,340 |






| Building Lease / Rent | \$ | 13,648 | \$ | 496,346 | \$ | 818,392 | \$ | 1,195,548 | 5 | 1,217,333 | \$ | 1,239,537 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remodeling \& Renovations | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Purchase Of Buildings \& Fixed Equipment | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Land | \$ | - | \$ | * | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Facilities Acquisition \& Construction | \$ | 13,648 | \$ | 496,346 | \$ | 818,392 | \$ | 1,195,548 | \$ | 1,217,333 | \$ | 1,239,537 |



| Salaries (Accounting \& Bookkeeping Personnel) | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | -' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professional Services (Payroll, Accounting, Auditing) | \$ | - | \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 10,200 | \$ | 10,404 | \$ | 10,612 | \$ | 10,824 |
| Total Fiscal Services | \$ | - | \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 10,200 | \$ | 10,404 | \$ | 10,612 | \$ | 10,824 |




## Budget Details Informational Summary

Florida Charter Support Unit Budget Template - Summary ${ }^{\text {H }} 6$


## Enrollment

| Total \# of Students | 600. |  | 900 |  | 1200 |  | 1200 |  | 1200 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Per Student Revenue | \$ | 8,337.33 | \$ | 6,994.80 | \$ | 7,116.36 | \$ | 7,246.03 | \$ | 7,378.20 |



Facilities Budget

| Maximum Facility Expense | \$ | 861,940 | \$ | 1,285,476 | \$ | 1,755,410 | \$ | 1,788,323. | \$ | 1,821,745 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Building Size | \$ | 40,050 | \$ | 60,075 | \$ | 80,100 | \$ | 80,100 | \$ | 80,100 |
| Maximum cost per square foot | \$ | 12.39 | \$ | 13.62 | \$ | 14.93 | \$ | 15.20 | \$ | 15.47 |
| Operating and Fixed Costs | \$ | 365,594 | \$ | 467,084 | \$ | 559,862 | \$ | 570,990 | \$ | 582,208 |
| Mortgage Payments/Rent | \$ | 496,346 | \$ | 818,392 | \$ | 1,195,548 | \$ | 1,217,333 | \$ | 1,239,537 |

## Staffing

| Average Class Size | 19.4 | 18.2 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 19.4 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| \# of Classroom Teachers | 31 | 49.5 | 62 | 62 | 62 |  |  |
| \# of Other Teachers | 3 | 4.5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| \# of Other Staff Members |  | 15 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  |  |
| Salary + Benefits Per Teacher | 7.916666667 | 40,225 | $\$$ | $40,965.00$ | $\$$ | $41,719.80$ | $\$$ |
| Total Teacher Salary + Benefits + Employer Costs | $\$$ | $1,643,086$ | $\$$ | $2,683,491$ | $\$$ | $3,380,131$ | $\$$ |
| Other Employee Salary + Benefits + Employer Costs | $\$$ | 484,656 | $\$$ | 598,811 | $\$$ | 656,254 | $\$$ |

Five Year Enrollment Projections

|  |  | Wabay |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kindergarten | $\square \square$ |  |  |  |  |
| Ist Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 rd Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th Grade |  |  |  |  | ua |
| 5th Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th Grade | $=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| 7th Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8th Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9th Grade | 12 Sections 300 Students | 12 Sections 300 Students | 12 Sections 300 Students | 12 Sections 300 Students | 12 Sections 300 Students |
| Total Possible Enrollment | 24 Sections 600 Students. | 36 Sections 900 Students | 48 Sections 1200 Students | 48 Sections 1200 stuidents | 48 Sections 1200 Students |

Five Year Staffing Projections

|  |  |  | 2k |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classroom Teachers | . 31 | 49.5 | $62=$ | $\bigcirc 62$ | -2 62 |
| ESE Teachers | 3 | 4.5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Glfted Teachers | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | \%-\% - - | - | $\cdots=$ |
| Other Teachers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Princlpal | $1-$ | 1 | 1 | $\cdots 1$ | $\cdots 1$ |
| Assistant Principal | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Guitdance Counselor --: | -1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | $\bigcirc 3$ |
| Business Manager |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Assisfant - | \% | 3 | 3 | 3. | 3 |
| Data Prep Clerk. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Educational Assistant | .... |  | : | - | $\cdots$ |
| Maintenance 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance 2 |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| Total Employees | 48 | 72 | $\therefore 88$ | 88 | - 88 |

Detailed ESE Estimates

|  |  |  | Wukh |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kindergarten | $\because 0-5$ |  | - 0 | $\square \mathrm{O}=2$ | $\bigcirc 0$ |
| 1st Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\therefore \cdots$ 2nd Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | -0, | 0 |
| 3rd Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - 4th Grade | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 |
| 5th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6th Grade: | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 |
| 7th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8th Grade:- | -0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9th Grade. | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Total ESE Enrollment | 60 | \%90- | 2, 120 | $\cdots 120$ | 120 |

Detailed Gifted Estimates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2nd Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| 3rd Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4th Grade | $0 \ldots$ | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 |
| 5th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - 6th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\because 0$ | $0-7$ |
| 7th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - $\quad 0$ |
| 9th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total ESE Enrollment | $\bigcirc 0$ | 0 | - 0 | 0 | - 0 |

Detailed ELL Estimates

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K.Klndergarten | $\because 0$ | 00 | 0 | $\bigcirc 0$ | $\therefore 0$ |
| 1st Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2nd Grade | 0 | $\therefore 0$ | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 |
| 3rd Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\cdots$ - 4th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 = |
| 5th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8th Grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 |
| 9th Grade | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Total ESE Enrollment | 36 | - 54 | $72 \times$ | 72 | \%72 |

Special Populations Summary

| ESE Students | 60 | 90 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gifted Students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ELL Students | 36 | 54 | 72 | 72 | 72 |
| Fres／Reduced Lunch | 324 | 486 | 648 | 648 | 648 |
| Totals | 420 | 630 | 840 | 840 | 840 |

Revenue Assumptions
Kindergarten－ 3 rd Graders

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base FEFP | \＄4，671 | \＄4，765 | \＄4，860 | \＄4，957 | \＄5，057 |
| Other Categoricals | 50 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| ESE Guarantee | \＄1，068 | \＄1，089 | \＄1，111 | \＄1，133 | \＄1，156 |
| \％Total Per Student | \％ 4,671 | $\because \quad \$ 4,765$ | \＄4，860 | －－\＄4，957 | \＄5，057 |
| Büdgeted Students | $\square 0$ | 0 | 0 O | 0 0， | 0 |
| Total K－3 Revenue | \＄0 | $\square \quad \$ 0$ | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |

4th－8th Graders

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base FEFP | \＄4，149 | \＄4，232 | \＄4，316 | \＄4，403 | \＄4，491 |
| Other Categoricals | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| ESE Guarantee | \＄1，196 | \＄1，220 | \＄1，245 | \＄1，270 | \＄1，295 |
| $\because$ Total Per Student | \＄4，149 | － | $\therefore$ ：$\$ 4,316$ | －\＄4，403 | \＄4，491 |
| Bưdgeted Students | 00 | 0 | 00 | $0-0$ | 0 |
| Total：4－8 Revenite | \＄0 | －\＄0 | $\because$ \＄0 | \％\＄0 | \＄0 |

9th－12th Graders

|  |  |  | 建高高 | 91e |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base FEFP | \＄4，165 | \＄4，249 | \＄4，334 | \＄4，420 | \＄4，509 |
| Other Categoricals | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 |
| ESE Guarantee | \＄852 | \＄869 | \＄886 | \＄904 | \＄922 |
| Total Per Stuident | \＄4，165 | \＄4，249 | \＄4，334 | \＄4，420 | \＄4，509 |
| Budgeted Students | 600 | 900 | 1200 | 1200 | $\cdots-1200$ |
| Total 9－12 Revenue | \＄3，657，293 | \＄5，584，046 | \＄7，594，303 | －\＄7，746，189 | \＄7，901；113 |

Revenue Estimate Worksheet for Reaaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach Charter School Based on the Second Calculation of the FEFP 2014-15
School Distriet:
Paim Dearh

1. 2014-15 FEFP State and Local Funding

Base Student Allocation District Cost Differential: 1.0290

| Program (a) | Number of FTE <br> (b) | Progran Cost Factor (c) | Welghted FTE <br> (b) $\times(c)$ <br> (d) | 2014-15 Base <br> Funding WFTE $x$ <br> BSA $\times$ DCD <br> (e) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 Basic K-3 | 0.00 | 1.126 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 111 Basic 1-3 with ESE Services | 0.00 | 1.126 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 102 Basic 4-8 | 0.00 | 1,000 | 0.0000 | 5 | - |
| 112 Basie 4-8 widl ESE Serrices | 0.00 | 1.000 | 0.0000 | S | - - |
| 103 Basic 9-12 | 504,00 | 1.004 | 506.0160 | 5 | 2,099,304 |
| 113 Basic 9-12 with ESE Services | 60.00 | 1.004 | 60.2400 | \$ | 249,917 |
| 254 ESE Level 4 (Grade Level PK-3) | 0,00 | 3.548 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 254 ESE Level 4 (Grade Level 4-8) | 0.00 | 3.548 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 254 ESE Level 4 (Grade Level 9-12) | 0.00 | 3.548 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 255 ESE Level 5 (Grade Level PK-3) | 0.00 | 5.104 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 255 ESE Level 5 (Grade Level 4-8) | 0.00 | 5.104 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 255 ESE Level 5 (Grade Leval 9-12) | 0.011 | 5.104 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 130 ESOL (Grule Level PK-3) | 0.00 | 1.147 | 0.0000 | \$ | - |
| 130 ESOL (Grade Level 4-8) | 0.00 | 1.147 | 0.0000 | S | - |
| 130 ESOL (Grafe Level 9-12) | 36.00 | 1.147 | 41.2920 | S | 171,308 |
| 300 Career Education (Grades 9-12) |  | 1.004 | 0,0000 | S | - |
| Totals | 600.00 |  | 607.5480 | \$ | 2,520,529 |
| 2. ESE Guamutecd Allocation: | FTE | Grade Lejel $\begin{gathered}\text { Matrix } \\ \text { Level }\end{gathered}$ | Gyarante <br> Per Student |  |  |
|  | 0.00 | P1C3 251 | S 1,047 | S | - |
| Additional Funding from the ESE | 0.00 | PK-3 252 | \$ 3,380 | \$ | - |
| Guaranteed Allocation. Enter the | 0.00 | PK-3 253 | S 6,896 | S | - |
| FTE from 11,112 , \& 113 by grade | 0.00 | 4-8 251 | \$ 1,173 | \$ | - |
| and matrix level. Students who do | 0.00 | 488252 | S 3,506 | 5 | - |
|  | 0.00 | $4.8 \quad 253$ | \$ 7,023 | S | - |
|  | 60.00 | 9-12 251 | S 835 | S | 50,100 |
|  | 0.00 | 9-12 252 | S 3,168 | S | - |
|  | 0.00 | $9-12253$ | \$ 6,685 | S | - |
| Total FTE with ESE Services | 60.00 | Total from ESE Guaraitee $\$$ |  |  | 50,100 |
| 3. Suppfemental Academic Instruction: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Districi SAl Allocation | \$ 34,651,002 |  | Per Siudent |  |  |
| divided by district FTE | 181,379,80 |  | S 191 | \$ | 114,600 |

4. Reading Allocation:
'Charter schools should contact their school district sponsor regarding efigiblity and distribution of teading atlocalten funds.
Total Base Funding, ESE Guarantes, and SAI \$ $\quad \mathbf{2 , 6 8 5 , 2 2 9}$
5. Class size Reduction Funds:

|  | Weighted FTE, (Fromi Scetion 1) | DCD | X Allocation fa |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PK-3 | 0.0000 | 1.0290 | 1325.01 | $=$ | 0 |  |  |
| 4-8 | 0.0000 | 1.0290 | 903.80 | $=$ | 0 |  |  |
| 9-12 | 607.5480 | 1.0290 | 905.98 | $=$ | 566,389 |  |  |
| Total * | 607.5480 |  | Total C | ize R | Funds | S | 566,389 |


17. Fundiag for the purpose of calculating the administrative fee for ESE Charters.

If you have more than $\boldsymbol{*} 75 \%$ ESE student population pleasc place a 1 in the following box;
(h)
$\qquad$

Notes:
(a) District allocalions muldiptid by percentage from tems 6as.
(b) District allosations nultiplited by porcentage front item 6 .

(d) Consisient nith Section 1005.at, Florida Statules and DOE Stuteut Transporiation General Instructions. Numbers entered bere will be matliplied by fhe distrist level transportation fundling per rider. "All Rders" should faclude bolh basic and ESE Riders. "ESE Student Riders" should tnelude orlj; ESE Rlders. (e) The Digital Classoon Allocation is provided pursant to House Bill 5101 and requirts that charter schont submit a digitai chass rooms phan to their sthool distede for approval by the Depariment of Education.
(1) Teacher Classroom Supply Assistance Progrann Alliocation per Section 1012.71, Florida Statutes
(g) Fundlag based on sfudenfetigibility and meals provided, If particlpating in the National School Lunch Progran).
(h) Consistent with Setilion 1001.33(20)(a), Forida Statutes, for ctiarter schools with a population of $75 \%$ or more ESE students, the adminbitrative fee shall be calculated based on unmeighted full-time equiraleat sturents,
(I) As provided tin the 2013 General Appropriations Act, school dishets are requited to pay for fastructional materials used for the instruction of public acheol high school students wha are sarning tredit toward high school graduation under the dual enrollment program as provided in section 1011.62(I)(H), Florida Statutes.

Adtuantitrative fass charger by the sehool distritt shall be catcntaved based upon 5 pescent of avallable funds from the FEFP and cotegorical funding for intich charter








FEFP and witegorical fundirg aft reculculated during the four to reflect the revised number of full-ime equivalent studenis reported duthg the surixy perlods desfgutared by the Comnitsioner of Editcution.
Reventres flov to disticts foon state sources ond froun county tax collectors on wrians distribution schedites

## ATHTACHMIENT 3



## Agenda Item Detalls

| Meeting | Nov 04, 2015-4. SPECIAL MEETTNG immediately following Workshop in the Board Room |
| :--- | :--- |
| Category | 10. Consent Agenda |
| Subject | CS5 Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach - New Application |
| Type | Action. (Consent) |
| Recommended | I recommend the Board deny the application of Renaissance Charter High School of Palm <br> Action |
| Beach for any and/or all of the reasons stated by the evaluation instruments and the overall <br> assessment, and authorize the Superintendent and/or his designee to sign all related <br> correspondence and documents. |  |

## DESCRIPTION:

On August 3, 2015, the Department of Charter Schools received an application from Renaissance Charter School, Inc. to open Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach in the School Distritt of Palm Beach County in August, 2016.

Per the listing of applicants filed in 2015, with the Florida Department of Education, Renaissance Charter School, Inc. submitted one application to Duval County (Renalssance Charter School at Coastal Duval) and one application to Seminole County (Renalssance Charter School at Seminole).

A review of the application was conducted using the required Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instrument.
Renalssance Charter High School of Palm Beach "Does Not Meet the Standard" in the required 19 sections.
Flve sections recelved a rating of "Partially Meets the Standard:"

- Section 6-Exceptional Students (ESE)
- Section 7 - English Language Learners
- Section 13-Student Recruitment and Enrollment
- Section 17 - Budget
- Section 19 - Action Plan

One section received a rating of "Does Not Meet the Standard."

- Section 1 - Mission, Guiding Principles \& Purpose

Per the Overall Assessment Summary/Checklist, the ratings indicated that the application did not meet the statutory requirements set forth in the Florida Charter School Application Evaluation Instruments and their referenced statutes, including F.S. 1002.33(6). (See Overall Assessment/Checkilst) It was determined that substantive changes to the application would have been needed to cure these deficiencies and the School District does not accept substantive changes.
"If an application is denied, the sponsor shall, within 10 calendar days after such denfal, articulate in writing the specific reasons, based upon good cause, supporting its denlal of the charter application and shall provide the letter of denial and supporting documentation to the applicant and to the Department of Education."

Altached are copies of the full Application, Budget, Evaluation Instruments with Reviewers' Notes, Overall Assessment, Board Notification, and Matrix for November 4, 2015 Agenda Items.

## CONTACI:

David Christiansen, Ed.D., Deputy Superintendent/Chief of Schools (david,christiansenompaimbeachschools.ora) Keith Oswald, Chief Academic Officer

Joseph M. Lee, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent
James T. Pegg, Director
RNANCIAL IMPACT:
There is no financial impact to the District.
SCHOOL BOARD GOALS: (Check all that apply.)
X 1. Student First Philosophy

- 2. Family Matters
- 3, Qualfied and Highly Effective Workforce
a 4. Efficlency and Accountability
- 5. Cómmunity Engagement
- 6. Communication

RenCen HS of PB - New Application.pdf ( $11,909 \mathrm{~KB}$ )
RenCen HS of $9 B$ - Evaluation Section 1, nd ( 65 KB )
RenCen HS of PB - Evaluation Section 5 . pdF ( 76 KB )
RenCen HS of PB - Evaluation Section 7.pdf ( 64 KB )
Rencen HS of PB - Evaluation Section 13 .pdf ( 66 KB )
Rencen HS of $P B$ - Evaluation Section 17 ndf ( 304 KB )
Rencen HS of PB - Evaluation Section $19 . \operatorname{sff}$ ( 62 KB )
RenCen HS of PB - Overall Assessment. pdf ( 49 KB )
Rencen HS of PB - Board Notification - 10-28-15.palf (764 KB)
APPLICATION MATRIX - November 4_2025.pdF (49KB)


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hereinatter the written notice of appeal filed by the Applicant with the Agency Clerk for the Department of Edacation on December 10,2015 , with the attachments thereto, will be referred to as its "Notice of Appeal."

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ While the Applicant provided the November 13, 2015 denial letter as an exhibit, it did not include the attachments. Accordingly, the School Board has included the attachments as a composite exhibit to this response, Exhibit "A."

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Of note, the Applicant's incorporation of a newspaper article about the Board Meeting is inappropriate, as it is not property part of the record on appeal. See Fla. Admin. Code R. $6 \mathrm{~A}-6.0781(\mathrm{I})(\mathrm{b})$. The Applicant may offer its opinion about what occurred at the Board Meeting in its written arguments; the article has no place in these proceedings.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ The School Board was required to use the Evaluation Instrument. See Fla. Admin. Code R. 6A-6.0786.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ This fact is consistent with the Charter School Statute, which only permits an applicant to make "technical or nonstustantive corrections or clarifications," such as grammatical or typographical errors, before a district school board approves or denies the final application. § 1002.33 (6)(b), Fla. Stat. (2015); cf. Sch Bd. of Volusia Cly, 974 So. $2 d$ at 1191 (school board lacked good cause to deny application based on typographical error that applicant had indicated it was willing to correct). Accordingly, any missing "important additional information" that would cause an application to only partially meet the standard could not be added after the application was submitted.
    ${ }^{6}$ The School Board acknowledges that the issues in Section 19, Action Plan, were clarified at the interview and that that one Section should have been rated as meeting the standard.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ Notably, the prescribed method for asserting that an agency rule is an invalid exercise of delegated legislative authority is found in section 120.56, Florida Statutes, as part of the Administrative Procedure Act.
    ${ }^{8}$ The Applicant's argument that the duty to ensure the charter is innovative applies to the charter contract and not to the charter school itself is specious. The chater governs how the charter school will operate. The term "charte" in that context clearly encompasses the instructional program of the charter school, which is the charter school's duty to implement. That is why the sponsor is also required to ensure that the charter is consistent with the state educational goals in section 1000.03(5), Florida Statutes, which sets forth "It he priorities of Florida's K-20 education system[.]"

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ See Sieniarecki v. State, 756 So. 2 d 68 (Fla. 2000) (in absence of a statutory definition, words of common usage are construed in their plain and ordinary sense and, if necessary, the plain and ordinary meaning of the word can be ascertained by reference to a dictionary).

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ Section 1002.33 (6)(a) 6 does not require that the Applicant "agree" to providing such information.
    ${ }^{11}$ The Applicant also argues that the CSAC and SBE "specifically rejected the 'lack of innovation' argument" in an appeal last year. (Notice of Appeal at 7.) Notably, the CSAC did not expressly comment on the School Board's innovation argument in its recommendation (CSAC Recommendation, Fla. Charter Ed. Found. v. Sch. Bd of Paln Beach Cty., Case No. 2015-3112, Apr. 15, 2015), nor did the SBE in its Order (SBE Final Order, Fla. Charter Ed. Found v. Sch. Bd. of Palm Beach Coy., Case No. 2015-3112, Apr. 23, 2015). Accordingly, neither the CSAC recommendation nor the DOE's final order from that appeal constitute precedent on the issue of innovation. Furthermore, the School Board has appealed the SBE's ruling to the Fourth District Court of Appeal, and the appeal involves the meaning of the term "innovative" in the Charter School Statute. See Sch. Bd of Palm Bch. Cnty v. Fla. Chater Ed, Found, Inc., No. 4D15-2032 (Fla. 4th DCA, initial brief filed Sep. 28, 2015).

[^8]:    ${ }^{12}$ The current version of the statute similarly states: "The sponsor shall not apply its policies to a charter school tuless. mutually agreed to by both the sponsor and the charter school." $\$ 1002.33(5)$ (b)I.d, Fla. Stat. (2015). The ImhotepNguzo cout emphasized that the statute does not "prohibit the School Board from adopting and enforcing policies related to the creation, renewal or termination of the charter schools they sponsor . . . . because the legislature has delegated primary decision-making authority to the school boards over these basic decisions." 947 So. 2d at 1284.

[^9]:    ${ }^{13}$ Even at the interview, the Applicant would only state that enrollment for the next school year would be "questioned" where the volunteer requirement was not fulfilled. (See Exhibit 4 at 17.) Though given repeated opportunities to do so, the Applicant failed to explain "if and how" the volunteer requirement would be enforced. (See id at 11-23.) This information was crucial to confirm that the school's enrollment process would be fair, as required by the Charter School Statute. The failure to describe an enforcement plan meant that District reviewers (and in turn the School Board) were provided no assurances against arbitrary (i.e., unfair) enforcement of the volunteer requirement.

[^10]:    ${ }^{14}$ As discussed above, the District reviewer for Section 6 utilized a number closer to the previous year's figure, $14 \%$, when she was reviewing that Section. In any event, $10 \%$ was well below both the previous year's figure and the one provided to applicants for this year's application cycle.

[^11]:    ${ }^{15}$ Application of collateral estoppel "requires examination of extrinsic evidence," namely "the pleadings and judgments in the prior litigation[.]"Univ, Hosp., Ltd. v. State, Agency for Health Care Admin, 697 So. 2d 909, 912 (Fla. Ist DCA 1997). The Applicant has offered no evidence regarding past applications.

[^12]:    ${ }^{16}$ See Notice of Appeal at 2 ("RCS intended to open the Renaissance Charter High School of Palm Beach to provide further education to the large number of students it was already educating in Palm Beach County who wanted to stay with its school program through high school.").
    ${ }^{n}$ Although it is not within the purview of the SBE to rule on the constitutionality of statutes, the SBE's exercise of its authority to reject the School Board's denial of the Application would also be unconstitutional and the SBE should decline to exercise it. The School Board also raises this argument to preserve the issue for further appellate review.

[^13]:    ${ }^{18}$ State Board of Education Rule 6A-6.0781, regarding procedures for appealing the denial of an application, reiterates the very limited statutory appeal process.

[^14]:    ${ }^{19}$ The Applicant may argue that the Fifh District Court of Appeal in 2008 rejected an assertion "that, because the act of operating and controlling all free public schools in [the] County is conferred exclusively on the School Board, section 1002.33 (6)(c) is unconstitutional because it permits the State Board to open a chaiter school." School Board of Volusia County, 974 So. 2d at 1191. To save the statute, the Fifth District reasoned, inter alia, that "Igranting a charter application is not equivalent to opening a public school." Id. at 1193. That reasoning is flawed, however, as approval of the application plainly begins the establishment of the school. With the statutory authority to overturn school board decisions and unilaterally direct school boards to approve charters, the SBE is ultimately in control of a charter school's establishment and operation. Accordingly, the Fifth District's decision in Academies of Excellence. should not dissuade the SBE from recognizing that the administrative appeal process in the Charter School Statute is unconstitutional or declining to exercise its statutory authority to reject the School Board's denial of the Application.

[^15]:    Section 7
    Partially Meets the Standard
    Stephen Byrne (8/24/15 12:29 PM)
    Schools must reference compliance with the District agreement with the United States
    Department of Justice which was signed by the Superintendent on February 26, 2013.

[^16]:    The Schook Distutct of Palm Iteach County
    A Top-Rated District by the flortla Depatment of Education Shice 2005
    

