

Adopted, as amended, by the Board of Education at its Regular Meeting of May 11, 2010

Superintendent's Proposal

**Superintendent's Recommendation Regarding
THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL**

**104-13Sp2 -~~AUTHORIZATION TO GRANT OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE DENY~~ DENY
THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL'S PETITION FOR A
NEW CHARTER SCHOOL**

WHEREAS: THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL submitted a Petition for
THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL, a new Charter School on April 5, 2010;
and

WHEREAS: THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL is requesting that the
Board of Education make a final decision regarding the new charter by May 11, 2010 so
that **THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL** may use the remainder of this school
year and next school year – 2010-2011 – for planning purposes with the goal of opening
the new Charter School in August 2011; and

WHEREAS: The San Francisco Unified School District staff ~~will complete~~ **has**
completed the review of **THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL** Petition and its
final report and recommendation ~~will be~~ **has been** forwarded to the Board of Education.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Education, based on the findings
of SFUSD District staff, ~~grant this charter petition or in the alternative~~ deny the petition.
~~based on staff's findings; and~~

~~**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:** That if the Board of Education grants the Petition for a
Charter School, **THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL** shall negotiate and
execute in good faith an annual Memorandum of Understanding with the school district
prior to the commencement of its operation in August of 2011, and both parties agree to
abide by the terms of the MOU and that **THE MISSION PREPARATORY SCHOOL**
shall abide by all the local, state, and federal laws applicable to charter schools.~~

Superintendent's Proposal
104-13Sp2
4/13/10
5/11/10

Please Note:

- Referred by order of the Chair to the Curriculum and Program and Budget and Business Services Committees.
- Taken up by the Budget and Business Services Committee on 4/29/10. Forwarded to the Board with a negative recommendation by general consent of the Committee.
- Taken up by the Curriculum and Program Committee on 5/3/10. Forwarded to the Board with a negative recommendation by general consent of the Committee.
- Adopted, as amended, by the Board of Education on 5/11/10.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING
RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF
EDUCATION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD

ON 5/11/10 BY A VOTE OF 5 AYES

0 NAYS 0 ABSTAIN 0 ABSENT.

Esther V. Casco
Esther V. Casco, Executive Assistant
Board Of Education Date 5/13/10

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT CHARTER SCHOOL MATRIX

School Name: Mission Preparatory School

Date Submitted: April 5, 2010

Initial Charter Petition

Charter Renewal

REQUIRED PETITION SIGNATURES IF CONVERSION OF EXISTING PUBLIC SCHOOL (Education Code 47605(a))				
	Yes	No	N/A	
• 50% of permanent status teachers of school to be converted			X	
REQUIRED PETITION SIGNATURES IF NOT CONVERSION OF EXISTING PUBLIC SCHOOL (Education Code 47605(a))				
	Yes	No	N/A	
• 50% of parents/guardians of number of students expected to attend charter school for its 1st year of operations			X	
OR				
	Yes	No	N/A	
• 50% of the number of teachers expected to teach at the charter school during its 1st year of operation	X			
REQUIRED AFFIRMATIONS (Education Code 47605(d)(1))				
	Yes	No	N/A	
Statement that school will be non-sectarian in its programs, admission policies, employment practices, and all other operations, will not charge tuition, and will not discriminate against any pupil on the basis of ethnicity, national origin, gender or disability	X			
REQUIRED ELEMENTS (Education Code 47605(a)-(o))				
A. Educational Program	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Targeted School Populations				
◆ Age, grade levels and number of students		X		
◆ Type of desired student populations		X		
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Attendance				
◆ School year and school day		X		

◆ Attendance requirements				
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. What it Means to be an Educated Person in The 21st Century	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Objective of enabling pupils to become self-motivated, competent, lifelong learners	X			
◆ Clear list of general academic skills and qualities important for an educated person	X			
Clear list of general non-academic skills and qualities important for an educated person	X			

- ◆ *Strongly suggested to ensure that charter elements are reasonably comprehensive.*
- Required to be included in charter petition and/or Memorandum of Understanding.*
No legend indicates that while not necessarily recommended, they would be nice to include.

<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Description of How Learning Best Occurs	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
Persuasive instructional design		X		
◆ • Broad outline (not entire scope and sequence) of the curriculum content		X		
◆ • Description of instructional approaches and strategies	X			
◆ • Description of learning setting (e.g. traditional, home-based, distance learning, etc.)		X		
◆ Proposed program strongly aligned to school's mission	X			
◆ Affirmation that, or description of, how curriculum aligned to student performance standards		X		
◆ Outlines a plan or strategy to support students not meeting pupil outcomes		X		
◆ Instructional design or strategies based upon successful practice or research	X			
◆ Describes strategies for special education, Limited English proficient students, etc.			X	
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Transferability of Courses (High School)	Strong			N/A
Clear description of transferability of courses to other high schools and eligibility of courses to meet college entrance requirements.				X
B. Measurable Student Outcomes - “Exit Outcomes” or “Graduation Standards”	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Pupil outcomes are measurable, i.e. specific assessments listed for each exit outcome		X		
◆ How pupil outcomes will address state content and performance standards in core academics		X		
◆ Exit outcomes include acquisition of academic and non-academic skills		X		
Concise (one page) list of exit outcomes encompass specific skills, not too vague	X			
Affirmation that "benchmark" skills and specific classroom-level skills will be developed		X		
◆ Affirmation/description that exit outcomes will align to mission, curriculum and assessments		X		
Affirmation that college-bound students wishing to attend California colleges or universities will have the opportunity to take courses that meet the “A–F” requirements				X
◆ Lists school-wide student performance goals students will make over a given period of time, projected attendance, dropout, or graduation rate goals, etc.		X		
◆ Acknowledges that exit outcomes and performance goals may need to be modified over time		X		

◆ If high school, graduation requirements defined				X
◆ If high school, WASC accreditation standards addressed				X
C. The Method by Which Pupil Progress in Meeting the Pupil Outcomes Will be Measured	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
◆ At least one assessment method or tool listed for each of the exit outcomes	X			
Assessments include multiple, valid and reliable measures using traditional/ alternative tools	X			
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment tools include all required state assessments (STAR and API)		X		
◆ Chosen assessments are appropriate for standards and skills they seek to measures		X		
◆ Affirmation/description of how assessments align to mission, exit outcomes, and curriculum		X		
◆ Describes minimal required performance level necessary to attain each standard		X		
◆ Outlines a plan for collecting, analyzing and reporting student/school performance data		X		
D. Governance Structure of School Including, But Not Limited to, Parental Involvement	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Describes what role parents have in the governance of the school			X	
<input type="checkbox"/> Describes key features of governing structure (usually a board of directors) such as:		X		
• Size/composition of board		X		
• Board committees or advisory councils		X		
• Board's scope of authority/responsibility		X		
• Method for selecting initial board members		X		
• Board election/appointment and turnover		X		
◆ Affirms future development of, or has set of, proposed bylaws, policies or similar documents		X		
◆ Initial governing board members identified by name or the process used to select them		X		
◆ Clear description of school's legal status and determination of whether a board member from the charter-granting agency is on the board of the charter		X		
◆ Outlines other important legal or operational relationships between school and granting agency			X	
Comments:				
<p>The Governance section does not supply a solid description of how parents will be involved – it just states that parents “may” be invited to Participate in ad hoc committees, and that the Board will meet pursuant to the Brown Act, with public noticed meetings.</p> <p>There is no description of the important legal or operational relationships between the school and the District.</p>				
E. Qualifications to be Met by Individuals to be Employed by The School	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
◆ Identifies key staff positions with the school	X			
◆ Describes specific key qualifications (knowledge, experience, education, certification, etc.)	X			
<input type="checkbox"/> Defines “core, college preparatory teachers/affirms they will hold appropriate credentials	See Comment			

(Commission on Teacher Credentialing Certificate/permit)				
Identifies any non-core, non-college prep teaching positions staffed by non-certified teachers and their qualifications	X			
Comments: While the petition describes their teaching staff members qualifications and their recruitment efforts with focus on attracting highly skilled educators with a “no-excuse” attitude and a commitment to “hard work” this intention is not commensurate with petitioners’ public statements that most of their teachers in start-up year will be newer/beginning teachers. The petition also describes a longer school year without additional compensation for staff.				
F. Health and Safety Procedures	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Affirms that each employee will furnish the school with a criminal record summary		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outlines specific health and safety practices addressing such key areas as:		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Seismic safety (structural integrity and earthquake preparedness)		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Student safety procedures clearly stated		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Natural disasters and emergencies		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Immunizations, health screenings, administration of medications		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Tolerance for use of drugs and/or tobacco		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Staff training on emergency and first aid response		X		
<input type="checkbox"/> References/accompanied by more detailed set of health and safety related policies/procedures.		X		
Comments: All employees must go through criminal background checks – not just new. Safety Plan needs to include Crisis Response protocol.				
G. Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial and Ethnic Balance	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists several specific practices/policies likely to lead to a diverse applicant pool/enrollment: practices and policies appear to be selected to target relevant racial and ethnic groups			See Comment	
Comments: While the petition states their target student population will be ELLs and lower SES students from the Mission District to ensure access to a broader, more diverse pool of applicants they should provide additional outreach sessions and materials in languages other than English and Spanish.				
H. Admissions Requirements	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory assurances regarding non-discriminatory admission procedures		X		
<input type="checkbox"/> No contradiction of admissions requirements re: conversion schools and public random drawings		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clearly describes admissions requirements, including any preferences		X		

◆ Proposed admissions and enrollment process and timeline		X		
I. Financial Audit	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
◆ Procedure to select and retain independent auditor	X			
Qualifications of independent auditor	X			
◆ Audit will employ generally accepted accounting procedures	X			
Describe specific scope of audit	X			
◆ Timing of audit and whom it will be sent to	X			
◆ Process for resolving audit exceptions to satisfaction of granting agencies	X			
Comments:				
All elements are in place.				
J. Pupil Suspension and Expulsion	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
◆ Detailed, step-by-step process by which student may be suspended or expelled OR		X		
◆ Reference to a comprehensive set of student disciplinary policies		X		
◆ Outlines or describes strong understanding of relevant laws protecting constitution rights of students, generally, and of disabled and other protected classes of students		X		
◆ Policies balance students' rights to due process with responsibility to maintain a safe learning environment		X		
◆ Explains how resident school district or COE will be involved in disciplinary matters		X		
K. Staff Retirement System	Yes	No	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Statement of whether staff will participate in STRS, PERS, or Social Security (if STRS, then all teachers must do so)	X			
L. Attendance Alternatives	Yes	No	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> States that students may attend other district schools or pursue an inter-district transfer in accordance with existing enrollment and transfer policies of their district or county of residence or description of other attendance alternatives	X			
M. Description of Employee Rights	Yes	No	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement that collective bargaining contract in sponsor district will be controlling	X			
◆ Whether and how staff may resume employment within the district	X			
◆ Sick/vacation leave (ability to carry it over to and from charter school)	X			
◆ Whether staff will continue to earn service credit (tenure) in district while at charter school	X			
N. Dispute Resolution Process	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
◆ Outlines a simple process for charter and granting agency to settle disputes		X		
◆ Process indicates whether it is binding on school or granting agency/fair process		X		
◆ Step by step process for identifying/framing dispute points				

• Whether internal charter disputes may be brought to granting agency		X		
• Identifies specific parties to be involved at each step		X		
• Basic rules at each step			X	
• Which results are binding		X		
Comments: The dispute resolution section states that MPS will frame the disputed issue in a dispute statement that is submitted to the Superintendent and Head of School, and states that the dispute statement will indicate whether the BOE believes that the issue could lead to revocation. It is not clear how this would work given that the Board meets every other week and how would they actually insert this language into MPS's dispute statement.				
O. Labor Relations		Yes	No	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Whether charter or local school district will be employer for EERA purposes		X		
If local district the employer, includes provisions clarifying charter's roles in collective Bargaining		X		
P. Closure of Charter School		Yes	No	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Clear description of procedures to be used if the charter school closes to include final audit disposition of assets and liabilities, and transfer of records.		X		

Special Education/SELPA (SAN FRANCISCO SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY)	Yes	No	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies whether or not in an independent LEA for special education purposes	X		
<input type="checkbox"/> Consulted with the SELPA Director	X		
• Discussed special education responsibilities of charter	X		
• Discussed application of SELPA policies	X		
<input type="checkbox"/> In writing explains how special education services will be provided consistent with SELPA plan and/or policies and procedures	X		
• Includes fiscal allocation plan	X		
<input type="checkbox"/> If charter not an independent LEA:			
• Clarifies in charter or an MOU the responsibilities of each party for service delivery	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> Referral	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> Instruction	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> Due Process	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> Agreements describing allocation of actual and excess costs	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> Charter fiscally responsible for fair share of any encroachment on general funds	MOU		
<input type="checkbox"/> If charter is LEA within SELPA			
• Notifies SELPA Director of intent prior to February 1 st of the preceding school year			X
• Located within SFUSD SELPA geographical boundaries			X
• Provides current operating budget in accordance with Ed Code 42130 and 42131			X
• Provides assurances that all be instructed in safe environment			X
• Provides copy of original charter petition and any amendments			X
• Responsible for any legal fees relating to application and assurances process			X
• Meets the terms of the “Agreement Regarding the Organization, Implementation, administration and Operation of the SELPA			X
• Meets the terms of all SFUSD SELPA policies and procedures			X
• Charter fiscally responsible for fair share of any encroachment on general funds			X
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition includes the following assurances:			
• The charter will comply with all provisions of IDEA	X		
• No student will be denied admission based on disability or lack of available services	X		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will implement a Student Study Team process 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any student potentially in need of Section 504 services responsibility of charter school 	X		
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition/MOU describes the process for notifying district of residence and chartering district when a special education student enrolls, becomes eligible, ineligible and/or leaves charter school	X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overview of how special education funding and services will be provided by:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Charter School 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Charter Granting Agency 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SELPA 	X		
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition/MOU describes the transition to or from a district when a student with an IEP enrolls in, or transfers out of, the charter school	X		
<p><u>Comments:</u></p> <p>The petition states the MPS will participate in SFUSD’s SELPA and as such will be considered a “school of the district” for Special Education purposes and receive all supports and services through SFUSD in exchange for a special education fee.</p>			

<p>Identifies any non-core, non-college prep teaching positions staffed by non-certified teachers and their qualifications</p>															
<p>F. Health and Safety Procedures</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Affirms that each employee will furnish the school with a criminal record summary</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outlines specific health and safety practices addressing such key areas as:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismic safety (structural integrity and earthquake preparedness) • Student safety procedures clearly stated • Natural disasters and emergencies • Immunizations, health screenings, administration of medications • Tolerance for use of drugs and/or tobacco • Staff training on emergency and first aid response 												
<p><input type="checkbox"/> References/accompanied by more detailed set of health and safety related policies/procedures.</p>															
<p>G. Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial and Ethnic Balance</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists several specific practices/policies likely to lead to a diverse applicant pool/enrollment: practices and policies appear to be selected to target relevant racial and ethnic groups</p>														
<p>H. Admissions Requirements</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory assurances regarding non-discriminatory admission procedures</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No contradiction of admissions requirements re: conversion schools and public random Drawings</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clearly describes admissions requirements, including any preferences</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed admissions and enrollment process and timeline</p>											
<p>I. Financial Audit</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Procedure to select and retain independent auditor</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualifications of independent auditor</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Audit will employ generally accepted accounting procedures</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Describe specific scope of audit</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timing of audit and whom it will be sent to</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process for resolving audit exceptions to satisfaction of granting agencies</p>									
<p>Comments: All elements are in place.</p>															

If local district the employer, includes provisions clarifying charter's roles in collective Bargaining			
P. Closure of Charter School	Yes	No	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Clear description of procedures to be used if the charter school closes to include final audit disposition of assets and liabilities, and transfer of records.			

REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION (Education Code 47605(g))

Financial Plan	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> First year operational budget <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start-up costs • Cash flow for first three years • Financial projections for first three years 		X		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning Assumptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number/types of students • Number of staff • Facilities needs • Costs of all major items are identified and within reasonable market ranges • Revenue assumptions in line with state and federal funding guidelines • Revenue from "soft" sources less than 10% of ongoing operational costs • Timeline allows window for grant applications to be submitted and funded 	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Start-Up Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identifies most major start-up costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Staffing <input type="checkbox"/> Facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment and Supplies <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Services • Assumptions in line with overall school design plan • Identifies potential funding source • Timeline allows for grant and fundraising 	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual Operating Budget <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual revenues and expenditures clearly identified by source 	Strong	Sufficient	Insufficient	N/A

• Content, process, timelines and evaluation criteria for charter renewal		X	
• Statement allowing reasonable opportunity to correct deficiencies in charter performance		X	
◆ Specific proposed support service needs and payments to district for services rendered			
• Clearly drafted contract or agreement		X	
◆ Identify whether or not will request district-owned facilities			
• Reasonably detailed lease or occupation agreement	X		X
◆ Proposed legal status of school is identified			
◆ Describes facilities agreements with charter-granting agency if appropriate		X	X
◆ Identify whether school intends to manage risk independently or secure it through district	X		
◆ Addresses the increased civil liability exposure for the district	X		

Comments:

Start up budget – budget for secretary is for 3 months, budget for facility is for 2 months. Will the secretary be working from home (assuming the director is) for one month? (narrative has 2 months, budget tables says 2-3 months) *Office space at Mission YMCA*

step 1 on SFUSD scale

Teacher salaries are low when compared to SFUSD salaries. Projected average salary for SFUSD for 180 days (7 hours / day) is \$61,070. MPS is budgeting \$58,000 per teacher for 190 days (8 hours/ day). Stipends for orientation at \$150 day. I do not see the additional funding for the 28 days (18 days in out years) of PD for teachers mentioned in the petition. *Salary includes prof dev 4 days.*

Salaries based on other charter schools and expectation that we will not be able to attract teachers with 10 yrs experience in SFUSD. Quotes from CSEA + private providers

Health plan costs are budgeted approximately \$1,500 lower than SFUSD amounts per employee. *lifetime costs built into SFUSD cost*

Student assumptions – budget assumptions note that 20% of students are expected to be below the poverty line, but 80% are expected to qualify for free and reduced priced lunch. FRPL eligibility is 130% of poverty, so this does not make sense. *Unclear why this is problematic*

Very low budget for materials and supplies for year 1 (and out years). *Comparable to other CA charter schools with similar education programs + student populations*

Funding for food is very low. Petition includes breakfast, snack and lunch and does include federal nutrition funding in revenues, but the budget listed would only provide \$1.65 per student for food. (\$47,115 /150 /190) *Quote from Revolution Foods*

~~Speciated encroachment is budgeted low; it is currently in excess of \$600/pupil.~~ *(Mary will delete - our projection of \$500 is accurate)*

**THE MISSION PREPARATORY CHARTER SCHOOL
STATEMENT AND WRITTEN FACTUAL FINDINGS IN SUPPORT
OF STAFF/SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION
Tuesday, May 11, 2010**

Education Code Section 47605 – Petition Process

The Mission Preparatory School submitted its' initial charter petition on April 5, 2010. On April 9, 2010 the petition was presented to the Board of Education along with a memo citing the timeline for staff review with final recommendation and Board decision to take place by May 11, 2010. A resolution for First Reading went before the Board at the regular meeting of April 13, 2010. During that meeting the petition was referred for hearing at both the Budget and Business Services Committee on April 29, 2010, and the Curriculum and Program Committee on May 3, 2010 which would ensure that the review process was complete and final recommendation and Board decision would be made by the first meeting in May.

After final review of the petition, inclusive of consideration or resolution of specific elements discussed in public hearing, district staff is recommending that the SFUSD Board of Education deny The Mission Preparatory School as it has concluded that the petitioner group will be unable to successfully implement their proposed program.

Pursuant to Education Code Section 47605, The Mission Preparatory School (MPS hereinafter) should be denied as:

- *The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition [California Education Code Section 47605(b)(2)].*

In support of the recommendation to deny, staff has prepared the following factual findings which will be attached to the amended language of Superintendent's Recommendation 104-13Sp1 for public record on Tuesday, May 11, 2010.

The findings include:

- Although the minimum threshold for submission and review of a charter petition is either 50% meaningful interest from teachers or 50% meaningful interest from parents of appropriate age to start a school prospective student enrollment is key to successful implementation. There is also a statement in the petition of starting the school with 90 K students and 60 1st with the heavier K load due to providing adequate financial footing for the school. While reviewing the signature pages of the petition there were 39 potential K-1 students with 11 of the 39 qualified (born in 2006/5 years) for your K class in 2011. Additionally, 14 of the 39 potential K-1 students were from the 94110 (Mission District). Again, the petition includes 50% of teachers' signatures but robust student enrollment is critical.
- In the Means to Achieve Racial/Ethnic Balance section of the petition MPS's efforts are focused on the Mission district and organizations therein. Because the target population focus is on EL students and students of poverty/low SES and those demographics span

racial/ethnic backgrounds the petition needs to provide enrollment access for all members of the community efforts need to include further outreach with organizations serving broader demographics, and include translation in languages in addition to Spanish.

- The petition states that MPS's target population will be comprised of 60-70% ELL. The petition states that it does "not intend to adopt a singular English language development program". It does not dedicate an ELD period during the regular instructional day for English learners to study the ELD standards. It asserts that "students who need additional support with English language acquisition" will receive sessions in the Academic Support class, where tutoring and homework occurs. While the petition describes that it will develop English learners' English proficiency in two years through reading intervention, vocabulary instruction, and developing academic English, there is no reference to teaching English Language Development content standards.
- The petition's professional development plan and the educational services to its English learners identifies an extensive list of topics and strategies but does not address what professional developers will provide trainings other than the designated head of school, or who on site will develop expertise to coach teachers. The Academic Dean is scheduled to be hired in the school's third year. The petition describes that the Dean will "design, teach, and lead professional development when appropriate".
- In addition to serving almost 70% ELL students the petition cites that MPS anticipates at least 80% students of poverty. Although, the proposed staffing chart for the first two years of operation only includes head of school, teachers, and two operations managers. The petition states some reference to non-academic supports and given the disproportionate students of poverty population it would be better to include MPS counseling staff member in start-up years to coordinate and provide site-based supports and services, and specific PD for staff to use during the instructional day to engage students of poverty/lower SES. While the petition emphasizes "hard work/no excuses" and extended day learning opportunities this might be a better "front load" turn-around strategy for middle or high school students not for start-up with 5 or 6 year old students.
- The petition describes MPS as K-8 school located and serving predominantly students and families from the Mission District with special focus on ELL , low SES, and special needs students. At the Curriculum and Program Committee meeting several parents who spoke in support of MPS did so because they were excited about the second language opportunity – specifically Spanish Bilingual/Immersion. Although, in the petition Spanish language and literacy classes occur during Enrichment period only. The Enrichment period is dedicated to Music, Art, or Dance will be taught in Spanish.

It states that those “in grades K-5 may attend Spanish language and literacy classes in enrichment periods”. While as a fundamental school focused on basic skills, the petition does not describe the Spanish language and literacy curriculum and instructional approach. In grades 6-8, Spanish is included in the daily schedule.

- In the Student Discipline section of the charter, petitioner states that MPS will implement “The Self Control Classroom” incentive/consequence approach as well as adhering to the standards set forth in Ed. Code and law. Again, given the high needs target population of MPS the concern is that there is no identified counselor or student support personnel listed as part of MPS’s staff to administer the program or to train and assist teachers in implementation.
- In the Governance section of the petition it is not clear how parents will be included in decision-making only stating that they “may” be invited to participate in ad hoc committees. Additionally, the resumes supplied for the initial Board of Directors does not include any members with school based practical, administrative, or operations experience.
- MPS describes qualifications and recruitment of teaching staff in Section E of the petition to focus on attracting highly skilled educators with a “no excuse/hard work” attitude and commitment and was not consistent with petitioner group’s public comments at Budget Committee hearing that most of their start-up staff would be newer/beginning teachers and would embrace the challenge of extended work day/school year without commensurate compensation.
- The petition also describes MPS’s school year to have 190 days – 10 additional days of instruction. The petition also describes extended daily schedules/hours – 432 additional annual hours for K-5 and 252 aah for 6-8. The petition also describes a 15 day remedial program during the summer months for those not meeting grade standards. It is not clear – especially for the summer program – from the budget worksheets how the additional days will be specifically funded except statements that staff will work “harder”.
- The petition states that MPS expects to serve at least 80% low income students with a large portion of that percent qualifying for FRL. Petitioner also stated publicly that they will provide subsidized meals and snack for 100% of their population regardless of qualification. The funding described in MPS’s budget for this potential subsidy is well below what they would have to supplement based on federal nutrition revenues that they would capture for their qualifying students.

The legislative intent of the Charter Schools Act of 1992 was in part to encourage innovation and provide parents and students with expanded choices. MPS’s educational program and philosophy as presented in their petition share a variety of common features with most of SFUSD’s existing regular public schools. The MPS petition proposes daily schedules of instruction - DEAR Time, Read Aloud, Advisory, balanced literacy: Guided

Reading/Phonic and Phonemic Awareness and Writing, Community Meetings, do-nows/sponges/warm-ups, Academic Support/extended learning, PE, and enrichment (arts/music, etc.) include many/all of the strategies currently used in the schools cited as well as other K-5 and K-8 public schools currently operating in/around the Mission District. Some examples include SF Community K-8, Marshall ES, Moscone ES, Alvarado ES, and Buena Vista ES.

Finally it is important to note that MPS has indicated in their petition that the vision of their school is to support children growing up in low-income communities such as the Mission District in San Francisco to access a rigorous college preparatory public education. The petition also states that it has strong support of a founding Board of Directors as well as many Mission District families and organizations. The petition was developed by the Lead Founder with support as a Fellow under the national organization Building Excellent Schools - Building Excellent Schools Fellows' focus on founding and leading a results-focused, mission-driven, high-achieving urban charter school. Also, the petition does describe the founding Board of Directors role in the initial years of operation but it is unclear to district staff whether the families and community supporters will play an integral role, or, have made a specific commitment to participate in the implementation, development and daily operations of the proposed school.

May 6, 2010

Ms. Mary Richards
Executive Director, Charters, K-8s, Small Schools
San Francisco Unified School District
555 Franklin St.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mary,

As the founding team of The Mission Preparatory School, we thank the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) staff and commissioners for conducting a thorough review of our charter proposal and engaging with us in dialogue about the proposed school. We share your commitment to access, opportunity, and achievement, and we will uphold that commitment for every family from every background that wants the choice to send their child to Mission Prep. Our aim is to provide a new public school option within the district to meet the specific needs and the demand of families and the broader community and to eliminate the predictive power of demographics for all children we have the duty to educate.

We are grateful for the thorough review process and particularly pleased to note that our proposal was rated "strong," "sufficient," or with a "yes" as having met the standard on 138 out of 146 evaluation criteria. As evidenced by our accountability plan and our high expectations for all future students and staff, and for ourselves, we are committed to being held to the highest standard. Therefore, we wish to address and respond to the items rated as "insufficient" on the review matrix, as well as other aspects of the proposal that were called into question during the review process.

As SFUSD School Board President Jane Kim noted at the Curriculum Committee meeting on May 3, 2010, Mission Prep is designed according to proven school design elements and instructional strategies, yet such components are only as effective as the school leader and staff are at implementing them. The leadership, training, and support Mission Prep's proposed Head of School Jane Henzerling will bring, bolstered by her incredible track record of achievement as a teacher, instructional leader, and non-profit executive, make her uniquely positioned to recruit and lead a highly effective staff to implement the mission and meet the accountability goals outlined in the charter.

Our strong and first preference is to be part of the district's comprehensive and far-reaching efforts to meet the academic needs of every child within the district. Our commitment remains, however, should this not be possible, and we will use

appropriate next steps at the state level to make Mission Prep a reality for all the families and students whom we would have the privilege to serve.

We provide responses to the charter review below, and we are available to clarify any further items as may be helpful. Thank you again for your careful consideration and for sharing our commitment to ensuring every child in San Francisco has access to the highest-quality public education. We look forward to the days and weeks ahead as we work to become part of San Francisco's comprehensive effort to meet the academic needs of every student.

Respectfully,

The Mission Preparatory School Founding Team

Kirsten Bourne

Clay Deanhardt

Jane Henzerling

Saamra Mekuria-Grillo

David Noyola

Lou Vasquez

Mario Rubiano Yedidia

Required Petition Signatures

We appreciate the indication that we have satisfied and exceeded the petition signatures requirement with nine (9) teacher signatures, which is five (5) more than the four (4) required for a school with seven (7) teachers in its first year. We also appreciate that staff members noted that we went above and beyond that requirement and began collecting parent signatures as part of our early student recruitment efforts. These efforts are growing by the day, and we will continue to intensify and expand these efforts over the 15 months leading up to the school's opening as we know how critical it is, both in terms of meeting our stated mission and in being a viable and sustainable school, that we meet our enrollment targets.

A. Educational Program

Serving English Language Learners

The Mission Preparatory School expects 60-70% of our student population to be English Language Learners. Thus, we have structured our educational and professional development models to ensure that we are able to meet these students' needs.

Our developmentally-appropriate and highly-structured approach to teaching English (articulated most robustly in the "Supporting Limited English Proficient Students" section of our petition, pages 68-72) will ensure that we identify, monitor, assess and continually develop the academic English skills of our Limited English Proficient students.

Each regular school day, Mission Prep students with limited English proficiency will participate in 45-minute English Language Development (ELD) sessions during the scheduled Academic Support time (outlined on page 39 and referenced on page 69). California's ELD content standards are part of our scope and sequence (Appendix U) and assessment program (pages 80-81). During our three daily literacy blocks, our teachers will integrate specific strategies to promote English vocabulary acquisition, oral language development, reading comprehension, and writing production and provide specific instruction to meet ELD standards during differentiated guided reading groups (page 70). Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) will be central to our teachers' instructional strategies in all content classes, such that our ELL students will continually develop their proficiency with English while mastering grade-level skills and content (page 69).

As indicated in our sample lesson plans for all grade levels (Appendix R), each Mission Prep teacher will incorporate English Language Development into their daily pedagogy. At a minimum, our teachers will plan for “What key vocabulary words [they will teach]” and “What Structured English Immersion strategies [they will implement]” in every lesson to ensure mastery of both curricular and ELD content and skills standards.

The Mission Preparatory School’s standards and assessment protocol for English Language Development involves regular, strategic assessment of the English language development of our Limited English Proficient students as set forth in Element C of our petition, which articulates “The method by which pupil progress in meeting pupil outcomes is to be measured” and begins on page 79 of our proposal; the assessment tools and timeline specific to English Language Development are enumerated beginning at the bottom of page 80. Our students’ English Language Development will be assessed by our teachers in: “daily and/or weekly” Internally-Created Assessments; at the “beginning of the year, end of each unit, end of each quarter, and the end of the year” with Interim Assessments (IA); through the CELDT, which will be conducted “upon [a student’s] enrollment and annually thereafter”; and by way of an Oral Language Development Assessment, conducted for each LEP student “every six weeks or as often as needed.”

Moreover, the Mission Preparatory School’s professional development model and teacher recruitment guidelines prioritize our teachers’ ability to develop the English language skills of our Limited English Proficient students. This commitment is borne out, for example, in the key qualifications of our proposed teaching staff, which include preference for “experience in English Language Development and demonstrated success in supporting English Language Learners to reach ambitious achievement outcomes” (page 100). Our extensive professional development program will ensure that our teachers “provide strategic, targeted English Language Development for English Language Learners so they are equipped to meet the same ambitious academic goals as native- English speakers” (page 23). As noted in the Professional Development sub-section of the “Supporting Limited English Proficient Students” section:

We will support teachers by providing: professional development on structured immersion instruction; specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) teaching strategies; language acquisition and development; and monitoring and assessment of ELLs. We commit to monthly professional development specifically addressing instructional effectiveness in promoting language development, reviewing assessment data, and revising instructional strategies to meet our ELL students’ needs. (page 72).

Our professional development program, including 18 days prior to the start of the school year, eight (8) days during the year, two (2) days at the conclusion of the school year, and 2.5 hours every Wednesday afternoon, provides for extensive time to develop and support our teachers' effectiveness in meeting the academic needs of all students, and to provide targeted development for serving English Language Learners.

Serving High-Poverty Students

Our target population includes students of high-poverty communities, and as such, all elements of the school design are specifically informed by their academic needs. The inter-related instructional and design elements that form the foundation for Mission Prep are those that have proven highly effective and essential in schools serving students growing up in poverty. It is the presence of all of these elements, and the acute understanding the proposed Head of School possesses in how to plan and execute on each one at a high level, that will ensure students of Mission Prep reach unprecedented levels of academic achievement.

As described in our charter proposal:

Our models for the academic program and the school's college-going culture are developed from detailed in-person study of successful practices of high-performing urban schools that serve low-income student populations and from research detailing the most effective approaches to accelerating student achievement for under-performing student populations. (pages 34-35)

Analysis of urban charter schools achieving exceptional, measurable results indicates a core set of common characteristics that drive the overarching school design, educational program, staffing, and day-to-day operations. These include:

- Firm belief that all students can learn and achieve at high levels
- Clear, outcome-focused mission, understood by all, evidenced throughout school
- Frequent internal assessments with data to drive instruction
- Highly-visible leader who ensures all are focused on the mission
- Clear and frequent communication with parents regarding student performance
- Highly-structured learning environment and sound operating principles
- Strong curricular focus on skill mastery
- School-wide practices that promote continuity from one classroom to another
- Extended school day and year
- "No-excuses" culture that promotes accountability at all levels, from the leader, to teachers, to students, to parents, to the governing board

In designing and delivering on the college-preparatory mission of Mission Prep, we stay true to these core elements that have shaped high-performing urban schools' effectiveness and impact while adapting our model to meet the specific needs and articulated desires of our school community.

Professional Development

To ensure our teachers are equipped with the training, ongoing support, and strategic planning time needed to meet all students' needs, and the often greater needs of children growing up in poverty and of English Language Learners, we have proposed to provide a total of 28 full professional development days and 2.5 hours every Wednesday for mastery/gap analysis and collaborative planning. We have outlined the objectives for our 18 days of professional development prior to the start of the school year, the eight (8) days during the school year, and the two (2) days at the conclusion of the school year on pages 22-24 of the charter application. We will develop the specific training modules to meet these objectives during our planning year.

In designing and providing professional development, perhaps one of Mission Prep's greatest assets is the school founder and proposed Head of School herself. Jane Henzerling's background as an urban educator and a teacher professional developer in high-poverty communities, and as someone who has researched, developed, and implemented district-wide English Language Acquisition programming make her perfectly suited to train and support teachers serving our target population. To further supplement her expertise, Ms. Henzerling will spend multiple weeks in leadership residency during the spring, summer, and fall of 2010 in two highly successful charter schools serving high-ELL, high-poverty student populations to engage in, learn from, and evaluate their professional development programs. These experiences, continued collaboration with a network of more than 30 effective urban charter school leaders nationally, and partnering with experts in the field to provide training in key methodologies (such as the Taxonomy of Effective Teaching Practices, specially designed academic instruction in English, and Reading Mastery) will ensure Mission Prep develops and executes a professional development program designed to equip teachers with the skills and strategies that have proven most effective in driving academic achievement, particularly for students growing up in poverty and English Language Learners.

To address another issue noted in the staff review, we appreciate the recognition of our two operations staff – an operations manager and an operations coordinator (which is an administrative support staff person). Having more support on the operations side of our proposed school will further free our Head of School to truly function as the

instructional leader of the school as she works directly with our seven (7), then 10 teachers in our first two (2) years, during dedicated professional development days and in ongoing cycles of observation and feedback throughout the school day and week.

With regard to the Dean of Academics position, we intend to identify the teachers with the strongest potential for instructional leadership and cultivate and train them such that one will be able to grow into that role in the third year of the school's operations. During our first and second years, during which we plan to have seven (7) and 10 teachers, respectively, we believe that our founder, with her wealth of experience as a teacher professional developer, in combination with budgeted outside support, will effectively serve our teachers, and by continuation our students, in their professional development and instructional effectiveness.

A comparison may be helpful in illustrating the soundness of our staffing structure: We will have two instructional leaders (a Head of School and a Dean of Academics) by the time our staff reaches a total of 13 teachers. Other elementary schools in SFUSD have as many as 30 teachers and only one instructional leader (a Principal). We are committed to ensuring our teachers receive the training, support, and supervision needed to be effective and accountable, and our staffing structure was designed to that end.

Spanish Enrichment

We appreciate Dr. Zavala's question about our approach to Spanish enrichment in grades K-5. While we have incorporated Spanish language and literature as a daily course for students in grades 6-8, the art, music, and/or dance enrichment classes to be instructed in Spanish for K-5 students will be developed by the Head of School in collaboration with the qualified person we hire to teach those classes. As our primary focus is on English language and literacy, we do not have a stated goal or program to ensure full Spanish proficiency by the end of 5th grade, but we are committed to providing all students with exposure to Spanish and to opportunities that begin building or build upon existing Spanish language and literacy skills in Kindergarten. These skills will be deepened during the academic Spanish classes in grades 6-8.

Longer School Day

The design decision regarding the length of the school day at Mission Prep (7:40 am – 4:00 pm) and the structure and content of each day, is based on two key sources of information: 1) Parents who want Mission Prep to be available as a choice for their children, and 2) The most successful charter elementary schools serving high-poverty student populations.

Literally every parent with whom the founding team has spoken has expressed

gratitude that we will provide their Kindergarten and 1st grade children with instruction until 4:00 pm, and most have asked what we will provide in terms of after-school programming until 6:00 pm. The community has expressed no concerns about the length of the school day, and is grateful that such a choice may be available.

In founding Mission Prep, we aim to eliminate the need for a reactive, “turn-around” school program later in our students’ educational careers. Currently, too many students enter middle school and high school far behind, and unable to read, write, think, or compute on grade level. A longer school day provides for additional instructional time that students from poverty and English Language Learners in particular need to master fundamental skills and content and be set up for success right from the start. We believe our children should not have to wait for academic preparation and achievement, or for later remediation attempts. Waiting too long only fuels the low self-esteem that comes from the experience of failure and feelings of inadequacy when school is too challenging. Waiting to provide our children with the foundations they need also fuels our drop-out rate. Elementary charter schools like Leadership Prep in Brooklyn, NY, and North Star Academy in Newark, NJ, have implemented longer instructional days beginning in Kindergarten and, as Mission Prep proposes to do, have implemented developmentally-appropriate instructional strategies that incorporate multiple modalities, high levels of student interaction and cooperation, sponge activities and transitions that ensure plenty of movement, and ongoing songs, chants, rituals, and learning games that keep students engaged, motivated, and supported.

D. Governance Structure of School Including, But Not Limited To, Parental Involvement

Parent Involvement in Governance

Among the members of Mission Prep’s founding team are three parents of children ranging from toddlers, to elementary school students, to young adults. As such, we fully appreciate the importance of parent engagement and input in operating a successful school; we believe that educational achievement is most effectively attained through collaboration and partnership between families and schools.

As explicated in the charter proposal, we have comprehensive plans for involving and communicating with parents in daily, weekly, monthly, annual, and ongoing ways, and to making home visits with all new families prior to the start of each school year. We will establish a Family Achievement Council, open to all, that will meet monthly. At these meetings, parents, guardians, and family members will have the opportunity to

participate in workshops and provide input and feedback to school staff and board members. This Council will serve in an advisory capacity to the governing board.

We note in the proposal's governance section that board members may include parents of past, current, or future students. We have discussed the notion of explicitly reserving a seat on the Board for a parent of a current student and vetted such a policy with leaders and board members of high-performing charter schools nationally. The clear consensus is that vesting governing board responsibilities in one parent puts an unrealistic expectation on that parent to represent the views, concerns, and beliefs of ALL parents, and can diminish the role that a larger group of parents can play in the ongoing development and life of the school. We do not want to limit parents' policy-making input to a single voice; rather, we will ensure all parent voices can be heard and considered through avenues including the Family Achievement Council, participation on board committees, and public comment at board meetings in full compliance with the Brown Act. Our openness regarding parent representation on the board and not limiting board membership to just one parent allows for the potential of multiple parents to serve on the board and compels us to provide for multiple channels for family engagement and input in school governance.

Other Important Legal or Operational Relationships Between School And Granting Agency

At the beginning of Section D of the charter proposal, under the heading Independent and Non-Profit Assurance, we state:

The Mission Preparatory School will be an independent charter school. Mission Preparatory is incorporated as a non-profit public benefit corporation in the State of California. The Mission Preparatory School will be solely responsible for the debts and obligations of the charter school. (page 82)

In the **Required Supplemental Information** section of the proposal, we indicate that Mission Prep would be a member of the SFUSD SELPA and would be considered a "school of the district" for Special Education purposes and be eligible for supports and services through SFUSD in exchange for a special education fee.

Other legal or operational relationships of which we are aware are noted as items to be included in a Memorandum of Understanding between the charter school and the granting agency.

We believe that all legal and operational relationships have been fully addressed. If there are additional legal or operational relationships of which we should be aware or

should address in our proposal, we would be pleased to add details regarding those relationships accordingly. Thank you in advance for any additional guidance not currently outlined in the charter application materials or other publicly available documents.

E. Qualifications to be Met by Individuals to be Employed by The School

Defines “Core, College Preparatory Teachers”/Affirms They will Hold Appropriate Credentials

We have seen through our own professional experiences and our analysis of some of the country’s top-performing urban charter schools that staff talent and capacity, time and again, rise up as key levers in reaching ambitious student achievement outcomes, particularly for students from low-income families and English Language Learners. As we have also seen, and as research studies have borne out, there unfortunately is no reliable correlation between years of teaching experience and the talent and capacity needed to effect significant gains in academic achievement. As one of our founding team members noted at the Budget Committee Meeting on April 29, 2010, new charter schools tend to attract more teachers who are earlier in their careers (for example, 4th or 5th year teachers) than teachers of average tenure of 11+ years in a school district. In our lead petitioner’s experience in training and supervising hundreds of teachers and in the experiences of our charter leader colleagues nationally, there has been no incongruence between the qualities of being high-skilled, having a no-excuses attitude, and being committed to hard work and the qualities of early-career teachers.

For more details about the competitiveness of our salary scale and the school’s capacity to recruit and fairly compensate quality teachers willing to work a longer school day and year, please see the information in the Financial Plan section of this document. In addition, please note that schools such as Mission Prep typically have 80 to 100 applicants for every teaching position available, continuing to evidence that there is a high demand from ambitious and dedicated professionals to a mission-driven, achievement-oriented, collaborative school environment such as the one that Mission Prep will offer.

G. Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial and Ethnic Balance

Lists several specific practices/policies likely to lead to a diverse applicant pool/enrollment: practices and policies appear to be selected to target relevant racial and ethnic groups

We appreciate the acknowledgement that our founding team has conducted effective community outreach and has built strong relationships with families and organizations representing our target population of low-income students and English Language Learners, particularly in the Mission District where we plan to locate the school. As a public charter school, we are also committed to serving all students of all backgrounds and from all neighborhoods throughout San Francisco and beyond. As we move into the planning year, we will continue to broaden our outreach efforts city-wide using our founding team members' diverse backgrounds and neighborhoods of work and residence as a launch pad. In addition, we will translate all documents for families and community members into additional languages and conduct information sessions in appropriate languages to communicate effectively with each and every group we have the opportunity to meet.

N. Dispute Resolution Process

Step by Step Process for Identifying/Framing Dispute Points – Basic Rules at Each Step

To clarify the question raised in the staff review regarding how a Board of Education that meets every other week would be able to insert language into a dispute statement indicating whether the Board believes that the issue could lead to revocation, we propose to delete the second sentence of the third paragraph of this section. The revised paragraph would read:

In the event of a dispute between The Mission Preparatory School and the District, the staff, employees, and Board members of The Mission Preparatory School agree first to frame the issue in written format (“dispute statement”) and refer the issue to the Superintendent and the Head of School of Mission Prep. Participation in the dispute resolution procedures outlined in this section shall not be interpreted to impede or as a pre-requisite to the District’s ability to proceed with revocation in accordance with **Ed. Code § 47607**. (revision of page 128)

This makes it clear that the Board of Education’s stance regarding potential charter revocation need not be included in a dispute statement, allows the Board to progress with any urgency deemed necessary, and upholds **Ed. Code § 47607** that allows the District to proceed with revocation outside of the parameters of the dispute resolution procedures.

Financial Plan

We know all public schools in California - and other states that contend with far-below-average rates of per-pupil funding - must work relentlessly and strategically to maintain a healthy, sustainable financial position and allocate resources as effectively as possible in the best interests of student achievement. We have created a conservative budget based on projected decreases in state funding levels and increases in costs. Clearly, that degree of fiscal conservatism is challenging and must constantly be weighed against the capacity to deliver on a highly-effective educational program, which is our core commitment.

Planning Assumptions – Costs of all major items are identified and within reasonable market ranges / Annual Operating Budget – Expenditure assumptions reflect market costs

We are grateful for having had the opportunity to analyze the planning budgets and financial statements of two charter schools in Los Angeles that operate similar educational programs and serve similar student populations to those proposed for Mission Prep. Our cost projections on several key budget items are based on those schools' actual expenditures.

Health Insurance

We have received quotes from Health Net, Blue Shield of California, and the California Charter Schools Association's JPA, and we have consulted with Equitas Academy Charter School in Los Angeles in determining our projection of \$6,000 per staff member per year for health insurance. Being aware of rising health care costs, this figure represents \$1,000 more per staff member per year than the \$5,000 Equitas Academy is currently paying to cover 100% of employees' medical, vision, dental, and life insurance.

Materials and Supplies

Our materials and supplies projections were formulated based on California Charter Schools Association guidelines and actual expenditures at Equitas Academy Charter School and Valor Academy Charter School in Los Angeles. We have front-loaded certain expenditures in the planning year (i.e. purchasing student furniture and supplies) which make these costs lower in year one, and we will continue to monitor these budgetary needs in alignment with actual expenditures.

Food and Free/Reduced-Price Meals

We thank you for noting the error in the formula for food in the planning budget's revenues and expenditures. We have adjusted the formula in the planning budget for

years 1-5 to reflect more accurate federal reimbursement level projections and costs based on quotes from Revolution Foods. Also noted in the information we have received from Revolution Foods is the assurance that the company is committed to maintaining prices below the federal reimbursement level. We will not subsidize the costs of meals for students who are not eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

Please see the attached planning budget and cash flow documents that reflect these revisions.

To clarify the assumptions regarding the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students (those living below the poverty line) and the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (up to 130% of poverty): We anticipate that 20% of our total student population will be Economically Disadvantaged (living below the poverty line). We anticipate that an additional 60% will come from families whose incomes range from just above the poverty line up to 130% of poverty, and thus entitle them to free or reduced-price lunch as part of the federal nutrition program. This totals 80% of our total student population (Economically Disadvantaged and other eligible students) who will qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.

Annual Operating Budget – Expenditure assumptions reflect school design plan

Teacher Salaries

We know that we must invest in our teachers, both financially and professionally, in order to support their effectiveness in leading our students to ambitious academic outcomes. Our projected average annual teacher salary of \$58,000 in year one of operations, and 2% COLA increases in subsequent years, is derived based on factors of competitiveness – we will work to attract the best and brightest in the field - and fairness given the extended school day and year and the 28 days of professional development, totaling 218 teacher work days. While we expect to pay some teachers more and others slightly less, this average annual salary is equivalent to step 11 on the SFUSD teacher Salary Schedule II (BA plus 30 units), and is, for example, 17% higher than the SFUSD salary for a 5th year teacher with a BA degree. The Mission Prep team was advised by a Bay Area charter school consulting firm to lower our average salary and eliminate our COLA given that we would still be competitive relative to other charter schools in the area and would thus be able to build a larger reserve for contingencies and a permanent site in the future. We remain committed to supporting our teachers as best as possible and therefore left our salary plans intact.

We have already received signatures of nine (9) teachers who have reviewed our charter proposal - including the work day, school year, professional development

schedule, and average teacher salary – and thus demonstrated initial capacity to attract teachers to Mission Prep.

We will, of course, be highly selective in our hiring process. Equitas Academy in Los Angeles received in excess of 300 applications for just 6 teaching positions in the school's first year of operations. Teachers at Equitas work for 211 days each year (181 instructional days + 30 professional development days), and the average teacher salary is \$50,000 per year - \$8,000 less than the proposed average salary at Mission Prep for just 7 fewer work days. At the KIPP schools in San Francisco, the average teacher salary is \$56,122 for 213 work days (193 instructional days + 20 professional development days).

Based on these sample comparisons, Mission Prep is well positioned to attract and retain the teaching talent needed to meet our mission of equipping K-8th grade students with the knowledge, skills, and strength of character needed to succeed in college and serve as leaders in their communities.