



2015-16
Five-Year Charter Review Report
Shining Stars Montessori Academy
Public Charter School

October 26, 2015

DC Public Charter School Board
3333 14th Street, NW, Suite 210
Washington, DC 20010
(202) 328-2660
www.dcpsb.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOARD VOTE AND KEY FINDINGS	1
CHARTER REVIEW STANDARD.....	2
BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL	2
SECTION ONE: GOALS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS	3
SECTION THREE: FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMIC VIABILITY	19

BOARD VOTE AND KEY FINDINGS

The District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (“PCSB”) staff conducted a charter review of the Shining Stars Montessori Academy Public Charter School (“Shining Stars PCS”) according to the standard required by the School Reform Act (“SRA”), D.C. Code §§ 38-1802 *et seq.*¹ PCSB staff recommends that the PCSB Board vote to continue the school’s charter with the condition that the school must undergo another Qualitative Site Review (“QSR”) before Spring 2017. The QSR team will include a member who has experience observing Montessori classrooms and/or has Montessori training. If less than 50% of the ratings in this subsequent QSR are not Proficient or Distinguished, PCSB staff may recommend the Board consider an immediate review of the school’s fulfillment of its goals and academic achievement expectations.

After an analysis of the school’s goals and academic achievement expectations, PCSB staff concludes that of Shining Stars PCS’s five goals, the school fully met two goals, substantially met two goals, and partially met one goal. The school has neither materially violated the law nor its charter and is in strong fiscal health.

One troubling aspect of the school’s five-year review was a significant difference between the relatively poor results from a QSR² and the outcomes of students on Shining Stars PCS-administered early childhood literacy and math assessments. During the two-week window of the QSR, observers use the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to score classroom observations in two domains: Classroom Environment and Instruction. In the Instruction domain, the majority of observations were rated as Basic and only 28% were rated as Proficient or Distinguished. During these particular observations, teachers frequently did not clarify learning tasks, engage all students in discussions, or adjust lessons when it was clear that all of the students were not following the instruction. This accounted for the lower scoring in this domain. Meanwhile, over 80% of the students, in some years 100%, met the literacy and math goals.

In addition to the concerns on instruction, Shining Stars PCS partially met its goal related to re-enrollment. A significant change in leadership as well as a last-minute relocation to a temporary facility caused the school to experience decreased re-enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15. The school is planning to move to a permanent facility for the 2016-17 school year. PCSB recommends that the school create and implement a plan to encourage student re-enrollment as part of this upcoming relocation.

Based on the findings contained in this report, on October 26, 2015 the PCSB Board voted 4 – 0 to continue the school’s charter with the condition that the school must undergo another QSR before Spring 2017. The QSR team will include a member who has experience observing Montessori classrooms and/or has Montessori training. If less than 50% of the ratings in this subsequent QSR are

¹ D.C. Code § 38-1802.12(a)(3).

² See the Shining Stars PCS QSR report, attached as Appendix A.

not Proficient or Distinguished, PCSB staff may recommend the Board consider an immediate review of the school's fulfillment of its goals and academic achievement expectations.

CHARTER REVIEW STANDARD

The SRA provides that PCSB "shall review Shining Stars PCS's charter at least once every five years."³ As part of this review, PCSB must determine whether:

- (1) The school committed a material violation of applicable laws or a material violation of the conditions, terms, standards, or procedures set forth in its charter, including violations relating to the education of children with disabilities; and/or
- (2) The school failed to meet the goals and student academic achievement expectations set forth in its charter.⁴

If PCSB determines that a school has committed a material violation of applicable law, or has not met its goals and expectations, as described above, it may, at its discretion revoke the school's charter.

Additionally, there is a fiscal component to the charter review. PCSB is required by the SRA to revoke a school's charter if PCSB determines in its review that the school (1) has engaged in a pattern of non-adherence to generally accepted accounting principles; (2) has engaged in a pattern of fiscal mismanagement; and/or (3) is no longer economically viable.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL

School Overview

Shining Stars PCS began operation in school year 2011-12 under authorization from PCSB. Shining Stars PCS was granted a charter by PCSB to open a PK3 through sixth grade Montessori school. It began with PK3 through kindergarten students and has expanded one grade per year. The school is currently serving PK3 through fourth-grade students in school year 2015-16.

The school's mission is as follows:

The mission of Shining Stars Montessori Academy is to offer a quality Montessori education infused with culturally inclusive principles to guide children to develop to their fullest potential.

³ D.C. Code § 38-1802.12(a)(3).

⁴ D.C. Code § 38-1802.12(c).

In its first five years, the school has undergone a leadership change, with the founding leaders no longer working for the school. Specifically, the school underwent a significant leadership change in 2013-14, when its board replaced its founder, who was serving in the role of Executive Director, with Dr. Regina Rodriguez. Dr. Rodriguez moved the school into a new location for the start of school year 2014-15 and will, once again, move to another location for the start of school year 2016-17. However, throughout these changes, the school’s board has had consistent membership and a strong presence, which has allowed the school to make academic progress, with a trend towards higher performance in more recent years. This year the school has a new principal, Deborah Golanski. Ms. Golanski has a deep background in Montessori education and is enhancing Shining Stars’ Montessori practices. Dr. Rodriguez also reported that the 2015-16 staff members all have bachelor’s degrees or higher and have all attained certification in Montessori education.

Summary of Performance

In addition to the school’s goals attainment, PCSB also assesses its performance on the Performance Management Framework (“PMF”). The school’s overall performance data on the PMF are summarized in the chart below.

Grade Levels	2015-16 Student Enrollment	2011-12 Accountability Plan Grades PK3 - K	2012-13 Accountability Plan Grades PK3 - 1	2013-14 PMF Grades PK3 - 2	2014-15 PMF Grades PK3 - 3
PK3 – 4	158 ⁵	Met 1 of 6 targets	Met 6 of 6 targets	Met 8 of 8 targets	Met 11 of 12 targets

The PMF assesses many indicators beyond reading and math proficiency, including academic growth, attendance, and re-enrollment.

SECTION ONE: GOALS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

The SRA requires PCSB to review whether a school has met its goals and academic expectations at least once every five years. Goals and expectations are only considered as part of the review analysis if they were included in a school’s charter, charter amendment, or accountability plans approved by the PCSB Board (collectively, the “Charter”).

The list below summarizes PCSB’s determinations of whether each academic program met their respective goals and academic expectations. These determinations, which are further detailed in the body of this report, are based on the school’s performance in the 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-

⁵ The student enrollment number was reported by the school before the official count date on October 5, 2015. This number will not be validated before the board vote in October 2015.

15 school years. (In November 2014, Shining Stars PCS adopted the indicators of the Early Childhood PMF as its goals and academic expectations.)⁶

Shining Stars PCS fully met two goals, substantially met two goals, and partially met one goal.

	Goals and Academic Expectations	Met?
1	a. Pre-kindergarten Literacy Progress/Achievement b. Kindergarten through Second Grade Literacy Progress/Achievement	Substantially
2	a. Pre-kindergarten Math Progress/Achievement b. Kindergarten through Second Grade Math Progress/Achievement	Fully
3	Attendance	Substantially
4	CLASS – Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, Instructional Support	Fully
5	Re-enrollment	Partially

- 1. **Literacy Progress/Achievement**
 - a. **Pre-Kindergarten Literacy Progress/Achievement**
 - b. **Kindergarten through Second Grade Literacy Progress/Achievement**

Assessment: **Shining Stars PCS substantially met this goal.** The school met targets related to this goal in three of the past four years but had just 28% of its observations earn a score of proficient or distinguished in its QSR.

⁶ See Shining Stars PCS Charter Amendment Board Memorandum, attached to this report as Appendix B. Please note on pages 2 and 3 of the Amendment, the standard score levels should be 86 for PPVT and 90 for TEMA.

PK Literacy Progress/Achievement Targets		
Year	Target	Target Met?
2011-12	60% of PK3 and PK4 students will demonstrate eight points of growth in their GSV score by the spring administration of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (“PPTV”).	No 26.9% of students met this goal.
2012-13	60% of PK3 and PK4 students will gain at least four standard score points on the PPVT.	Yes 100% of students met this goal.
2013-14	60% of PK3 and PK4 students will either gain four standard score points or scored at a standard score of 86 or higher on the PPVT.	Yes 89.6% of students met this goal.
2014-15	60% of PK3 and PK4 students will score average or above at the end of the year on the PPVT.	Yes 97.8.0% of students met this goal.

K-2 Literacy Progress/Achievement Targets		
2011-12	75% of kindergarten students will advance at least one level or maintain “low risk” by the spring administration on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (“DIBELS”) assessment.	No 55.6% of students met this goal.
	75% of kindergarten students will score at or above the benchmark in reading on the DIBELS assessment.	No 44.4% of students met this goal.
2012-13	60% of kindergarten through first-grade students will advance at least one level in reading on the DIBELS assessment.	Yes 82.0% of students met this goal.
	60% of kindergarten through first-grade students will score proficient or higher in reading on the DIBELS Assessment.	Yes 82.0% of students met this goal.

2013-14	50% of kindergarten students will either gain four standard score points or scored at a standard score of 86 or higher on the PPVT.	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p>90.9% of students met this goal.</p>
	50% of first and second-grade students who either advance one level or score at the benchmark level on the DIBELS assessment as designated by the publisher.	
2014-15	60% of kindergarten students will score average or above at the end of the year on the PPVT assessment.	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p>80.0% of students met this goal.</p>
	60% of first and second-grade students will score at or above the benchmark goals on the DIBELS assessment as designated by the publisher.	

2. Math Progress/Achievement

a. Pre-Kindergarten Math Progress/Achievement

b. Kindergarten through Second Grade Math Progress/Achievement

Assessment: **Shining Stars PCS fully met this goal.** The school met this goal for both years for which data are available. The school had no math goals for its first two years of operation, added a math goal in 2013-14, and had 28% of its observations earn a score of proficient or distinguished in its QSR.

PK Math Progress/Achievement Targets		
Year	Target	Target Met?
2011-12	The school did not have a math goal this year.	n/a
2012-13	The school did not have a math goal this year.	n/a
2013-14	60% of PK3 and PK4 students will either gain four standard score points or scored at a standard score of 86 or higher on the Test of Early Mathematics Ability (“TEMA”).	Yes 91.0% of students met this goal.
2014-15	60% of PK3 and PK4 students will be at or above the achievement level which is a standard score of 90 at the end of the year on TEMA.	Yes 87.9% of students met this goal.

K-2 Math Progress/Achievement Targets		
2011-12	No data available	n/a
2012-13	No data available	n/a
2013-14	50% of kindergarten students will either gain four standard score points or score at a standard score of 86 or higher on TEMA.	Yes 81.8% of students met this goal.
2014-15	60% of kindergarten through second grade students will be at or above the achievement level which is a standard score of 90 at the end of the year on TEMA.	Yes 80.0% of students met this goal.

For the academic goals 1 and 2, above, the QSR team conducted observations over the course of a two-week window, from November 10 through November 21, 2014. A team of two PCSB staff members (including PCSB’s Special Education Specialist) and one consultant conducted 12 observations of six classrooms.

The QSR team only scored 28% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. As consistent with the Montessori instructional model, students engaged in open-ended activities and were expected to choose when to complete and move on to another task. However all teacher questioning/discussion techniques were either leading students through a single path of inquiry

or not evidently meant to prompt student thinking. Task completion, rather than student learning and discovery, seemed to predominate in the team's observations. Multiple staff members, such as instructional aides/assistants and a guidance counselor, were observed working with children in small groups. Teachers guided their students in a variety of flexible groupings including small group, whole group, 1:1, and pairs, all of which were student-directed and teacher- guided.

The school described two strategies for “differentiating a lesson” - breaking down material into smaller sections for instruction and providing alternate ways of learning materials. Neither of these strategies was observed in the inclusive classroom. Further in almost all classrooms, the observers noted a general lack of engaging students in discussions and gathering evidence of student understanding, described by the school as strategies for progress monitoring. Based on these observations there is a concern with the lack of appropriate strategies and services to support all students, inclusive of students at risk of academic failure and/or students with disabilities.

3. Attendance

Assessment: **Shining Stars PCS substantially met this goal.** The school met this goal in three of the past four years.

Attendance Target		
Year	Target	Target Met?
2011-12	On average, PK3 and PK4 students will attend school 88.0% of the days.	No The average daily attendance was 82.0%.
	On average, kindergarten students will attend school 92.0% of the days.	No. The average daily attendance was 91.1%.
2012-13	On average, PK3 and PK4 students will attend school 88.0% of the days.	Yes The average daily attendance was 92.4%.
	On average, kindergarten through first-grade students will attend school 92.0% of the days.	Yes. The average daily attendance was 95.7%.
2013-14	PK3 and PK4 students will attend school at a rate equal to or greater than 80.0%.	Yes The in-seat attendance rate was 89.8%.
	Kindergarten through second-grade students will attend school at a rate equal to or greater than 82.0%.	Yes. The in-seat attendance rate was 88.8%.
2014-15	PK3 through third-grade students will attend school at a rate equal to or greater than 85.0%.	Yes. The in-seat attendance rate was 92.4%.

4. Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)

Assessment: **Shining Stars fully met this goal.** The school’s CLASS scores increased from 2013-14 to 2014-15 in all three domains.

CLASS Performance Targets		
Year	Target	Target Met?
2013-14	The school will score a rating equal to or greater than 3 on the Emotional Support domain of the CLASS Assessment.	Yes The score was 5.7.
2014-15		Yes The score was 5.8.
2013-14	The school will score a rating equal to or greater than 3 on the Classroom Organization domain of the CLASS Assessment.	Yes The score was 4.8.
2014-15		Yes The score was 5.3.
2013-14	The school will score a rating equal to or greater than 1 on the Instructional Support domain of the CLASS Assessment.	Yes The score was 1.5.
2014-15		Yes The score was 2.8.

The QSR team scored just over half (52%) of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, indicating that interactions between teachers and students as well as students and students in half the classrooms were generally polite, respectful, and caring. In alignment with the school's Montessori approach, children engaged in self-directed assignments and moved easily from one task to another. In general student behavior was appropriate and teachers monitored many students to encourage and redirect, as needed. However when student arguments were ignored, there was often escalation and teachers responded inconsistently and at times ineffectively in these moments. The adults had uneven rapport with individual students, hugging or saying words of encouragement to some, but not all students. Some teachers successfully redirected misbehavior through proximity or softly spoken words, while other teachers' attempts were threatening (taking away free time) and/or ineffective.

5. Re-enrollment

Assessment: **Shining Stars PCS partially met this goal.** The 2014-15 PMF re-enrollment calculation includes prekindergarten students, while the 2013-14 PMF re-enrollment rate did not. This change in the business rule, along with the school’s difficulty in securing a facility for the 2014-15 school year, and a significant change in leadership that occurred in the middle of school year 2013-14 in which the founders were replaced by a new head of school, contributed to the extremely low re-enrollment rate. Using preliminary data from SLED, the re-enrollment rate for SY2014-15 to SY2015-16 predicts that the school’s re-enrollment rate will be 73.7%. If this is the rate after the data is validated, the school will meet the re-enrollment rate for this time period.

Re-enrollment Target		
Year	Target	Target Met?
2012-13 to 2013-14	The school will have a re-enrollment rate for its kindergarten through second grade students that is equal to or greater than 60.7%.	Yes. The school’s rate was 80.0%. (If the rate were calculated with PK it would have been 58.7%).
2013-14 to 2014-15	The school will have a re-enrollment rate for its pre-kindergarten through third grade students that is equal to or greater than 64.7%.	No. The school’s rate was 42.5%.
2014-15 to 2015-16	The school will have a re-enrollment rate for its pre-kindergarten through third grade students that is equal to or greater than 64.7%.	The school’s rate may be 73.7% for this time period. This data will be validated in the Spring 2016. Please note that the full re-enrollment business rules were not applied to this calculation because PCSB does not have the exit data from SY14-15 yet.

SECTION TWO: COMPLIANCE WITH CHARTER AND APPLICABLE LAWS

The SRA requires PCSB to determine at least every five years whether a school has “committed a material violation of applicable laws or a material violation of the conditions, terms, standards, or procedures set forth in its charter, including violations relating to the education of children with disabilities.”⁷ The SRA contains a non-exhaustive list of applicable laws. PCSB also monitors charter schools for compliance with additional laws in annual compliance reviews. The table below discusses the school’s compliance with various requirements from 2011-12 to the time of this report’s publication.

Compliance Item	Description	School’s Compliance Status 2011-12 to present⁸
Fair enrollment process D.C. Code § 38-1802.06	DC charter schools must have a fair and open enrollment process that randomly selects applicants and does not discriminate against students.	Compliant since 2011-12
Notice and due process for suspensions and expulsions D.C. Code § 38-1802.06(g)	DC charter school discipline policies must afford students due process ⁹ and the school must distribute such policies to students and parents.	Compliant since 2011-12
Student health and safety D.C. Code §§ 38-1802.04(c)(4), 4-1321.02, 38-651	The SRA requires DC charter schools to maintain the health and safety of its students. ¹⁰ To ensure that schools adhere to this clause, PCSB monitors schools for various indicators, including but not limited to whether schools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have qualified staff members that can administer medications; - conduct background checks for all school employees and volunteers; and - have an emergency response plan in place and conduct emergency drills as required by DC code and regulations. 	At the time of publication of Shining Star PCS’s 2011-12 compliance report, the school did not have staff members trained to administer medications. PCSB waited for the training list in 2011-12. School has been compliant in this area since 2012-13.

⁷ D.C. Code § 38.1802.12(c).

⁸ See Shining Stars PCS 2011-12 – 2014-15 Compliance Reports, attached to this report as Appendix C.

⁹ See *Goss v. Lopez*, 419 U.S. 565 (1975).

¹⁰ D.C. Code § 38.1802.04 (c)(4)(A).

<p>Equal employment D.C. Code § 38-1802.04(c)(5)</p>	<p>A DC charter school’s employment policies and practices must comply with federal and local employment laws and regulations.</p>	<p>Compliant since 2011-12</p>
<p>Insurance As required by the school’s charter</p>	<p>A DC charter school must be adequately insured.</p>	<p>Compliant since 2011-12</p>
<p>Facility licenses D.C. Code § 47-2851.03(d); D.C. Mun. Regs., tit. 14, §§ 14-1401 et seq.</p>	<p>A DC charter school must possess all required local licenses.</p>	<p>Compliant since 2011-12</p>
<p>Highly Qualified Teachers Elementary and Secondary Education Act (“ESEA”)</p>	<p>DC charter schools receiving Title I funding must employ “Highly Qualified Teachers” as defined by ESEA.</p>	<p>In 2011-12, Shining Stars PCS was out of compliance with this indicator because teachers did not have required action plans in place. School has been compliant in this area since 2012-13.</p>
<p>Proper composition of board of trustees D.C. Code § 38-1802.05</p>	<p>A DC charter school’s Board of Trustees must have: an odd number of members that does not exceed 15; a majority of members that are DC residents; and at least two members that are parents of a student attending the school.</p>	<p>Compliant since 2011-12</p>
<p>Accreditation Status D.C. Code § 38-1802.02(16)</p>	<p>A DC charter school must maintain accreditation from an SRA-approved accrediting body approved by the SRA.</p>	<p>Compliant since 2011-12</p>

Procurement Contracts

D.C. Code § 38-1802.04(c)(1) requires DC charter schools to use a competitive bidding process for any procurement contract valued at \$25,000 or more, and within three days of awarding such a contract, to submit to PCSB all bids received, the contractor selected, and the rationale for which contractor was selected. To ensure compliance with this law, PCSB requires schools to submit a “Determinations and Findings” form to detail any qualifying procurement contract that the school has executed.

While the school had a 2012 audit finding related to its compliance with procurement contract requirements, the school has since corrected that issue and has remained compliant in this area since that time.

Year	Qualifying contracts executed by Shining Stars PCS	Corresponding documentation submitted to PCSB
2011-12	3	3
2012-13	5	5
2013-14	2	2
2014-15	6	6

Special Education Compliance

Charter schools are required to comply with all federal and local special education laws, including, among others, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act¹¹ (“IDEA”) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The following section summarizes Shining Stars PCS’s special education compliance from 2011-12 to the present.

OSSE Special Education Compliance Reviews

The DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education (“OSSE”) monitors charter schools’ special education compliance and publishes three types of reports detailing these findings: (1) Annual Determinations; (2) On-Site Monitoring; and (3) Quarterly Findings (also called Special Conditions Reports). OSSE’s findings of Shining Stars PCS’ special education compliance are summarized below.

(1) Annual Determinations

As required by a federal regulation, OSSE annually analyzes each LEA’s compliance with 20 special education compliance indicators, and publishes these findings in an Annual Determination report.¹² Each year’s report is based on compliance data collected several years earlier. As such, OSSE does not require schools to cure any compliance issues detailed in these reports. In 2014, OSSE published its 2011 Annual Determination reports (based on the school’s 2011-12 performance).

¹¹ 20 USC §1413(a)(5).

¹² As required by federal regulation 34 CFR § 300.600(c).

Shining Stars PCS’s Annual Determination compliance performance is detailed in the table below.¹³

Year	Percent compliant with audited special education federal requirements	Determination Level
2011	87%	Meets Requirements
2012	106% ¹⁴	Meets Requirements
2013	83%	Meets Requirements

(2) On-Site Monitoring Report

OSSE periodically conducts an on-site assessment of an LEA’s special education compliance with student-level and LEA-level indicators, and publishes its findings in an On-site Compliance Monitoring Report. At the time, if a school was less than 95% compliant with a student-level and/or LEA-level indicator, it was required to implement corrections and report these corrections to OSSE. (Beginning in 2013, LEA’s are responsible for being 100% compliant with student-level indicators and LEA-level indicators on On-Site Monitoring Reports.)¹⁵ The findings show that the school is within acceptable ranges.

In 2015, OSSE published an On-site Compliance Monitoring Report of Shining Stars PCS based on the school’s performance in 2014-15.¹⁶ The school was required to implement corrections in the following areas:

¹³ See Shining Stars PCS annual determination reports, attached to this report as Appendix D.

¹⁴ The school’s compliance rate is over 100% because OSSE issued a “bonus” compliant indicator – not having any longstanding noncompliance issues from FY2009, FY2010, or FY2011.

¹⁵ If the school was found to be less than 100% compliant with a student-level indicator that could not be cured retroactively, OSSE would identify the point of noncompliance as an LEA-level violation.

¹⁶ See 2014-15 On-Site Monitoring Report Attachment, attached to this report as Appendix E.

On-Site Monitoring Report LEA-Level Compliance		
Compliance Area	Compliant? (If school is noncompliant, the area of noncompliance is noted)	Corrected?
Extended School Year	Compliant	N/A
Least Restrictive Environment	Compliant	N/A
Individualized Education Program (“IEP”)	Compliant	N/A
Data	Compliant	N/A
Fiscal	<p>Noncompliant in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement procedures • Invoices for expenditure in IDEA • Construction expenses • IDEA funds for providing CEIS • Tracking of students who receive CEIS • Consultation with rep/parent of parentally-placed students in private schools • Seeking reimbursement for serving parentally-placed students with disabilities in private schools 	Yes.

On-Site Monitoring Report Student-Level Compliance		
Compliance Area	Compliant? (If school is noncompliant, the area of noncompliance is noted)	Corrected?
Initial Evaluation and Reevaluation	Compliant in four of four indicators	N/A
IEP	Compliant in twelve of thirteen indicators Noncompliant in the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing evidence that the IEP team considered the use of positive behavior supports and behavioral interventions and other strategies to address behavior including developing an FBA and BIP if necessary. 	Yes.
Least Restrictive Environment	Compliant in zero of one indicator Noncompliant in the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of harmful effects 	Yes.

(3) Special Conditions Quarterly Reports

OSSE submits quarterly reports to the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs detailing District of Columbia LEA’s compliance in three areas: (1) Initial and Reevaluation Timelines; (2) Early Childhood Transition Timelines; and (3) Secondary Transition Requirements. The tables below show the results for the Initial and Reevaluation Timelines. There were no reports for the Early Childhood Transition Timelines. The Secondary Transition Requirements are not applicable to Shining Stars PCS because it is not a high school.

After reviewing recent special conditions reports on OSSE’s DC Corrective Action Tracking System Database (“DCCATS”), PCSB found that school’s overall compliance in these areas has been strong during the past three years.

Quarterly Findings – April 2012 through March 2013				
	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
Initial Evaluation Timeline	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
Reevaluation Timeline	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant

Quarterly Findings – April 2013 through March 2014				
	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
Initial Evaluation Timeline	Compliant	0 of 2 items compliant	Compliant	Compliant
Reevaluation Timeline	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant

Quarterly Findings – April 2014 through March 2015				
	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
Initial Evaluation Timeline	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant
Reevaluation Timeline	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant	Compliant

Blackman Jones Implementation Review

With compliance requirements pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) and the 2006 Blackman Jones Consent Decree, OSSE manages and oversees the Blackman Jones database that tracks each LEAs’ timely implementation of Hearing Officer Determinations (“HODs”) and Settlement Agreements (“SAs”).

As of July 2015, the Blackman Jones Database shows Shining Stars PCS has no HODs or SAs.

SECTION THREE: **FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMIC VIABILITY**

Introduction

The SRA requires PCSB to revoke a school's charter if PCSB determines that the school:

- Has engaged in a pattern of non-adherence to generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP");
Has engaged in a pattern of fiscal mismanagement; and/or
Is no longer economically viable.¹⁷

As part of the charter review process, PCSB reviewed Shining Stars PCS's financial record regarding these areas. PCSB finds that there are no grounds to revoke the school's charter based on this standard.

Summary of Findings

Shining Stars PCS is economically viable, has complied with GAAP, and has not engaged in a pattern of fiscal mismanagement. The data reviewed as a part of the summary for this review dates back to the 2012 fiscal year ("FY"), the school's first year of operations. Shining Stars PCS has been identified as a high fiscal performing school by PCSB since its inception. In FY2012, the school's audit included findings related to personnel files and lack of compliance with PCSB's procurement policy. The school cured these findings in subsequent years. Shining Stars PCS has remained financially stable and increased its enrollment throughout its first years of operation.

Financial Overview

The following table provides an overview of Shining Stars' financial information over the past three fiscal years. Enrollment has grown 64% in the last three years to 87 students in FY14 from 53 students in school year FY12. The school's net asset position has increased over the past three years.

¹⁷ See D.C. Code § 38-1802.13(b).

	Audit Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Audited Enrollment	53	55	87
Total DC Funding Allocation	\$ 861,940	\$ 899,507	\$ 1,392,890
Total Federal Entitlements and Funding	\$ 254,282	\$ 376,198	\$ 213,560
Unrestricted Cash and Cash Equivalents on 6/30/14	\$ 308,392	\$ 373,013	\$ 472,753
Total Assets	\$ 440,374	\$ 635,783	\$ 636,702
Total Current Assets	\$ 408,036	\$ 490,079	\$ 519,610
Total Liabilities	\$ 32,608	\$ 135,931	\$ 122,857
Total Current Liabilities	\$ 32,608	\$ 135,931	\$ 122,857
Net Asset Position	\$ 407,766	\$ 499,852	\$ 513,845
Total Revenues	\$ 1,284,539	\$ 1,298,619	\$ 1,635,396
Total Expenses	\$ 956,254	\$ 1,206,533	\$ 1,621,403
Change in Net Assets	\$ 328,285	\$ 92,086	\$ 13,993

Spending Decisions

The following table provides an overview of the school's spending decisions over the past three years. The school's operating margins have fallen significantly over the past three years, with the school's 1% margin for FY14 being well below the sector average of 6%. However, so long as the school has a positive margin, PCSB generally is not concerned. Since its first operating year, more resources have been directed towards salaries and benefits, in line with the school's increased enrollment. The increase in rent payments was due to a two-year lease agreement with Sela PCS.

	Audit Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Total Personnel Salaries and Benefits	\$ 520,770	\$ 545,511	\$ 874,151
Total Direct Student Costs	\$ 159,338	\$ 220,177	\$ 184,495
Total Occupancy Expenses	\$ 105,947	\$ 241,024	\$ 303,176
Total Office Expenses	\$ 97,111	\$ 109,706	\$ 99,371
Total General Expenses	\$ 73,088	\$ 90,115	\$ 160,210
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)	\$ 328,285	\$ 92,086	\$ 13,993
	as a percent of revenue		
Total Personnel Salaries and Benefits	41%	42%	53%
Total Direct Student Costs	12%	17%	11%
Total Occupancy Expenses	8%	19%	19%
Total Office Expenses	8%	8%	6%
Total General Expenses	6%	7%	10%
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)	26%	7%	1%

Adherence to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles

Audits of Shining Stars PCS establish that the school has adhered to GAAP. The auditor expressed unqualified/unmodified opinions on the financial statements. Audit findings from FY12 were resolved in the subsequent fiscal year.

	2012	2013	2014
Statement Opinion. Required when auditor finds areas of doubt/questionable matters.	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unmodified
Statement Material Weakness. A deficiency in internal control, indicating a reasonable possibility that a material financial misstatement will not be prevented.	No	No	No
Statement Non-Compliance. Auditor tests for compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements.	No	No	No
Program Opinion (A133). Review of compliance with federal requirements conducted when school receives \$500K+ in federal funds.	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unmodified
Program Material Weakness (A133). Lack of internal control over compliance with applicable laws, regulations, etc.	No	No	No
Findings & Questioned Costs. Findings important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance, with documentation of corrective action plans noting the responsible party.	2	0	0
Unresolved Prior Year Findings. Disclosure of prior audit findings that have not been corrected.	0	0	0
Going-Concern Issue. Indicates the financial strength of the school is questioned.	No	No	No
Debt-Compliance Issue. School was not in compliance with certain debt covenants. A debt-compliance issue may prelude insolvency.	No	No	No

Fiscal Management

The school has not engaged in a pattern of fiscal mismanagement. Shining Stars PCS has had clean audit findings, aside from the 2012 findings that were subsequently corrected. Since opening, the school has strengthened its balance sheet, including building up its cash reserves.

Economic Viability

The school is economically viable and has remained financially stable in its first five years. Audited enrollment increased 64% from FY12 to FY14. Over that time period, revenues increased by 27%, and expenses increased by 70%. While the expense growth has exceeded revenue growth, the school has maintained a positive operating margin each year. The following sections review the school's financial results in four key areas:

- Operating Performance
- Liquidity
- Debt Burden
- Sustainability

Operating Performance

PCSB assesses a school's financial performance with two key indicators. The first indicator is a school's operating surplus or deficit – the difference between its total annual revenues exceed its total annual

expenditures. In general, PCSB recommends that a school have positive annual operating results. Another indicator of a school’s financial performance is its earnings before depreciation (“EBAD”).¹⁸ EBAD is a financial measure of operating cash flows. Based on these measures, **Shining Stars PCS has maintained positive cash flows over the last three years.**

	Indicator of Concern	Audit Year		
		2012	2013	2014
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)	< 0	\$ 328,285	\$ 92,086	\$ 13,993
Earnings Before Depreciation	< 0	\$ 334,050	\$ 154,339	\$ 122,777

Liquidity

Liquidity refers to a school’s ability to meet its financial obligations. Too few assets or insufficient cash to pay vendors and/or creditors is a cause for concern and threatens the school’s viability in the short-term. Two indicators of a school’s liquidity are its current ratio¹⁹ and its days of cash on hand.²⁰ The current ratio is indicative of a school’s ability to satisfy its immediate financial obligations. When the current ratio is less than one, the school’s ability to meet its obligations is in doubt. **Shining Stars PCS’s current ratio has varied over the last three years, but has remained above 1.0. At the end of FY14, the current ratio was 4.2.** This high ratio is a strong indicator of the school’s ability to meet its immediate financial obligations.

“Days of cash on hand” reflects a school’s ability to continue to satisfy its financial obligations in the event of unexpected cash delays. Typically, 90 days of cash or more is recommended. Less than 30 days of cash is a liquidity concern. **Shining Stars PCS’s cash on hand has remained above 100 days for all three years.** The school has sufficient cash to remain financially viable in the short-term.

	Indicator of Concern	Audit Year		
		2012	2013	2014
Current Ratio	< 0.5	12.5	3.6	4.2
Days of Cash On Hand	< 30	116	111	105

Debt Burden

As part of the evaluation of a school’s long-term viability, PCSB considers a school’s debt burden. In particular, PCSB reviews two debt ratios – the debt ratio²¹ and the modified debt service²² ratio. The

¹⁸ EBAD is the change in net assets plus amortization and depreciation.

¹⁹ A school’s current ratio is its current assets divided by current liabilities.

²⁰ “Cash on hand” equals unrestricted cash and cash equivalents divided by total expenditures divided by 360 days. It is a measure of the school’s ability to pay debts and claims as they come due.

²¹ Debt Ratio equals the total debt divided by the total assets.

²² Modified Debt Service Ratio equals the sum of the current portion of long-term debt, interest, and rent divided by the total revenues.

table below shows the school’s debt burden has remained well below the Indicator of Concern over the past three years. Outstanding payables to vendors are the school’s only debt.

PCSB began monitoring the modified debt service ratio in FY14 and it measures how much of a school’s revenues are dedicated to meeting its facilities-related financial obligations. This is an indicator of the sustainability of the debt payments. A rate greater than 15% is a cause for concern. The school’s current modified debt service ratio at the end of FY14 was 11.0%. This aligned with the sector median of 11.7%. **Shining Stars PCS’ debt levels and payments are manageable.**

	Indicator	Audit Year		
	of Concern	2012	2013	2014
Debt Ratio	> 0.92	0.07	0.21	0.19
Modified Debt Service Ratio	> 15.0%	N/A	N/A	11%

Sustainability

A school’s net assets²³ and primary reserve ratio are indicators of its long-term sustainability.²⁴ PCSB recommends that schools accrue reserves equal to 25% to 50% of operating expenditures and PCSB would be concerned with reserves below zero. **Shining Stars PCS’ metrics fell within the recommended range for each of the past three years.** At the end of FY14, the net asset position was equal to nearly four months of the school’s annual operating expenditures.

	Indicator	Audit Year		
	of Concern	2012	2013	2014
Net Asset Position	< 0	\$ 407,766	\$ 499,852	\$ 513,845
Primary Reserve Ratio	< 0.00	0.43	0.41	0.32

²³ Net Assets equals total assets minus total liabilities.

²⁴ Primary Reserve Ratio equals total net assets divided by total annual expenses.

Appendix A



February 5, 2015

Allison Brown, Board Chair
Shining Stars Montessori PCS
6015 Chillum Place NE
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Ms. Brown:

The DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) conducts Qualitative Site Reviews to gather and document evidence to support school oversight. According to the School Reform Act § 38-1802.11, PCSB shall monitor the progress of each school in meeting the goals and student academic achievement expectations specified in the school's charter. Your school was selected to undergo a Qualitative Site Review during the 2014-15 school year for the following reason:

- School eligible for 5-year Charter Review during 2015-16 school year

Qualitative Site Review Report

A Qualitative Site Review team conducted on-site reviews of *Shining Stars Montessori Public Charter School (PCS)* between November 10 - 21, 2014. The purpose of the site review is for PCSB to gauge the extent to which the school's goals and student academic achievement expectations were evident in the everyday operations of the public charter school. To ascertain this, PCSB staff and consultants evaluated your classroom teaching by using an abridged version of the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* observation rubric. We also visited a board meeting.

Enclosed is the team's report. You will find that the Qualitative Site Review Report focuses primarily on the following areas: charter mission and goals, the classroom environment, and instruction.

We appreciate the assistance and hospitality that you and your staff gave the monitoring team in conducting the Qualitative Site Review at Shining Stars Montessori PCS.

Sincerely,



Naomi DeVeaux
Deputy Director

Enclosures
cc: School Leader

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Shining Stars Montessori PCS serves 122 students in prekindergarten 3 (PK3) through grade 3 in Ward 4. The DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) conducted a Qualitative Site Review (QSR) in November 2014 because Shining Stars Montessori Public Charter School (Shining Stars PCS) is eligible for 5-year charter review during the 2015-16 school year.

The QSR team conducted observations over the course of a two-week window, from November 10 through November 21, 2014. A team of two PCSB staff members (including PCSB's Special Education Specialist) and one consultant conducted 12 observations of six classrooms. A PCSB staff member also attended a Board of Trustees meeting. The QSR team used Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* Rubric throughout the observations and observed classrooms in mornings and afternoons. In some instances, a QSR team may have observed a teacher twice. The QSR team also collected evidence regarding the school's stated mission and goals.

The QSR team scored 52% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Classroom Environment domain, indicating that interactions between teachers and students as well as students and students in half the classrooms were generally polite, respectful, and caring. In alignment with the school's Montessori approach, children engaged in self-directed assignments and moved easily from one task to another. In general student behavior was appropriate and teachers monitored many students to encourage and redirect, as needed. However when student arguments were ignored, there was often escalation and teachers responded inconsistently and at times ineffectively in these moments. The adults had uneven rapport with individual students, hugging or saying words of encouragement to some, but not all students. Some teachers successfully redirected misbehavior through proximity or softly spoken words, while other teachers' attempts were threatening (taking away free time) and/or ineffective.

The QSR team only scored 28% of the observations as distinguished or proficient in the Instruction domain. As consistent with the Montessori instructional model, students engaged in open-ended activities and were expected to choose when to complete and move on to another task. However all teacher questioning/discussion techniques were either leading students through a single path of inquiry or not evidently meant to prompt student thinking. Task completion, rather than student learning and discovery, seemed to predominate in the team's observations. Multiple staff members, such as instructional aides/assistants and a guidance counselor, were observed working with children in small groups. Teachers guided their students in a variety of flexible groupings including small group, whole group, 1:1, and pairs, all of which were student-directed and teacher-guided. The school described two strategies for "differentiating a lesson" - breaking down material into smaller sections for instruction and providing alternate ways of learning materials. Neither of these strategies was observed in the inclusive classroom. Further in almost all classrooms, the reviewer noted a general lack of engaging students in discussions and gathering evidence of student understanding, described by the school as strategies for progress monitoring. Based on these observations there is a concern with the lack of appropriate strategies and services to support all students, inclusive of students at risk of academic failure and/or students with disabilities.

CHARTER MISSION, GOALS, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

This table summarizes Shining Stars Montessori PCS’s goals and academic achievement expectations as detailed in its charter and subsequent Accountability Plans, and the evidence that the Qualitative Site Review (QSR) team observed of the school meeting those goals during the Qualitative Site Visit.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>Mission: The mission of Shining Stars Montessori Academy is to offer a quality Montessori education infused with culturally inclusive principles to guide children to develop to their fullest potential.</p>	<p>The QSR team observed evidence that Shining Stars Montessori PCS is carrying out parts of its mission.</p> <p><i>Quality Montessori education:</i></p> <p>Most of the observed classrooms demonstrated elements of Montessori curricula and philosophy through the use of large blocks of work time, student-directed lessons/activities (e.g., students select their learning tasks while teachers acted as guides/facilitators) and the use of Montessori manipulatives (e.g., mats for activities, picture cards, cylindrical pegs/puzzles, geographical puzzles, life-skills activities such as pouring water in a glass or identifying a spoon, fork and knife).</p> <p>The mission statement of Shining Stars was also posted upon entering the school on the wall facing the entrance. However the majority of observations indicated that little to no invitation of student intellectual engagement was present. While children may have engaged in the activities, it was mostly procedural work with little exploration of strategic thinking.</p> <p><i>Culturally inclusive principles:</i></p> <p>All observed classrooms had students and teachers from varying ethnic/cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Classrooms incorporated</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
	<p>elements of cultural inclusivity through the display of flags from countries across the world, students playing with puzzles of continents on a world map, pictures of world leaders (Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr.) and names of classrooms based on these leaders/concepts (Keller stars, Bethune stars, etc.). Many classrooms displayed photographs of students and their families. One teacher was observed reading aloud a book, teaching students to count in Arabic.</p>
<p>Goals: 1. Stimulate the growth of the whole child by following the natural developmental cycles of human beings.</p>	<p>Students had the flexibility to choose their own learning tasks in terms of which activity, where to do the work, and with whom. In some of the observations, teachers used prompting to engage students in various activities. In the majority of the observations, students were responsible for clean up as well as helping each other.</p>
<p>2. Encourage the child to follow their own individual interests as they learn at their own pace.</p>	<p>In the majority of observations, the teacher advised students to pick an activity of their choosing. These activities included tasks such as: reciting sight words, tracing numbers, cursive writing, coloring, and manipulating beads to show place value. The teacher and aides circulated in the classroom to support students with their selected activity. Most students were not given time frames in which to complete activities, thus allowing them to work at their own pace.</p> <p>The QSR team also saw teachers ignoring students engaged in conflicts with other students, thus not addressing the social-emotional side of the children. These arguments also distracted other students from their learning work. Teachers left students alone who were not on task, seemed upset, or were otherwise misbehaving for long periods of time. This took significant time away from the learning tasks of those students.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
3. Provide multi-age classrooms to facilitate and encourage individualized learning.	All classrooms were multi-age with a schedule adjusted for students' needs. The younger students took naps after lunch, while other stayed in their classrooms to continue learning. Students engaged in tasks individually as well as collaboratively, and several teachers encouraged individualized learning by directing students to tasks and supporting them with specific goals.
4. Provide an uninterrupted work cycle in which learning can occur.	Almost all classrooms had uninterrupted work cycle time from 8:30-11:30. Several classrooms also had uninterrupted work cycles in the afternoon. However in one observation the teacher continually interrupted students to clean up messes around them in the midst of their work time.
5. Encourage collaboration between the teacher and the child.	In most observations teachers circulated around the classroom to provide support with students on their selected activities. The majority of these interactions were respectful. One classroom had a read aloud where students were aggregated near the teacher's seat. In other observations there was limited collaboration observed between adults and children. One adult worked with one child for the duration of the observation while the other adult worked on his/her laptop.
6. Organize the child's activities and learning according to their social development.	Some children worked independently, while others worked collaboratively. Fluid movement was observed in almost all classrooms. Adults spent extra time and/or used proximity with some children in almost all classrooms.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>7. Encourage the child to be motivated and rewarded by his own individual achievement.</p>	<p>Many children spent significant time on one activity, sometimes showing work to their teacher, other times, moving on to another activity. In all observations at least half of the students appeared to be engaged in their self-selected activities. The other students appeared to require prompting by the teacher and/or aide in order to engage in their activities. During the read aloud in one classroom, half of the students were not engaged in the story as evidenced by them staring off into space, watching other students, or being distracted by other materials on or near the floor where they were seated.</p>
<p>8. Promote the child's ability to find out and do things for him/ herself through manipulation of the materials (auto-education), leading to his/her functional independence.</p>	<p>Students in most observations helped with clean up and/or taking care of themselves (shoe tying). Many activities, especially in Primary rooms, were somewhat open-ended, although teachers often asked students to do specific things with the materials.</p>
<p>9. Encourage the development of positive self-image through specialized integrated culture-based learning activities and materials.</p>	<p>In many classrooms photographs of the children and their families were displayed. International flags were observed in all classrooms, and students in several classrooms were observed engaging with maps or globes. In one observation the teacher conducted a read-aloud of a book entitled <i>Today I Feel Silly and Other Moods That Make My Day</i> followed by the teacher asking students to share their feelings for the day with their classmates. In another read-aloud the students were meant to learn to count in Arabic, although the students were only moderately successful with this outcome.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
10. Promote and encourage parental development and involvement.	Most classrooms had a newsletter posted in front of school. Thanksgiving was celebrated during the second week of observations with parents invited into the classrooms for a feast. A few classrooms had photos of students and their families.
11. Provide a loving, secure, and ordered place for every child.	Teachers addressed misbehavior unevenly among observed classrooms. In some cases the teacher/aide would address specific students and redirect them and in other cases would ignore students. There were several altercations between students, often involving tears, which were unsuccessfully addressed or ignored altogether. Teachers and aides had uneven rapport with students, hugging or saying words of encouragement to some, but not all students. Some teachers successfully redirected misbehavior through proximity or softly spoken words, while other teachers' attempts were threatening (taking away free time) and/or ineffective.
12. Provide adequately trained and responsive staff.	All classrooms had at least two adults who, for the most part, utilized similar strategies as the primary teacher.
13. Promote and encourage self-discipline and conflict resolution strategies.	In several observations there was little misbehavior and students engaged in self-discipline successfully. Some teachers stepped into conflicts and directed student behavior/action (rather than promoting conflict resolution). Other teachers asked questions when conflict arose. In other observations teachers appeared to ignore conflicts altogether.

Mission and Goals	Evidence
<p>14. Provide the opportunities for and encourage, purposeful movement, leading to the refining of the fine and gross motor skills.</p>	<p>All observations had multiple examples of this goal as it relates to fine motor skill development. Students practiced using scissors and cutting paper, pinching clothespins and placing them on wooden bowls, pouring water into a glass, painting, tracing shapes, using stencils, putting together puzzles, etc. Students also practiced this goal when eating their morning snack (bagel, cupcake, apples) through spreading the cream cheese on their bagels, un-wrapping the cupcake wrapper, etc. There was limited evidence of gross motor development. All students moved about the classroom, some running while others walking, as encouraged. In one classroom students practiced marching.</p>
<p>15. Effective instruction supporting student academic progress and achievement in reading and math.</p>	<p>Many students were observed with books in hand and several teachers conducted read alouds. One observation included students copying definitions and information. Observers saw a wide variety of math activities, including ordering by size, counting, tracing numbers, and solving standard algorithms throughout all classrooms. In many observations, teachers appeared to be more focused on task completion rather than student learning and engagement.</p>
<p>16. Moving students to advanced levels of proficiency in reading and math.</p>	<p>There were some instances of differentiation observed including teachers working individually with a student, repeating the same content, and asking individual students to do specific tasks (tying, matching words, tracing numbers, finding given number of objects). Two teachers took notes about work with children (although one teacher's notes were not specific about the student's accomplishments and/or challenges). There was limited evidence of students working on content that was above grade-level.</p>

Mission and Goals	Evidence
17. Promotion of reading proficiency by third grade and math proficiency by eighth grade.	There were no specific reading tasks observed in the Elementary room. The math tasks in this classroom involved solving algorithms (multi-digit addition and subtraction, one digit multiplication), but no specific instruction was observed in this room related to this. In one Primary room students practiced phonics with a CD.
18. Culture of learning and support in the classroom.	Multiple teachers in each classroom worked with individuals/small groups on both behavioral redirection and academic lessons.
Governance:	<p>The Shining Stars PCS Board met for their monthly meeting on November 7, 2014. A quorum was present. The executive director delivered her monthly report to the board. She discussed that the school had administered its fall assessment and would be reviewing the results in an upcoming full-day professional development session. She also discussed the school's upcoming qualitative site review. Additionally she updated the board on the school's dual accreditation process, and announced that the school had hired a new special education coordinator.</p> <p>The board chair discussed the school's enrollment, noting that the school's move hurt enrollment. Sixty students decided not to enroll because of the difficulty in traveling to the school's Chillum location. The board chair commended parents and staff who worked hard to recruit new students, and congratulated the school for enrolling 121 students for the 2014-15 school year.</p>

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT¹

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Classroom Environments domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," “basic,” and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored only half (52%) of observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Classroom Environment domain.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<p>Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</p>	<p>The QSR team rated 59% of the observations as proficient or distinguished in this component. Interactions between teachers and students as well as between students were generally polite, respectful, and caring. Some teachers used the phrase, "doing things peacefully" when they noticed students sitting or working quietly. This language was also used to redirect misbehaviors in some instances. Most students were called by their first name and all adults engaged in support and redirection. The majority of these instances were positive and respectful in nature.</p>	<p>Distinguished</p>	<p>17%</p>
		<p>Proficient</p>	<p>42%</p>
	<p>The QSR team scored 42% of the observations as basic in the component of "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport". Teachers ignored students engaging in conflicts with other students, not addressing their social-emotional needs. These arguments also distracted other students from their learning work. Teachers left students alone, who were not on task, seemed upset, or were otherwise misbehaving for long periods of time.</p>	<p>Basic</p>	<p>42%</p>
		<p>Unsatisfactory</p>	<p>0%</p>
		<p>Distinguished</p>	<p>0%</p>

¹ Teachers may be observed more than once by different review team members.

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	<p>The QSR team rated only one-third of the observations as proficient in the component of "Establishing a Culture for Learning" and none as distinguished. Most students understood their role as learners and engaged in activities for much of the observation time. Some students were observed telling their teacher or peers that they wanted to do the work on their own, and a few students said that they had not yet had a lesson.</p>	Proficient	33%
	<p>The QSR team scored 66% of the observations as basic or unsatisfactory. There were multiple instances where teachers appeared to be "going through the motions", seemingly with task completion as the goal. In several read-aloud observations, the teacher engaged in a very limited way with students in terms of comprehension, participation, or paying attention. In other observations the teachers remained neutral or had limited engagement with students and their learning.</p>	Basic	58%
		Unsatisfactory	8%
Managing Classroom Procedures	<p>In the "Managing Classroom Procedures" component, the QSR team rated 67% of the observations as proficient or distinguished. The management of time, transitions, and materials were successful in these observations. In many observations students also assisted with getting their own materials as well as clean up, both in between activities and at the end of the work period. Teachers and aides circulated amongst children and also assisted in clean up.</p>	Distinguished	17%
		Proficient	50%
	<p>The QSR team rated 33% of the observations as basic. Transitions were not smooth and students were not engaged when not working directly with the teacher. Some students were also not engaged or responsive when they</p>	Basic	33%

The Classroom Environment	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>were with the teacher, primarily in a larger group setting. Several students appeared confused during transitions, unclear of what to do. For example when the bell rang, most students in one observation did not stop their work, even after the teacher also requested this verbally.</p>	Unsatisfactory	0%
Managing Student Behavior	<p>The QSR team rated 50% of observations as proficient or distinguished in the component of "Managing Student Behavior". In some observations student behavior was generally appropriate and teachers responded appropriately to misbehaviors. In most classrooms all adults circulated during student work times to monitor and redirect behavior.</p>	Distinguished	8%
		Proficient	42%
	<p>The QSR team scored 50% of the observations as basic in this component. Teachers did not appear aware of disruptions or responded ineffectively to them. Several observations noted inconsistent responses from teachers in terms of response to misbehavior. In one observation, students argued over an item for several minutes without adult intervention.</p>	Basic	50%
		Unsatisfactory	0%

INSTRUCTION

This table summarizes the school’s performance on the Instruction domain of the rubric during the unannounced visits. The label definitions for classroom observations of "distinguished," "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" are those from the Danielson framework. The QSR team scored only 28% of observations as “distinguished” or “proficient” for the Instruction domain.

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
<p>Communicating with Students</p>	<p>The QSR team scored 25% of observations as proficient in the component of "Communicating with Students" and none as distinguished. In these observations teachers gave specific directions/tasks to students, sometimes with a clear purpose, "I want you to practice tying, please get the lacing board." There were very few content errors observed and some teachers modeled processes in individual and/or small group lessons.</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	25%
	<p>The QSR team score 75% of the observations as basic or unsatisfactory in this component. The majority of observations indicated that little to no invitation of student intellectual engagement was present. While children may have engaged in the activities, it was mostly procedural work with little exploration of strategic thinking. In several observations the teacher's explanation of content left many students more than half the class, confused or unengaged.</p>	Basic	50%
		Unsatisfactory	25%
<p>Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques</p>	<p>The QSR team did not score any of the observations as proficient or distinguished in the component of "Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques."</p>	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	0%
	<p>The QSR team scored all of the observations as basic or unsatisfactory in this component. When teachers posed questions, they often answered them themselves. Few to no questions invited student thinking or asked</p>	Basic	45%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	students to explain beyond a few word response. In one observation when students began discussing the read-aloud text, the teacher redirected them and told them not to get carried away. The majority of observations indicated that when questions were asked, they were in regards to activity selection or completion.	Unsatisfactory	55%
Engaging Students in Learning	The QSR team rated 33% of observations as proficient and none as distinguished. Students often engaged in open-ended activities, such as painting, reading, and tray tasks. As students decided they were done with a task, the majority of them moved on to another activity to complete either independently, in collaboration with another student, or sometimes with an adult.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	33%
	The QSR team scored 67% of the observations as basic in the component of "Engaging Students in Learning." Learning tasks required little to no opportunity for students to explain their thinking. Several tasks also required recall or passive learning, such as copying from a dictionary or solving standard algorithms. When teachers engaged with students in an activity, it was more for assessment of completion than inquiry about what the student was learning or how the student chose to engage and accomplish the task.	Basic	67%
		Unsatisfactory	0%
Using Assessment in Instruction	The QSR team rated half of the observations as proficient and none as distinguished in terms of using assessment in instruction. Several teachers and aides monitored students and gave corrective feedback. In one classroom where students were writing cursive on the board, the teacher gave specific feedback about how to make the letters more accurately.	Distinguished	0%
		Proficient	50%

Instruction	Evidence Observed	School Wide Rating	
	<p>The QSR team scored 8% of the observations as basic and 42% of the observations earned an unsatisfactory score. Students did not appear to be aware of any assessment criteria and the majority of teachers did not make an effort to determine student understanding. When teachers did assess, it was more often for task completion.</p>	Basic	8%
		Unsatisfactory	42%

APPENDIX I: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT OBSERVATION RUBRIC

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative or inappropriate and characterized by sarcasm, putdowns, or conflict.	Classroom interactions are generally appropriate and free from conflict but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity.	Classroom interactions reflect general warmth and caring, and are respectful of the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.	Classroom interactions are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring toward individuals. Students themselves ensure maintenance of high levels of civility among member of the class.
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The classroom does not represent a culture for learning and is characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work.	The classroom environment reflects only a minimal culture for learning, with only modest or inconsistent expectations for student achievement, little teacher commitment to the subject, and little student pride in work. Both teacher and students are performing at the minimal level to “get by.”	The classroom environment represents a genuine culture for learning, with commitment to the subject on the part of both teacher and students, high expectations for student achievement, and student pride in work.	Students assumes much of the responsibility for establishing a culture for learning in the classroom by taking pride in their work, initiating improvements to their products, and holding the work to the highest standard. Teacher demonstrates as passionate commitment to the subject.
Managing Classroom Procedures	Classroom routines and procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function unevenly or inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established and function smoothly for the most part, with little loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures are seamless in their operation, and students assume considerable responsibility for their smooth functioning.

The Classroom Environment	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Managing Student Behavior	Student behavior is poor, with no clear expectations, no monitoring of student behavior, and inappropriate response to student misbehavior.	Teacher makes an effort to establish standards of conduct for students, monitor student behavior, and respond to student misbehavior, but these efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is aware of student behavior, has established clear standards of conduct, and responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate, with evidence of student participation in setting expectations and monitoring behavior. Teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive, and teachers' response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs.

APPENDIX II: INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Communicating with Students	Teacher’s oral and written communication contains errors or is unclear or inappropriate to students. Teacher’s purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students. Teacher’s explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher’s oral and written communication contains no errors, but may not be completely appropriate or may require further explanations to avoid confusion. Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. Teacher’s explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher communicates clearly and accurately to students both orally and in writing. Teacher’s purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situated within broader learning. Teacher’s explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students’ knowledge and experience.	Teacher’s oral and written communication is clear and expressive, anticipating possible student misconceptions. Makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking purpose to student interests. Explanation of content is imaginative, and connects with students’ knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	Teacher’s use of questioning and discussion techniques is uneven with some high-level question; attempts at true discussion; moderate student participation.	Teacher’s use of questioning and discussion techniques reflects high-level questions, true discussion, and full participation by all students.	Students formulate many of the high-level questions and assume responsibility for the participation of all students in the discussion.
Engaging Students in Learning	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning, as a result of inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content, or lack of lesson structure.	Students are intellectually engaged only partially, resulting from activities or materials or uneven quality, inconsistent representation of content or uneven structure of pacing.	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson, with appropriate activities and materials, instructive representations of content, and suitable structure and pacing of the lesson.	Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson and make material contribution to the representation of content, the activities, and the materials. The structure and pacing of the lesson allow for student reflection and closure.

Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
<p>Using Assessment in Instruction</p>	<p>Students are unaware of criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring. Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum, and feedback to students is of poor quality and in an untimely manner.</p>	<p>Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information; feedback to students is uneven and inconsistent in its timeliness.</p>	<p>Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated, and frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards. Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information; feedback is timely, consistent, and of high quality.</p>	<p>Students are fully aware of the criteria and standards by which their work will be evaluated, have contributed to the development of the criteria, frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards, and make active use of that information in their learning. Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding understanding and monitors progress of individual students; feedback is timely, high quality, and students use feedback in their learning.</p>

Appendix B

Charter Agreement Amendment

FOURTH AMENDMENT TO CHARTER SCHOOL AGREEMENT BETWEEN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD AND SHINING STARS MONTESSORI ACADEMY PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

This fourth amendment (the “**Amendment**”) is entered into by and between Shining Stars Montessori Academy Public Charter School, a District of Columbia nonprofit corporation (the “**School Corporation**”) and the D.C. Public Charter School Board (“**PCSB**” or the “**Charter Board**”; collectively, the “**Parties**”). It is effective as of the date it is fully executed.

WHEREAS, the Parties entered into a contract on or about July 14, 2011 (the “**Charter Agreement**”), wherein the School Corporation agreed, among other things, to operate a public charter school (the “**School**”) in the District of Columbia in accordance with the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995, D.C. Code §§ 38-1802 *et seq.*, as amended;

WHEREAS, on August 18, 2014, PCSB voted to approve a request from the School Corporation to amend its Charter Agreement to relocate the School Property to 6017 Chillum Place, NE, Washington, D.C. 20011.

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2014, PCSB voted to approve a request from the School Corporation to amend its Charter Agreement to increase its enrollment ceiling to no more than one hundred and twenty-four (124) pupils in academic year 2014-15, no more than one hundred and seventy-five (175) pupils in academic year 2015-16, no more than two hundred (200) pupils in academic year 2016-17, no more than two hundred and seventy-five (275) pupils in academic year 2017-18, and no more than three hundred and fifty (350) pupils in subsequent academic years substantially.

WHEREAS, on November 17, 2014, PCSB voted to approve the School Corporation’s request to change its goals and student academic achievement expectations and adopt PCSB’s Early Childhood Performance Management Framework.

In consideration of the mutual covenants, representations, warranties, provisions, and agreements contained herein, the Parties agree as follows:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT

1.1 The School Corporation and the Charter Board agree to amend Section A(1)(d)(B) of the School Corporation’s Charter Petition, attached to the Charter Agreement, to state:

A. EC PMF Measurement and Assessments

For the 2014-15 academic year and every academic year thereafter, the School Corporation shall use the assessments included in the table below to measure the Student Progress and Achievement Indicators of the EC PMF. The School Corporation’s performance on these assessments will determine whether it met the goals listed in the table below until the PCSB determines the performance

standards for the EC PMF tiers. After PCSB establishes the criteria for the EC PMF tiers, the School Corporation will be considered to have met its goals and academic achievement expectations if it meets performance standards to be set by PCSB.

Domain	Goals
Pre-kindergarten Literacy Achievement	60% of pre-kindergarten-3 (PK3) and PK4 students will be at or above the achievement level which is a standard score of 100 at the end of the year on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) assessment.
Pre-kindergarten Math Achievement	60 % of PK3 and PK4 students will be at or above the achievement level which is a standard score of 100 at the end of the year on the Test of Early Mathematics Ability (TEMA) assessment.
Pre-kindergarten Emotional Support	The school will score a rating equal to or greater than the floor for the corresponding PMF indicator as detailed in the PMF Technical Guide for that given year on the Emotional Support domain of the CLASS Assessment.
Pre-kindergarten Classroom Organization	The school will score a rating equal to or greater than the floor for the corresponding PMF indicator as detailed in the PMF Technical Guide for that given year on the Classroom Organization domain of the CLASS Assessment.
Pre-kindergarten Instructional Support	The school will score a rating equal to or greater than the floor for the corresponding PMF indicator as detailed in the PMF Technical Guide for that given year on the Instructional Support domain of the CLASS Assessment.
Pre-kindergarten In-Seat Attendance	PK3 and PK4 students will attend school at a rate equal to or greater than the floor for the corresponding PMF indicator as detailed in the PMF Technical Guide for that given year.
Kindergarten Literacy Achievement	60% of kindergarten students will be at or above the achievement level which is a standard score of 100 at the end of the year on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) assessment.

Domain	Goals
Kindergarten through Second Grade Math Achievement	60% of kindergarten through second grade students will be at or above the achievement level which is a standard score of 100 at the end of the year on the Test of Early Mathematics Ability (TEMA) assessment.
First through Second Grade Literacy Achievement	60% of first and second grade students will score above the benchmark goals on the Dynamic Indicators Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment as designated by the publisher.
Third Grade Literacy Achievement	The percentage of third grade students, who score proficient or advanced in reading on the state assessment, will meet or exceed the sector's third grade average for each year.
Third Grade Math Achievement	The percentage of third grade students, who score proficient or advanced in mathematics on the state assessment, will meet or exceed the sector's third grade average for each year.
Kindergarten through Third Grade In-Seat Attendance	On average, kindergarten through third grade students will attend school at a rate equal to or greater than the floor for the corresponding PMF indicator as detailed in the PMF Technical Guide for that given year.
Re-enrollment	The school will have a re-enrollment rate for its kindergarten through second grade students that is equal to or greater than the floor for the corresponding PMF indicator as detailed in the PMF Technical Guide for that given year.

SECTION 2: TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AMENDMENT

2.1 Reservation of Rights. The Parties reserve their rights under the Charter Agreement. The execution of this Amendment shall not, except as expressly provided in this Amendment, operate as a waiver of any right, power or remedy of any party under the Charter Agreement, or constitute a waiver of any other provision of the Charter Agreement.

2.2 Continuing Effectiveness. Except as expressly provided in this Amendment, all of the terms and conditions of the Charter Agreement remain in full effect.

2.3 Representations and Warranties. The Parties represent and warrant that this Amendment has been duly authorized and executed, and constitutes their legal, valid and binding obligations.

Shining Stars PCS - Charter Agreement Amendment

September 2015

Page 3

2.4 Counterparts and Electronic Signature. This Amendment may be signed by the Parties in separate counterparts, each of which when so executed and delivered shall be deemed an original, but all such counterparts together shall constitute but one and the same instrument; signature pages may be detached from multiple separate counterparts and attached to a single counterpart so that all signature pages are physically attached to the same document. Electronic signatures by either of the parties shall have the same effect as original signatures.

2.5 Severability. In case any provision in or obligation under this Amendment shall be invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, the validity, legality, and enforceability of the remaining provisions or obligations in this Amendment or in the Charter Agreement shall not in any way be affected or impaired thereby.

2.6 Assignment. This Amendment shall not be assignable by either Party; except that if the Charter Board shall no longer have authority to charter public schools in the District of Columbia, the Charter Board may assign this Amendment to any entity authorized to charter or monitor public charter schools in the District of Columbia.

2.7 No Third Party Beneficiary. Nothing in this Amendment expressed or implied shall be construed to give any Person other than the Parties any legal or equitable rights under the Charter Agreement or any of its amendments. "Person" shall mean and include natural persons, corporations, limited liability companies, limited liability associations, companies, trusts, banks, trust companies, land trusts, business trusts, or other organizations, whether or not legal entities, governments, and agencies, or other administrative or regulatory bodies thereof.

2.8 Waiver. No waiver of any breach of this Amendment or the Charter Agreement shall be held as a waiver of any subsequent breach.

2.9 Construction. This Amendment shall be construed fairly as to both Parties and not in favor of or against either Party, regardless of which Party drafted the underlying document.

2.10 Dispute Resolution. Neither the Charter Board nor the School Corporation shall exercise any legal remedy with respect to any dispute arising under this Amendment or the Charter Agreement without first providing written notice to the other Party hereto describing the nature of the dispute; and thereafter, having representatives of the Charter Board and the School Corporation meet to attempt in good faith to resolve the dispute. Nothing contained herein, however, shall restrict the Charter Board's ability to revoke, not renew, or terminate the Charter Agreement pursuant to D.C. Code § 38-1802.13.

2.11 Notices. Any notice or other communication required or permitted to be given shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been given when: (i) sent by email, provided that a copy also is mailed by certified or registered mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested; (ii) delivered by hand (with written confirmation of receipt); or (iii) received by the addressee, if sent by a nationally recognized overnight delivery service (receipt requested) or certified or registered mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested,

in each case to the appropriate addresses set forth below (until notice of a change of address is delivered) shall be as follows:

If to PCSB:

District of Columbia Public Charter School Board
3333 14th St., NW; Suite 210
Washington, DC 20010
Attention: Scott Pearson, Executive Director
spears@dcpcsb.org
Telephone: (202) 328-2660

If to the School Corporation:

Shining Stars Public Charter School
6015 Chillum Place, NE
Washington, DC 20011
Attention: Regina Rodriguez, Executive Director
Email: rrodriguez@shingstarsdc.org
Telephone: (202) 319-2307

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have caused this Amendment to be duly executed and delivered by their respective authorized officers as evidenced below:

**SHINING STARS
PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD**

By: _____

By: _____

Allison Brown

Darren Woodruff, Ph.D.

Shining Stars Board President

PCSB Board Chair

Date:

Date:

Appendix C



Shining Stars Montessori
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2011-2012

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Enrollment of New Students				
Fair enrollment process.	Enrollment application; written lottery procedures with dates for enrollment process.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.06.	Yes	
Student Suspension and Expulsion				
Notice and due process.	Current year student handbook or other written document that outlines the school's discipline policy and procedures.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.06 (g); guidance for PCSB staff when contacted by parents.	Yes	
Student Health Records				
Health and safety of students.	Option 1: Notice of assigned nurse on staff .	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4) and the Student Access to Treatment Act of 2007.	No*	*Staff is on a waiting list for training.
	Option 2: Copy of staff certificate to administer medications.			
Background Checks on Employees and Volunteers				
Health and safety of students.	Current roster of all employees and volunteers (working greater than 10 hours at the school) with indication of date background check conducted and that a copy of the report is on file.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4).	Yes	
Employee Handbook				
Employment policies and the protection of confidential information.	Employee handbook or other written document on policies and procedures governing employment at the school.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04, FERPA, the Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007, and applicable state and federal employment laws.	Yes	
Insurance				
Appropriate insurance.	Certification that appropriate levels of insurance have been secured.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (b)(4).	Yes	

Shining Stars Montessori
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2011-2012

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
School Facility				
Lease/Purchase Agreement and certificate of occupancy.	Certificate of occupancy.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (b)(4) - a Certificate of Occupancy is required at opening and for a relocation to a new facility.	Yes	
	Lease/Purchase Agreement.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (b)(4) - lease or purchase agreement is required at opening, for a relocation to a new facility, and for amendments to a lease once it expires.	Yes	
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)				
School quality and choice.	Communication with parents on school's compliance with NCLB before September 1 or within 14 days of school AYP results.	Compliance with NCLB and ESEA guidance.	N.A.	
High quality teachers.	For Title I schools, current year teacher roster with grade and subject(s) taught, HQ status, and how the status was met (HOUSSE, Praxis, Degree, License/Certificate); action plans for all non-HQT staff.	Compliance with NCLB and ESEA guidance to ensure that all elementary and secondary subject area teachers are highly qualified.	No*	*Teachers need action plans.
Board of Trustees				
Composition.	Board roster with names and titles.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.05.	Yes	
Fiduciary Duty.	Board meeting minutes.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.05.	No*	Minutes need to be uploaded regularly to AOIS. Must reflect a quorum, previous



**Shining Stars Public Charter School
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2012-2013**

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Fair Enrollment Process	Enrollment application for SY 2013-2014	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.06	Compliant	
	Written lottery procedures		Compliant	
Notice and Due Process (suspension and expulsion)	Student handbook or other written document that outlines the school's discipline policy and procedures.	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.06 (g); guidance for PCSB staff when contacted by parents	Compliant	
Student Health	Option 1: Notice of assigned nurse on staff	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4) and the Student Access to Treatment Act of 2007	Compliant	
	Option 2: Copy of staff certificate to administer medications			
Student Safety	Current roster of all employees and volunteers (working greater than 10 hours at the school) with indication that background check has been conducted	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4)	Compliant	
	Sexual Violation Protocol Assurance Policy	Compliance with Mandated Reporter laws in DC Code Section 4-1321.02	Compliant	
	School Emergency Response Plan	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4)	Compliant	



Shining Stars Public Charter School
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2012-2013

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Charter School Employees	Employee handbook or other written document on policies and procedures governing employment at the school, including employee handling of student records	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04, 38-1802.07, FERPA, the Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007, and applicable state and federal employment laws	Compliant	
Insurance	Certification that appropriate levels of insurance have been secured	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (b)(4)	Compliant	
Occupancy, Lease and License for the Facility	Certificate of occupancy with an occupant load equal or greater than the number of students and staff in the building	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (b)(4)	Compliant	
	Lease/Purchase Agreement		Compliant	
	Basic Business License		Compliant	
High Quality Teachers: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	For Title I schools, teacher roster with HQ status, and how the status was met; action plans indicated for all non-HQT staff	Compliance with ESEA guidance to ensure that all elementary and secondary subject area teachers are highly qualified	Compliant	



**Shining Stars Public Charter School
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2012-2013**

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Fiduciary Duty: Board of Trustees	Board roster with names and titles	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.05	Compliant	
	Board meeting minutes submitted		Compliant	
	Board calendar with meeting dates		Compliant	
	Board Bylaws		Compliant	
Articles of Incorporation	Articles of Incorporation	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04	Compliant	
School Organization	School Organization Chart	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a)	Compliant	
Litigation Status	Litigation Proceedings Calendar (or nonapplicable memo)	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a)	Compliant	
School Calendar	School Calendar	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a)	Compliant	
High School Courses for Graduation	High School Course Offering	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a)	N/A	
Submission of Annual Report	Annual Report (SY 2011-2012)	Compliance with the School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c) (11)	Compliant	
Accreditation Status	Letter or license of accreditation or seeking accreditation (schools at least 5 years in operation)	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.02 (16)	Compliant	School is in its second year of operation and can seek accreditation in the future.



Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2013-2014

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Discipline Policy and Due Process	Student handbook or other written document that outlines the school's discipline policy and procedures	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.06 (g); guidance for PCSB staff when contacted by parents	COMPLIANT	
Attendance Policy	Student handbook or other written document that outlines the school's attendance policy and procedures	Compliance with the Attendance Accountability Amendment Act; fidelity to the school's charter	COMPLIANT	
Student Health	Option 1: Notice of assigned nurse on staff	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4) and the Student Access to Treatment Act of 2007	COMPLIANT	
	Option 2: Copy of staff certificate to administer medications			
Student Safety	Current roster of all employees and volunteers (working greater than 10 hours at the school) with indication that background check has been conducted	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4)	COMPLIANT	
	Sexual Violation Protocol Assurance Policy	Compliance with Mandated Reporter laws in DC Code Section 4-1321.02	COMPLIANT	
	School Emergency Response Plan (Assurance letter)	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4)	COMPLIANT	



**Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2013-2014**

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Charter School Employees	Employee handbook or other written document on policies and procedures governing employment at the school	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04, 38-1802.07, FERPA, the Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007, and applicable state and federal employment laws	COMPLIANT	
Insurance	Certification that appropriate levels of insurance have been secured	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (b)(4)	COMPLIANT	
Occupancy, Lease and License for the Facility	Certificate of occupancy with an occupant load equal or greater than the number of students and staff in the building	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c)(4)	COMPLIANT	
	Lease/Purchase Agreement (submitted for new campuses or new leases only)		COMPLIANT	
	Basic Business License		COMPLIANT	
Highly Qualified Teachers: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	For Title I schools, teacher roster with HQ status, and how the status was met; action plans indicated for all non-HQT staff	Compliance with ESEA guidance to ensure that all elementary and secondary subject area teachers are highly qualified	COMPLIANT	



Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS
COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT
2013-2014

INDICATOR	DOCUMENTATION	RATIONALE	COMPLIANCE STATUS	COMMENTS
Fiduciary Duty: Board of Trustees	Board roster	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.05	COMPLIANT	
	Board meeting minutes submitted		COMPLIANT	
	Board calendar with meeting dates		COMPLIANT	
	Board Bylaws (submitted for new LEAs or revised bylaws only)		COMPLIANT	
Articles of Incorporation	Articles of Incorporation (submitted for new LEAs or revisions only)	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04	COMPLIANT	
Special Education	Continuum of Services Chart	Compliance with DCMR Rule 5-E3012 and IDEA §300.115	COMPLIANT	
Litigation Status	Litigation Proceedings Calendar (or non-applicable memo)	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a)	COMPLIANT	
School Calendar	School Calendar	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a)	COMPLIANT	
High School Courses for Graduation	High School Course Offering	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.11 (a); school's charter	N/A	
Annual Report	Annual Report (SY 2012-2013)	Compliance with the School Reform Act Section 38-1802.04 (c) (11)	COMPLIANT	
Accreditation Status	Letter or license of accreditation or seeking accreditation (schools at least 5 years in operation)	Compliance with School Reform Act Section 38-1802.02 (16)	COMPLIANT	

SY 2014-2015 DC Public Charter School Board Compliance Review Report

For LEA/Campus: *Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS*

January 15, 2015

Requirement	Compliance Status	Due	On Time
Charter's Board Calendar	Compliant	7/25/14	✓
Fire Drills	Compliant	7/25/14	✗
School Calendar	Compliant	7/25/14	✓
Monthly Financial Statements - June	Compliant	7/31/14	✓
Annual Teacher and Principal Evaluation Reflection (Campus)	Compliant	8/1/14	✗
Annual Teacher and Principal Evaluation Reflection (LEA)	Compliant	8/15/14	✗
Auditor Engagement Letter	Compliant	8/15/14	✓
Charter School Athletics Compliance	Compliant	8/31/14	✗
Professional Development Calendar (Title I Schools)	Compliant	9/30/14	✗
Early Childhood (EC) PMF Assessment Selection Form	Compliant	10/1/14	✓
Annual Report SY2013-2014	Compliant	10/9/14	✓
Accreditation	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Basic Business License	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Board Meeting Approved Minutes	Compliant	10/10/14	✗
Board Roster	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Certificate of Insurance	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Certificate of Occupancy	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Child Find Policy	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Employee Handbook: Employment Policies	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Lease/Purchase Agreement - Certification of Completion	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Litigation Proceedings Calendar	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
School Emergency Response Plan	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
School Nurse Notification OR Certified Staff to Administer Medication	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
SPED-Continuum of Services	Compliant	10/10/14	✓

Staff/Volunteer Roster and Background Checks - 10/10/2014	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Student Handbook	Compliant	10/10/14	✓
Quarterly Financial Statements - 1st	Compliant	10/31/14	✓
Audited Financial Statements	Compliant	11/3/14	✓
Audited Financial Statements - FAR Data Entry Form	Compliant	11/7/14	✓
Sexual Violation Protocol Assurance Letter	Compliant	12/1/14	✓
Fire Drills	Compliant	12/5/14	✓

SY 2014-2015 DC Public Charter School Board Compliance Review Report - Contracts Submission

For LEA/Campus: *Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS*

Requirement	Compliance Status	Due	On Time
Contracts	6 Submitted	3 days after contract is awarded	6 of 6

Date of Submission to PCSB	Name of Charter School	Vendor	Services to be Provided	Effective Date of Contract-10 days (SRA)	Value of Contract	# of Days Between Date of Contract Award to Vendor & Submission to PCSB
9/25/14	Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS	Elsie Whitlow Stokes Community Freedom PCS Kitchen	Food Services	10/5/14	\$113,400	Compliant
9/25/14	Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS	Sela PCS	Sublease agreement	10/5/14	\$230,000	Compliant
9/29/14	Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS	Language Stars	Spanish Immersion Services	10/9/14	\$26,000	Compliant
9/29/14	Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS	Education Compliance Associates	Curriculum and PD Services	10/9/14	\$60,000	Compliant
9/29/14	Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS	Education Compliance Associates	Information Technology Services	10/9/14	\$26,000	Compliant
9/29/14	Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS	Paradigm Therapy Partners	Therapy Services	10/9/14	\$25,000	Compliant

2014-15 Compliance Review Requirements

Requirement	Description
2014-15 School Calendar	<p>Calendar must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -minimum 180 days of school (6+ hours) -first and last day of school listed -start and end times listed -instructional days and holidays listed -make-up days for inclement weather listed -indicate staggered start dates if applicable <p>*If different campuses within the LEA have different calendar days, please make note on the calendar, or submit separate calendars for each campus</p>
Charter Board Calendar	List of all days the Board of Trustees is scheduled to meet for the 2014-2015 school year (this schedule should reflect what is in the school's bylaws)
High School Course Offering--Assurance	All courses and credits offered to high school students; include graduation requirements
Fire Drill Schedule	<p><u>Fire drill schedule</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Must include TWO drills within the first two weeks of the school year -monthly thereafter (total of 10 per year)
Audited Financial Statement Engagement Letter - FY2015	The annual examination and evaluation of the financial statements of a charter school. The audit is performed by a PCSB approved auditor.
Monthly Financial Statements - FY2015	Statement of Activities and Statement of Financial Position (for the period ending and year-to-date). The files must be submitted in Excel.
Charter School Athletics Compliance	Evidence that appropriate medical/ trainer personnel are present at every interscholastic sporting event; fill out the template provided
Annual Report	<p><u>2013-14 Annual Report includes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Narrative (description of performance and progress; goal attainment; school program) -Data Report -Appendices (staff roster; board roster; financials)
Monthly Financial Statements - FY2015	Statement of Activities and Statement of Financial Position (for the period ending and year-to-date). The files must be submitted in Excel.
ESEA Focus and Priority Schools (Cohort I): Update web-based Intervention/Turnaround Plan	Assurance letter stating that the school has updated their Improvement plan in web-based tool.
ESEA Focus Schools: web-based Sub-group Intervention Plan	Assurance letter stating that the school uploaded their plan for supporting Focus sub-groups into web-based tool

2014-15 Compliance Review Requirements

Requirement	Description
Professional Development Calendar, Title I schools	Include all activities related to professional development. (As part of its accountability functions under Title I, Part A of ESEA for District public charter schools, PCSB must review, at least annually, each public charter school's activities related to professional development.)
Early Childhood Assessments	EC PMF assessment form indicating what assessments the school plans to administer for the current school year. Each school with early childhood grades (PK3-2) must let PCSB know which assessments the school will be held accountable to for the EC PMF.
Certificate of Occupancy	Includes school name and current address; Occupancy load on form is equal to or greater than the sum of staff and students
Insurance Certificate	Includes: general liability, directors and officers liability, umbrella coverage, property/lease insurance, auto liability insurance, workers compensation (or all coverage listed in school's charter agreement); should include all addresses/campuses of an LEA
Basic Business License	Current Basic Business License
School Nurse Notification OR Certified Staff to Administer Medicine	DOH notice of assigned nurse on staff; OR copy of staff certificate to administer medications (not expired)
Board Roster	<p>Board makeup must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Odd number of voting members (odd number of voting members/ doesn't include ex-officio) -Greater than 3 but no more than 15 -Majority of members residing in DC (include address or city of residence) -2 parent members (voting members) * <p><i>*Adult schools may use alumnae or adult students to satisfy the parent requirement</i></p>
Litigation Proceedings Calendar	Includes schedule of litigation or federal complaints issued against the school, includes: SPED-related legal proceedings, settlement agreements, and hearing officer decisions pending or occurring in the past school year; federal complaints issued against the school within the past year; or non-applicable memo
Board Meeting Minutes--1st Quarter	Minutes from all board meetings held/ approved between July and October 2014; should reflect decisions made by the Board that are consistent with the Charter granted to the school, the School Reform Act, and applicable law
School Emergency Response Plan	Evidence or assurance that the school worked with Student Support Center to develop their Emergency Response Plan. OR , an assurance letter confirming that the school has established procedures, protocol and drills in order to respond to potential crises (i.e., fire, tornado, earthquake, hurricane, lockdown, active shooter, health outbreak/ communicable diseases). The plan must be aligned with the guidelines of agencies such as Fire and EMS, MPD, and CFSA.
Sexual Violation Protocol	An assurance letter confirming that the school's policy regarding sexual violations has been read by all staff members <i>*Should confirm staff's understanding of their obligation for reporting sexual abuse of student.</i>

2014-15 Compliance Review Requirements

Requirement	Description
Child Find Policy	<p>An LEA's Child Find procedures should include, but is not limited to, a written description of how the LEA conducts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part C Identification (if applicable to your student population)- Assessment, Obtaining Consent, Determining Eligibility, Referral, Evaluation, Assessment • Part B Identification- Transitioning students from Part C to Part B (if applicable to your student population), Public Awareness, Screening, Referral, Evaluation, Assessment
Staff Roster & Background Checks	<p>Staff/volunteer name, position, indication that background check has been conducted within the past TWO years</p> <p><i>*All volunteers working more than 10 hrs/ week must have background checks</i></p>
Employee Handbook (or submit individual policies)	<p>Includes school board-approved policies around compliance with applicable employment laws including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *sexual harassment *equal opportunity *drug-free workplace *complaint Resolution Process *Whistle blower Policy (best practice, not mandatory)
Accreditation	<p>Letter and/or license of accreditation; or memo explaining where in the process the school is (undergoing accreditation); Schools not yet 5 years old may submit an N/A memo if they have not begun the accreditation process</p>
SPED--Continuum of Services	<p>Description of the school's continuum of services available to students with disabilities (template accurately filled out)</p>
<p>Student Handbook</p> <p>or submit policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Discipline Policy *Attendance Policy *Safeguard of Student Information 	<p>Discipline Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -clear explanation of infractions -clear explanation of consequences (basis for suspensions/ expulsions) -manifestation determination process for students with disabilities -due process and appeals procedures for student/ parents for disciplinary incidents <p>Attendance Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -clear explanation of consequences of tardiness and absences -clear explanation of what constitutes an excused absence (including documentation required) -aligned with state law (i.e., truancy mandatory reporting, Attendance Accountability Act of 2013) <p>Safeguard of Student Information Policy--aligns with FERPA regulations</p>
Lease	Lease
Charter Renewal Application	PCSB requests that schools submit charter renewal applications by this suggested date
Enrollment Ceiling Increase Request	Request to increase maximum student enrollment level beyond what is currently in the charter
Charter Amendment	Submission of requests and notifications of changes in the charter agreement (refer to charter amendment guidelines)

2014-15 Compliance Review Requirements

Requirement	Description
Monthly Financial Statements - FY2015	Statement of Activities and Statement of Financial Position (for the period ending and year-to-date). The files must be submitted in Excel.
Quarterly Financial Statements - FY2015	Statement of Activities and Statement of Financial Position (for the period ending and year-to-date). The files must be submitted in Excel.
Audited Financial Statements	The annual examination and evaluation of the financial statements of a charter school. The audit is performed by a PCSB approved auditor.
Audited Financial Statements - FAR Data Entry Form	Use the FAR Data Entry Form to upload data from your school's financial statement for the Finance and Audit Review report.
Monthly Financial Statements - FY2015	Statement of Activities and Statement of Financial Position (for the period ending and year-to-date). The files must be submitted in Excel.
Annual Financial Audit - PCSB Schedules - FY2014	Submission of functional expense schedule and contracts schedule using PCSB template. The file must be submitted in Excel.
Enrollment Projections	Forecast of the student enrollment for the subsequent school year. It must be submitted in Excel.
ESEA Focus and Priority Schools (Cohort I): Update web-based Intervention/Turnaround Plan	Update--Assurance letter stating that the school has updated their Improvement plan in web-based tool.
2015-2016 Student Application	<p>Application may only ask: student name, date of birth, grade level, address, gender, siblings currently attending school; parent/guardian name, parent/ guardian address, parent/ guardian phone number</p> <p>Must NOT contain questions referring to IEPs or SPED, birth certificate, report cards, nationality, race, language, interview</p> <p>*should include a non-discrimination clause</p>
2015-2016 Lottery Procedures	Lottery date; explanation of provisions for waitlisted students; provisions for notifying students of placement
Fire Drills Conducted	List of dates the school has conducted a fire drill thus far in the year; tentative dates for drills for remainder of year

Appendix D



ENCLOSURE 2

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2011 IDEA PART B LEA PERFORMANCE DETERMINATIONS

LEA:	Shining Stars Montessori Public Charter School
Final Percentage Rating:	87%
Determination Level:	Meets Requirements

SUMMARY OF EACH REQUIRED ELEMENT AND RATING ASSIGNED

Element	Element Description	Determination	Number of Points Achieved	Number of Points Possible
1	History, nature and length of time of any reported noncompliance (APR Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 4b – N/A • Indicator 9 – N/A • Indicator 10 – N/A • Indicator 11 – in compliance • Indicator 12 – N/A • Indicator 13 – N/A 	1	1
2	Information regarding timely, valid and reliable data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All data are submitted timely 	4	4
3a	Identified noncompliance from on-site compliance monitoring and/or focused monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not receive a report in FFY 2011 as the result of an on-site monitoring visit 	N/A	N/A
3b	Dispute resolution findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dispute resolution complaints were filed against the LEA 	N/A	N/A

4	Outcomes of sub-recipient audit reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely submission of A-133 Report (if applicable) –N/A • Type of Auditor’s A-133 Report Issued on Compliance (if applicable) –N/A • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – N/A • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – N/A • Auditor’s designation as low-risk sub-recipient in the A-133 Report (if applicable) –N/A • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the annual independent audit – 4 points • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the annual independent audit – 4 points • Noncompliance or other matters identified by the Auditor that is required to be reported under Government Auditing Standard – 4 points 	2 (average points)	4 (average points)
5	Other data available to OSSE regarding the LEA’s compliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, relevant financial data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely LEA submission of Phase I and Phase II applications and reimbursement for a minimum of 45% of its IDEA, Section 611 funds within the first 15 months of the FFY 2011 grants cycle 	4	4
6	Compliance with the IDEA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA in compliance with the IDEA MOE requirement and LEA reported on MOE to OSSE timely 	2	2
7	Performance on selected District of Columbia State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not meet minimum “n” size for disability subgroup 	0	0

8	Evidence of correction of findings of noncompliance, including progress toward full compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LEA did not receive any findings of noncompliance from FFY 2011 that were due for correction in FFY 2012 	0	0
Total Number of Points Achieved			13	
Total Possible Points from Applicable Elements			15	
Percentage of Points Achieved from Applicable Elements			87%	



ENCLOSURE 2

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2012 IDEA PART B LEA PERFORMANCE DETERMINATIONS

LEA:	Shining Stars Montessori Academy Public Charter School
Final Percentage Rating:	106%
Determination Level:	Meets Requirements

SUMMARY OF EACH REQUIRED ELEMENT AND RATING ASSIGNED

Element	Element Description	Determination Criteria	Number of Points Achieved	Number of Points Possible
1	History, nature and length of time of any reported noncompliance (APR Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 4b – N/A • Indicator 9 – N/A • Indicator 10 – N/A • Indicator 11 – N/A • Indicator 12 – N/A • Indicator 13 – N/A 	N/A	N/A
2	Information regarding timely, valid and reliable data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All data are submitted timely 	4	4
3a	Identified noncompliance from on-site compliance monitoring and/or focused monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not receive a report in FFY 2012 as the result of an on-site monitoring visit 	N/A	N/A
3b	Dispute resolution findings	LEA has 0-25 students with IEPs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dispute resolution complaints were filed against the LEA or 0-2 findings of noncompliance 	2	2

4	Outcomes of sub-recipient audit reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely submission of A-133 Report (if applicable) – N/A • Type of Auditor’s A-133 Report Issued on Compliance (if applicable) – N/A • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – N/A • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – N/A • Auditor’s designation as low-risk sub-recipient in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – N/A • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the annual independent audit – 4 • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the annual independent audit – 4 • Noncompliance or other matters identified by the Auditor that is required to be reported under Government Auditing Standard – 4 	4	4
5	Other data available to OSSE regarding the LEA’s compliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, relevant financial data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely LEA submission of Phase I and Phase II applications and reimbursement for a minimum of 45% of its IDEA, Section 611 funds within the first 15 months of the FFY 2012 grants cycle 	4	4
6	Compliance with the IDEA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA in compliance with the IDEA MOE requirement and LEA reported on MOE to OSSE timely 	2	2
7	Performance on selected District of Columbia State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not meet minimum “n” size for disability subgroup 	N/A	N/A

8	Evidence of correction of findings of noncompliance, including progress toward full compliance (points added to total score)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA was not issued any findings of noncompliance from FFY 2012 that were due for correction in FFY 2013 	N/A	N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BONUS: LEA has no longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2011, 2010 and 2009 	1	
Total Number of Points Achieved				17
Total Possible Points from Applicable Elements				16
Percentage of Points Achieved from Applicable Elements				106%

Appendix E

LEA Onsite Visit: LEA Compliance

Agency: **Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS**
 Initial Release Date: **2/24/2015**
 Date of Notification: **3/17/2015**
 Days Remaining: **289**

The percent compliant = $\#C / (\#C + \#NC)$ Note: NA responses are not included in calculation.

Compliance Item	N=	#C	#NC	#NA	%	Corrective Action
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)						
4) Continuum of Alternative Placements §300.115	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop a plan to provide a continuum of alternative placements consistent with the regulatory requirement.
Individual Education Program (IEP)						
5) IEP Accessibility §300.323(d)(1)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop a plan, policy or practice to ensure that all individuals responsible for the implementation of IEPs have access to student's IEPs.
Data						
6) Students Referred to Special Education Entered Into SEDS §300.211	1	1	0	0	100.00%	LEA must develop and implement a plan that addresses timely data entry.
7) LEA Timely Response to Data Requests §300.211	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop a plan, policy or practice to ensure timely data submissions.
Dispute Resolution						
8) LEA Provides Information of State Complaints OSSE State Complaint Policy	1	0	0	1	0.00%	LEA must develop and implement a plan that addresses timely compliance with dispute resolution activities. Provide documentation of the above to OSSE.
9) LEA Timely Implements Corrective Actions §300.600(e)	1	0	0	1	0.00%	LEA must develop and implement a plan that addresses timely compliance with dispute resolution activities. Provide documentation of the above to OSSE.
NIMAS						
10) LEA Provision of Instructional Materials §300.172	1	0	0	1	0.00%	LEA must provide documentation of communication with NIMAC or documentation of providing students with instructional materials.
Fiscal						
11) LEA Policy/Procedures Governing Budgets §80.20	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure for governing the preparation and approval of budgets and budget amendments for all funds.
12) LEA Procurement Policy/Procedures for Contractor Performance §80.36(b)(1)(b)(2)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policies/procedures that conform to applicable Federal, state, and local laws and regulations that shows the LEA has a contract administration system in place which ensures that contractors perform in accordance with the terms, conditions, and specifications of their contracts or purchase orders including ensuring that grant funds are used for allowable costs.
13) LEA Policies/Procedures to Ensure Expenditure Approval in IDEA RW OSSE GAN	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure that ensures expenditures included in the IDEA RW are reviewed and approved by the appropriate grant director/supervisor before the RW is submitted.
14) LEA Documentation of Obligation/Reimbursement of Federal Funds Within Grant Period §80.23	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must submit to OSSE evidence of tracking the following: awarded amount for each grant it receives, grant availability period, date of reimbursements requests submitted, dates of obligation periods. The LEA must also submit to OSSE invoices for expenditures incurred within the correct grant period, that equate to the amount deemed to be allowable. These invoices must not have been paid for by any other federal funding source previously.
15) LEA Retention of Financial Records For 5 Years GEPA	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure that ensures financial records are retained for 5 years.
16) LEA (Controls In Place) Policies/Procedures To Protect Assets Over \$5,000 §80.32	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure that ensures all assets procured with federal funds are protected, particularly those assets costing more than \$5,000. If applicable, an inventory list must be submitted by the LEA.

17) LEA Code of Conduct For Employees Administering Contracts §80.36(b)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop code of conduct/conflict of interest policy for employees involved in the administration of contracts.
18) LEA Accounting Record to Ensure Federal Funds Not Co-Mingled §80.20	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure that ensures federal grant funds are not co-mingled.
19) LEA Accurately Tracks IDEA Expenditures/ Set-asides §80.20	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure that ensures expenditures are accurately tracked.
20) LEA Appropriately Charges Salaries to IDEA Grant Programs OMB Circular A-87	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop policy/procedure that ensures salaries of personnel who are paid with grant funds are charged appropriately.
21) LEA Tracks Personnel Supported by IDEA Grant Funds OMB Circular A-87	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must maintain either Semi-Annual Certifications or Personnel Activity Reports (PARs) for all employees paid out of federal funds.
22) LEA Has Source Documentation for Purchased Items/IDEA Funds Reimbursement §80.20(b)(6)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must (1) submit invoices to OSSE for allowable expenditures that equate to the amount deemed allowable; and (2) include proof of payment documentation for all items included in the sample request.
23) LEA Followed Procurement Procedures §80.36	1	0	0	1	0.00%	The LEA must submit contracts for all vendors listed under Contractual Services on the sample request to OSSE. The contracts must (1) cover the date range of the expenditures listed on the sample, and (2) be signed by all representing parties responsible for the contract.
24) LEA Follows Procedures to Ensure Expenditure of IDEA Funds on Allowable Activities §80.20, OMB Circular A-87	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must (1) submit invoices to OSSE for allowable expenditures that equate to the amount deemed allowable; and (2) include invoices and proof of payment documentation for all items included in the sample request.
25) LEA Correctly Paid and Retained Invoices for Expenditure in IDEA RW §80.20, OSSE GAN	1	0	0	1	0.00%	The LEA must (1) submit invoices to OSSE for allowable expenditures that equate to the amount deemed allowable; and (2) include invoices and proof of payment documentation for all items included in the sample request.
26) LEA Correctly Procures, Utilizes and Charges Construction Expenses OMB Circular A-87	1	0	0	1	0.00%	The LEA must submit documents for the construction project paid for with IDEA funds.
27) LEA Utilizes IDEA Funds for Providing CEIS §§300.226, 300.646	1	0	0	1	0.00%	Voluntary Elections: the LEA must modify its existing budgets and spending plans. Required Election: the LEA must report on CEIS expenditures in the designated area of the fiscal workbook.
28) LEA Properly Tracks Students Who Receive CEIS §300.226(d)	1	0	0	1	0.00%	The LEA has a policy/procedure to track students receiving CEIS and subsequent special education services for two years and the LEA can demonstrate that they have begun tracking students who received CEIS (if applicable).
29) LEA Consultation with Rep/Parent of Parentally-placed Students in Private Schools §300.134	1	0	0	1	0.00%	The LEA must provide documentation of meaningful consultation regarding child find, proportionate share, consultation process and provision of services (including written explanation if needed).
30) LEA Seeks Reimbursement for Serving Parentally-placed Students with Disabilities in Private Schools §300.134	1	0	0	1	0.00%	The LEA must submit documentation / certifications showing that meaningful consultation occurred between the LEA and private school(s).
31) LEA Reduction of Expenditures for the Education of Students with Disabilities §300.203	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must provide OSSE with local funds in the amount of the reduction that does not qualify for an exception under §300.204 or an adjustment under §300.205.
Extended School Year						
3) ESY Limited Based on Disability §300.106(a)(3)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	The LEA must develop a plan or policy to ensure that ESY is not limited to students in particular disability categories.

LEA Onsite Visit: Student Compliance

Agency: **Shining Stars Montessori Academy PCS**
 Initial Release Date: **2/24/2015**
 Date of Notification: **3/17/2015**
 Days Remaining: **251**

The percent compliant = $\#C / (\#C + \#NC)$ Note: NA responses are not included in calculation.

Compliance Item	N=	#C	#NC	#NA	%	Corrective Action
Initial Evaluation and Reevaluation						
12) Parents Provided Procedural Safeguards §300.504(a)(1)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Provide a copy of procedural safeguards to parents. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
13) Parent Consent for Initial Evaluation §300.300(a)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Not correctable at the student level. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
14) Consent Form Signature Prior to Initial Evaluation §300.300(a)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Not correctable at the student level. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
15) Variety of Assessment Tools and Strategies Used §300.304	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Provide evidence that multiple and appropriate sources were used to determine eligibility. If no evidence can be provided, reconvene the IEP team to re-determine eligibility and the educational needs of the student. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
Individual Education Program (IEP)						
20) Parent/Student Invited to IEP Meeting §300.322(a)(1)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Provide evidence that the parent/student attended the meeting or refused to attend the meeting. If parent/ student was not invited, reconvene IEP meeting with invitation to the parent/student. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
21) Parent/Student Notified of Meeting §300.322(a)(1)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Reconvene IEP team and notify parent early enough to ensure an opportunity to attend. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
22) 'Parent' Meets Definition in IDEA Regulations §300.30	1	1	0	0	100.00%	If no parent can be located, promptly contact the OSSE for appointment of a surrogate parent and reconvene IEP meeting with invitation to surrogate parent. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.
23) General Education Teacher Attended IEP Meeting §§300.321(a), 300.321(e)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	Not correctable at the student level. OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

24) LEA Designee Attended IEP Meeting §§300.321(a), 300.321(e)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Not correctable at the student level.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
25) PLAAFP States Effect of Disability in General Curriculum/ Appropriate Activities §300.320(a)(1)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Convene an IEP meeting or amend the student's IEP so that it includes a PLAAF that demonstrates how disability affects involvement and progress in general curriculum.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
26) IEP Contains Measurable Annual Goals §300.320(a)(2)(i)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Convene an IEP meeting or amend the student's IEP so that it includes measurable goals.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
27) IEP Statement of Measurable Annual Related Services Goal(s) §300.320(a)(2)(i)(B)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Convene an IEP meeting or amend the student's IEP so it includes measurable related services goals.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
28) IEP Team Considered Strategies to Address Behavior §300.324(a)(2)	1	0	0	1	0.00%	<p>Provide evidence that the IEP team considered the use of positive behavior supports and behavioral interventions and other strategies to address behavior including developing an FBA and BIP if necessary.</p> <p>If no evidence is available, reconvene the IEP team or amend the IEP to document consideration of the use of positive behavior supports and behavioral interventions and other strategies to address behavior including developing an FBA and BIP if necessary.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
29) ESY Determined on Individual Basis §300.106(a)(2)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Provide evidence that ESY was determined on an individual basis.</p> <p>If no evidence can be provided, the IEP team must convene or amend the IEP to complete the ESY criteria worksheet and determine the appropriate amount of compensatory education if the student requires compensatory education.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
33) IEP Developed Within 30 Days of Initial Eligibility Determination §300.323(c)(1)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Not correctable at the student level.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
34A) Implementation of Related Services (LEA) §300.323(c)(2)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Develop a plan that addresses missed related services or specialized instruction hours.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
35) Annual IEP Review §300.324(b)(1)(i)	1	1	0	0	100.00%	<p>Convene the IEP Team to review and renew the student's IEP.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

37) Consideration of Harmful Effects §300.116(d)	1	0	0	1	0.00%	<p>Reconvene IEP team or amend IEP to include documentation in the justification section of the IEP that harmful effects were considered by the IEP team.</p> <p>OSSE must confirm that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.</p>
---	---	---	---	---	-------	---