



Charter Office
Start-Up Petition Review Results
2nd & Cumulative Review
August 2015

Petitioner: East Atlanta Charter School

Rationale Supporting the Recommendation to Deny the Petition

Current DeKalb Board Policy IBB defines “public interest” as follows: *“In order to be considered to be in the public interest by the DeKalb County Board of Education, a charter petition or any request for a charter renewal, must, at a minimum, demonstrate that the curriculum, instruction and accountability programs set forth in the petition combine to create an innovative, unique opportunity for student learning which does not duplicate existing DeKalb programs or exist in any DeKalb County school(s). Further, the proposed charter school(s) must demonstrate it [will] increase student achievement through academic and organizational innovation in accordance with O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2065(a). The petition must also show how the intended location of the school is in the public interest of the community. In addition, the charter petitioner must demonstrate ability, financial resources, expertise and other resources necessary to manage successfully all aspects of a charter school.”*

The proposed East Atlanta Charter School is not in the public interest for the following reasons:

1. Academics

- The whole-day Spanish immersion program is duplicative to other programs in the District.
- The academic, and curriculum and instruction plans proposed by the Petitioner lacked innovation. The Petitioner did not provide a clear demonstration of how language immersion would be the solution to low academic performance in the proposed attendance zone.
- The Petitioner was unclear in how the school would address the needs of Limited-English Proficient parents and students.

2. Governance, Organizational Structure & Human Resources

- The Petitioner did not provide evidence of parent and stakeholder engagement in the development of the petition, and governing board membership, that is representative of the diverse socioeconomic demographics of the proposed attendance zone.
- The Board’s function, duties, and roles were not clearly defined.
- The school’s grievance procedures were not fully developed.
- The Petitioner did not completely develop a structured plan for human resource functions and job specifications.
- The Petitioner’s proposed legal representation may present a conflict of interest.

3. Finances

- The Petitioner did not provide a clear demonstration of how the school plans to meet financial sustainability objectives.
- The Petitioner provided ambiguous examples of financial innovations.

4. Facilities & Student Enrollment

- The Petitioner does not have a proposed location. Currently, no District locations are available for a lease.
- The Petitioner was unable to provide a well-developed enrollment/lottery process.