



**STATE OF NEW MEXICO
PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
300 DON GASPAR
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501-2786
Telephone (505) 827-5800
www.ped.state.nm.us**

HANNA SKANDERA
SECRETARY-DESIGNATE OF EDUCATION

SUSANA MARTINEZ
Governor

August 31, 2015

Dear Public Education Commissioners:

Enclosed is the Final 2015 Charter School Application Final Analysis and Recommendation for Columbus Community Public School applying for a state charter in Columbus, NM in the Deming Public School District to serve grades 6-12 and represented by founders, Philip Skinner and Jack Long. The staff at the Charter Schools Division (CSD) along with a team of independent reviewers gave full consideration to the information gathered in this process.

The CSD has provided evidence and rationale gathered in the team analyses and interviews in this evaluation to fully support the recommendation.

Thank you all for your hard work and dedication to ensure that New Mexico's Charter Schools provide innovative, quality education to New Mexico's students.

Sincerely,

Katie Poulos
Director of Options for Parents

I. Recommendation

APPROVE

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) demonstrated a clear capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application. Nothing was identified that would indicate the applicant(s) do not have the experience, knowledge, and competence to successfully open and operate a charter school.

APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) demonstrated a general capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application. However, the CSD has identified some specific concerns that would need to be addressed during the planning year. The CSD has listed the noted concerns and conditions to address the concerns below. If the PEC determines that there are any additional conditions that need to be addressed, those should be noted during the public hearing and all approved conditions negotiated in the final contract.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS

The Applicant will negotiate a contract with the Public Education Commission pursuant to 22-8B-9.1:

1. Obtain standing as an approved Board of Finance
2. Secure a facility that meets PSFA Approval
3. Complete the planning-year checklist

DENY

Overall the application is either incomplete or inadequate; or during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) did not sufficiently demonstrate the experience, knowledge, and competence to successfully open and operate a charter school.

The Charter Schools Act, in paragraph 1 of Subsection L of Section 22-8B-6 NMSA 1978, states that a chartering authority may approve, approve with conditions or deny an application. A chartering authority may deny an application if:

- (1) the application is incomplete or inadequate;
- (2) the application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter Schools Act;
- (3) the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was involved with another charter school whose charter was denied or revoked for fiscal management or the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was discharged from a public school for fiscal mismanagement;

- (4) for a proposed state-chartered charter school, it does not request to have the governing body of the charter school designated as a board of finance or the governing body does not qualify as a board of finance; or
- (5) the application is otherwise contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applies to operate.

CHARTER SCHOOLS DIVISION

By: _____
Katie Poulos, Director of Options for Parents

I. Overall Score Sheet

Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
Application Overall Score	<i>106</i>	335
• Education Plan/Academic Framework	36	100
• Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework	48	155
• Business Plan/ Financial Framework	13	52
• Evidence of Support	5	24
• Required Appendices	4	4

II. Explanation Regarding Use of the Score Sheet

In the Recommendation and Final Analysis the CSD has considered the overall score in the written application, information obtained during the Capacity Interview and Community Input Hearing, and information obtained from the letters of support or opposition received after the Community Input Hearing.

Also please note two additional considerations:

- First, the CSD does not score the community input hearing or capacity interviews, but may reference these in the Recommendation and Final Analysis and if pertinent information was offered that contradicts or affirms what was found in the application.
- Second, if the applicant school did not answer any prompt because that prompt did not apply to the applicant school (e.g., the applicant school will be an elementary school and so did not provide responses to graduation-related prompts), then the CSD adjusted the total possible points in the application section where the non-applicable item(s) is found as well as in the final score. For this reason, you may see varying possible total points from application to application.

III. Final Analysis

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
EDUCATION PLAN/ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK	36	100
<p>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</p> <p>The CSD found this section to be complete but inadequate.</p> <p>The following areas of the applicant's response were found to meet the application requirements, for the reasons described.</p> <p>Mission</p> <p>The applicant provides a clear and reasonable purpose for the school. The mission statement sufficiently answers what the proposed school seeks to accomplish and how it will accomplish that.</p> <p>Graduation Requirements</p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates high school graduation requirements that meet the state requirements these include credit/course requirements and state assessment requirements including mandated end of course/summative assessments.</p> <p>The following areas of the applicant's response were found to be incomplete or inadequate, for the reasons described.</p> <p>Indicators/Goals</p> <p>The applicant does not adequately address the application requirements related to indicators/goals aligned with the mission of the proposed school.</p> <p>The applicant provides goals that are not specific and are not time bound. Additionally, the applicant does not provide sufficient information to understand if the goals are rigorous or attainable. The applicant does not provide measures or metrics for any of its goals.</p> <p>The applicant's rationale for some of the proposed goals is limited and unclear, for other goals a rationale is missing.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide adequate plans and methods for assessing each of the proposed goals.</p> <p>Curriculum, Instructional Program, Student Performance Standards</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a description of a developed curriculum that has the potential to raise student achievement. Instead, the applicant states in the application that the curriculum will be</p>		

developed by the students as the year progresses, and further states the curriculum development and standards alignment process will be a year-round, ongoing process that continues year after year. In the community input hearing, the applicant stated that the curriculum is the NMCCSS. This statement demonstrates a misunderstanding of the difference between standards and curriculum. No plan is provided for how or when a curriculum will be created.

The applicant identifies many references that they appear to believe support how instructional program will help the school achieve high outcomes for students, but the applicant does not cite, describe, or explain the research such that it can be understood how the research supports their belief.

The applicant does not adequately describe instructional strategies and methods that will be used or how those will be effective with the target population. The applicant generally identifies that the proposed school will implement a dual-language, project-based-learning program, but no specific details are provided to understand how this will be implemented. Additionally, the applicant provides contradictory statements throughout the application that make it difficult to understand how the program will actually be implemented.

The applicant also does not identify how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student need. Instead, the applicant states that the PBL model naturally lends itself to differentiated instruction. No support is provided for how the proposed school would implement this model to ensure differentiation occurs.

Special Populations

In responding to the prompts requiring the applicant to identify how it will identify, serve, and monitor the progress of students with IEPs, ELLs, and 504 plans, the applicant does not adequately describe particular practices or processes that will be implemented by the proposed school to identify, serve, and monitor the progress of special populations of students.

In relation to students with IEPs, the applicant does not identify any process to ensure these students will be identified. In relation to serving students with IEPs, the applicant makes assurances that all requirements will be met and relies on the implementation of a PBL model to meet the needs of these students, but does not provide an explanation of any specific strategies or practices that will be utilized to serve students with IEPs. The applicant provides limited information about the monitoring of these students, stating only that they will be monitored by appropriate staff.

The applicant also does not adequately address how it will graduate students with special education needs. The applicant identifies some basic requirements, but does not provide any plan for meeting the requirements.

In relation to ancillary staffing, the applicant provides a very limited plan stating that they will contract with CES.

In relation to serving students with 504 plans, the applicant similarly identifies some of the legal requirements, but does not provide a plan or description for how the proposed school would meet the legal requirements.

In relation to ELLs, the applicant does not provide a process for identifying ELLs that complies with the requirements of law. Specifically, the applicant only identifies testing for students whose “primary or home language is a language other than English”, law requires testing in a broader range of circumstances. Otherwise the applicant provides a limited explanation of how ELLs will be identified, failing to provide details including performance levels that will trigger identification or how students who don’t identify on the language survey, but otherwise demonstrate indicators of ELL status, will be identified.

The applicant does not provide an adequate explanation of how ELLs will be served/supported. The applicant identifies only that it will operate a bi-lingual program and utilize the PBL model without specifically identifying any services or supports that will be provided to ELLs. Additionally, the applicant provides contradictory statements throughout the application that make it difficult to understand how the bilingual program will actually be implemented.

The applicant also fails to identify how the proposed school will regularly evaluate and monitor the progress of ELLs. The applicant acknowledges its legal requirements for testing ELLs, and identifies that it will administer formative English and Spanish assessments for all students, but does not specifically identify how it will monitor the progress of ELLs.

In relation to staffing to meet the needs of ELLs, the applicant provides several options it may pursue, but does not identify a clear description of any of them. The applicant also identifies challenges it may face in implementing some of these plans, but does not sufficiently address how it will meet these challenges.

Assessment and Accountability

The applicant does not provide a clear assessment plan that identifies appropriate assessments or how assessment will be used to inform instruction. Instead, the applicant provides limited information stating that they will administer appropriate assessments at appropriate grade levels. The applicant also states they will administer formative assessments, but does not provide clear information on these formative assessments which will be developed by students and teachers during the course of the year. The applicant provides very limited mention of utilizing assessments to inform instruction, but provides no details on how that would be done.

The applicant fails to provide an adequate response that identifies corrective actions that will be taken if student achievement is not acceptable, either at an individual or school level. Instead, the applicant briefly identifies that it will be the administrator’s duty to review and respond to data. Very limited and unclear information is provided about how that will be done. The applicant also briefly identifies that tutoring will be provided daily to students needing additional help, but again no detail is provided.

The applicant provides very limited information about how student achievement data will be communicated. The applicant identifies a variety of mechanisms that will be utilized to disseminate data, but no detail is provided about what data will be shared. Specifically in relation to the governing body, the applicant stated that the head administrator will report to the board on a monthly basis, but does not provide detail about what will be reported.

Because 90 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” or “does not meet”

for the reasons described above this section of the application is inadequate.

Additionally, as noted above, the application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and the purposes of the Charter School Act because the application has not demonstrated the proposed school will 1) use of different and innovative teaching methods that are based on reliable research and effective practices or have been replicated successfully in schools with diverse characteristics; 2) address the needs of all students, including those determined to be at risk; 3) improve student achievement; 4) create new, innovative and more flexible ways of educating children within the public school system; or 5) meet the department's educational standards.

Finally, also for the reasons stated above the application is contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applies to operate.

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND GOVERNANCE / ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK	48	155

Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:

The CSD found this section to be incomplete and inadequate.

The following areas of the applicant's response were found to be incomplete or inadequate, for the reasons described.

Governing Body Creation/Capacity

The applicant does not demonstrate the capacity to create a governing body that will oversee the initiation and operation of a public school. While the applicant does provide a list of governing board members that appears to reflect the diverse skills necessary to oversee all aspects of a public school, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant provides a narrative and bylaws that contain many contradictions about the structure of the governing body as a result the applicant's response is inadequate. Specifically, the bylaws and the narrative contain contradictions with regards to the length of members' terms, and the officers and committees that will exist.

The applicant provides a limited process for selecting new members that does not provide sufficient detail to understand how the process will be focused on identified skill necessary to govern the proposed school. Substantial details are missing to understand how the limited process that is described would be implemented.

The applicant's list of qualifications for governing board members is limited to character traits rather than specific qualifications, thus it is unclear whether the proposed governance would be qualified to oversee the operation of a public school.

Governing Body Training and Evaluation

The applicant does not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation. The applicant's response indicates the governing board members will be required to attend training annually from the NMSBA or NMCCS, but does not provide any sort of plan for that training. The applicant merely identifies the legal requirements but does not describe how the proposed school will comply with those requirements.

The applicant does not provide any plan for evaluation. Rather, the applicant makes assurances that it will conduct annual governing body evaluations and will develop a process for doing so. This response does not constitute a plan for an annual self-evaluation.

Leadership and Management

The applicant does not provide a clear plan for how the governing body will monitor school outcomes. Instead, the applicant makes states that on a monthly basis the board will consider operational, financial, and academic outcomes with no detail on what information the board will review or what outcomes will be considered. The applicant also states that much of the work will be done at the committee level, without providing an explanation of the work that will be done, or what committees will be responsible for each of the areas the applicant indicated would be considered.

The applicant does not provide a clear description of the leadership characteristics or qualifications of a desired head administrator and does not provide a plan to hire or evaluate a head administrator. Instead, the applicant identifies that a head administrator will be hired five months before school opens, without providing any plan for how the applicant will ensure this occurs. The applicant lists qualifications that include skills, traits, and licensure, but the list does not take into account the mission of the school as it relates to project based learning. The list also does not include leadership characteristics.

The applicant does not identify how an administrator will be evaluated, except to state that an evaluation procedure will be included in the Board's Personnel Manual.

While the applicant provides a clear plan for conveying and delineating the roles and responsibilities of the head administrator, the applicant does not provide an adequate job description for the head administrator. The job description that is provided specifically conflicts with elements presented earlier in the application and contains information about processes that are not otherwise addressed in this application. Specifically, the job description does not align with the project based learning and dual language elements of this application and does not include responsibilities significant and unique to charter school leaders; additionally the job description discusses book students, PLCs and PBS which are not otherwise a part of this application.

Organizational Structure of the School

The applicant provides an inadequate organizational chart and narrative of the relationships between governance, administration, teaching, support staff, and external agencies essential to the proposed school. The applicant's organizational chart and narrative omits some positions which are otherwise identified in the application, does not provide clear information on the role and oversight of the parent-community center, and fails to appropriately identify the business manager's role on the finance committee.

The applicant provides inadequate job descriptions that do not provide consistent reporting lines and do not clearly identify job duties for all positions. The applicant also does not provide job descriptions for the "Secretary, Clerical" position that is identified in other locations in the application.

The applicant does not provide an adequate staffing plan to support timely implementation of the academic program. Instead, the applicant provides a limited identification of FTE staffing needs by calendar year that does not completely align with other sections of the application. Specifically, the applicant stated earlier that the special education teacher would provide special education services for .7 FTE and regular education services for .3 FTE, this is not reflected in any of the staffing information. No detail is provided about timelines for recruitment or hiring. Additionally, the staffing needs identified do not align with provisions for staffing in the budget. Specifically, the second year budget appears to provide for .75 FTE guidance counselor, but the staffing plan provides for 1.0; the budget includes Secretary, Clerical, Technical Assistants at 1.0 (year 1), 1.5 (Year 2), 2 (Years 3-5) but the staffing chart provides 1.0 FTE annually; the budget provides for .5 FTE special education in year 2, but the staffing plan provides for .75; and the staffing plan provides for 2.0 FTE special education Instructional Assistants in years 3-5, but the budget includes only 1.0 FTE in each of those years.

While the applicant does provide a calendar and schedule that appear to comply with state requirements, the applicant provides few details regarding how the calendar supports the target student population stating that the applicant understands more time will be required to implement the PBL model.

In the prompt requiring the applicant to provide a professional development plan, the applicant wholly fails to address the prompt. Instead, the applicant addresses the annual teacher evaluation process; the applicant's response raises questions about the applicant's understanding of the annual evaluation process.

Employees

The applicant provides limited terms of employment, does not provide terms of employment for all classes of employees, and does not address how the school will address employee's recognized representatives. The applicant does make an assurance that if employees decide to organize the proposed school would "follow state statutory and regulatory requirements." The applicant does not demonstrate an understanding of these requirements.

The applicant provides a limited set of personnel policies and procedures that somewhat comply with all applicable state and federal regulations. These limited policies do not address staff discipline or termination.

In relation to staff discipline policies, the applicant states that it will comply with the School Personnel

Act, but does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements of the act. The applicant also acknowledges that it has not developed a staff discipline policy, but does not provide a clear plan for doing so.

The applicant does not provide a clear grievance policy. Instead, the applicant provides two conflicting policies. It is unclear which policy the applicant would intent to implement.

Community/Parent/Employee Involvement in Governance

The applicant does not adequately describe school structures that provide meaningful parental, professional educator, and community involvement in governance and operation of the school. Instead, the applicant states the governing body's committee structure will invite the community to participate, but does not provide details to understand how community participation will be facilitated in this committee structure. Parent and professional educator participation is not mentioned. The applicant states it will have a center for parents and the community but does not describe how the center would allow for meaningful participation in the governance and operation of the proposed school.

The applicant provided a limited plan to receive and process concerns and complaints from the community and parents. Specifically, the applicant's proposed process lacks detail to understand how it will be implemented and contains contradictory statements about the timeframes for responses.

Student Policies

The applicant does not provide clear student discipline policies that comply with the student rights and responsibilities as set forth in the PED rules. Instead, the applicant provides policies that partially comply with the rules. The applicant's policies do no address search and seizure, enforcement of attendance, corporal punishment, or due process rights of students that are receiving short term or temporary suspensions.

The applicant also provides no plan for addressing alternative educational settings; rather the applicant identifies the legal requirements it must comply with but does not provide a plan for how it will comply with these legal requirements.

Student Recruitment and Enrollment

The applicant provides limited information about student recruitment and enrollment. Additionally, the applicant's responses raise some legal questions.

The applicant identifies that it will hold meetings, create a website, distribute fliers, advertise in the newspaper and on the radio, and conduct door to door recruitment. However, the applicant provides limited timelines and details regarding this planned outreach. The applicant also provides limited details and timelines for lottery procedures.

The applicant has identified that most of its students will be US citizens that live in Mexico, and thus are not New Mexico residents. This raises the question of whether the applicant will comply with legal requirements regarding admission of these non-resident students. The applicant has stated that all students will have previously been enrolled in New Mexico schools, but it is not clear if this will be the

case and if it is not the case, whether the school understands or will comply with legal requirements regarding tuition for students who have not been educated previously in a New Mexico schools.

Legal Compliance

The applicant does not demonstrate a capacity to comply with legal requirements. Specifically, the applicant provides a conflict of interest policy that does not clearly comply with NMSA 22-8B-5.2, in that the policy does not clearly define a conflict of interest in alignment with the requirements of statute and the policy appears to allow members to serve on the governing board even if there is a direct financial interest in another entity with which the school directly contracts, which is a violation of the statute.

The applicant also does not provide an explanation of how it will comply with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act and the Inspection of Public Records Act. Instead, the applicant identifies a limited subset of the legal requirements related to these two acts and states it will comply with the requirements but does not identify all the requirements or how it will meet the requirements.

Waivers

The applicant identifies waivers it will request and provides some limited information about how the waivers might be used or why they may be requested, but the applicant does not provide a clear rationale for the waivers.

Transportation and Food

The applicant indicates it plans to offer transportation to its students, but provides an inadequate description of how student transportation needs will be met. The applicant simply states they will contact the PED transportation department and will contract with a local school bus contractor, as necessary, after approval of the charter application. No information is provided about how this is addressed in the budget.

The applicant indicates it plans to offer food services to its students, but provides a very limited description of how food services will be provided. The applicant identifies it will implement breakfast and lunch programs and will contact PED's student nutrition department to receive information. No detail is provided in the applicant's response.

Facilities/School Environment

The applicant does not provide a description of its projected facility needs or desired school environment, but does provide a letter from PSFA providing tentative approval of the applicant's facilities master plan. The letter from PSFA indicates that if the PEC approves the charter application the applicant will be required to prepare an 18-month plan to correct deficiencies in the facility prior to occupancy.

The applicant also does not provide evidence that it has researched potential facilities or properties to identify a viable property. Instead, the applicant simply identifies an available property that it proposes to use as a site. No information is provided to understand why this was identified as a viable location. The applicant does not provide a description of potential capital outlay needs or requests for assistance.

Instead, the applicant states it has an MOU with the Village of Columbus to utilize a public facility and will apply for lease reimbursement. No information is provided about capital needs for equipment.

Because 97 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” or “does not meet” for the reasons described above, this section of the application is inadequate.

Additionally, as noted above, the application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and the purposes of the Charter School Act because the application has not demonstrated the proposed school will 1) create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site; or 2) encourage parental and community involvement in the public school system.

Finally, also for the reasons stated above, the application is contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applies to operate.

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School’s Possible Points
BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	13	52

Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:

The CSD found this section to be complete but inadequate.

The following areas of the applicant’s response were found to be incomplete or inadequate, for the reasons described.

Budgets

The applicant does not demonstrate the capacity to implement New Mexico School funding and budget for long-term sustainability. While the applicant does provide a proposed salary schedule for most key staff that meets state requirements, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant provides an inadequate 910B5 that contains errors that raise questions about the applicants understanding of and capacity to implement New Mexico School funding. The applicant’s 910B5s do not align with the school phase in plan and identifies 65 bilingual FTE, rather than 6.5. The applicant’s 910B5 also does not address the tuition issue raised earlier concerning non-NM residents who have not previously attended NM schools.

The applicant also provides a 5 year budget that is inadequate, and does not demonstrate long-term sustainability. The applicant’s budget, as identified earlier, does not align with the staffing plan.

The applicant also does not provide an adequate budget narrative; failing to explain basic assumptions, how they are determined, reliable sources, or priorities. The budget narrative introduces substantial questions about the applicant's understanding of budget and budgeting. Specifically, the applicant's narrative lists functions and objects with minimal information about what is covered by each without providing any information about the assumptions or how they were determined.

The applicant does not provide a description of budget adjustments that could be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges. Instead, the applicant's response describes staffing cuts and the use of volunteers, but does not describe how these would be viable in the context of the academic programs described in other sections of the application.

Financial Policies Oversight, Compliance, and Sustainability

The applicant does not demonstrate the capacity to manage public funds.

Specifically, the applicant does not provide a description of appropriate financial policies and internal controls. Instead, the applicant appears to indicate no such policies exist when it states that the governing body "will be responsible for developing and adopting financial policies and assure their implementation." The applicant's statement that the "Governing Board will seek out the necessary training to understand public school finances, the school budgeting process and applicable laws and rules" does not suggest a current capacity to manage public funds.

The applicant provides inadequate control procedures that will be implemented by the proposed school to safeguard assets, segregate payroll and other check disbursement duties, provide reliable financial information, promote operational efficiency and insure compliance with all federal and state statutes, regulations, and rules relative to school procedures. Specifically, the applicant's proposed policies and controls appear to allow the business manager to conduct nearly all financial tasks even tasks that should be segregated, with little or no oversight. Additionally, the applicant does not identify appropriate staff to perform financial tasks. Instead, the applicant states that the secretary and business manager will conduct all financial tasks; the secretary has not been identified in any of the control processes or policies. The applicant does not provide a description of the qualifications or responsibilities for the secretary position.

The applicant also does not provide a description of how the governing body will provide fiscal oversight and oversight of the audit and finance committees. Instead, the applicant wholly fails to address the required audit and finance committees. The applicant provides limited information about monthly reports the board will receive from the certified business manager and contracting with an external auditor annually. The applicant also stated, without detail or support, that the board will act on matters that fall into budgetary oversight as needed.

Finally, the applicant does not provide adequate long range goals and strategies to build the school's capacity to ensure the school's sustainability. Instead, of addressing the prompt the applicant states that enrollment is important to sustainability and describes that it will make cuts if it does not meet enrollment projections. The applicant also describes the desire to have teachers and students provide training on solar energy development and rammed earth construction. The applicant does not describe goals or strategies.

Because 90 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” or “does not meet” for the reasons described above this section of the application is inadequate.

Additionally, as noted above, the application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and the purposes of the Charter School Act because the application has not demonstrated the proposed school will meet the department's fiscal requirements.

Finally, also for the reasons stated above, the application is contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applies to operate.

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School’s Possible Points
EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	5	24

Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:

The CSD found this section to be complete but inadequate.

The following areas of the applicant’s response were found to be incomplete or inadequate, for the reasons described.

Outreach Activities

The applicant provides inadequate evidence that it has developed an outreach program. The applicant provides assurance that it will develop an outreach plan, but has not provided any evidence that it has already developed an effective and thoughtful outreach program that has reached a broad audience. The information provided is very limited and indicates the applicant will use word of mouth, notices in the water bills, community events, city government, fliers, and informational meetings. No additional detail is provided about any of these potential outreach strategies.

Community Support

The applicant does not provide evidence that there is community and student support for the proposed school. The applicant’s response states “See analysis of interested families and children who have expressed an interest as a result of outreach activities.” However, it is unclear where that analysis is provided. Reviewers were not able to find this information in the materials submitted by the applicant.

Community Relationships

The applicant provides inadequate evidence that it has developed adequate networking relationships or resource agreements with local community agencies, groups, or individuals. The applicant states, that it will only be successful by partnering with other entities. The applicant provides a list of entities it needs

the support of, but does not identify any established relationships other than the MOU with the Village of Columbus. The applicant makes assurances that it will contact and reach out to some of the identified entities.

Uniqueness and Innovation

The applicant has not provided evidence of the uniqueness, innovation, or significant contribution of its educational program to public education. The applicant identifies home visits, dual language, and STEAM instruction as innovative, unique, and significant. However, all of these appear to be common strategies and programs in schools today. The applicant has provided no meaningful comparison to other local schools. Instead, the applicant provided a table of generalized statements about traditional public schools, with little or no support.

Because 100 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” or “does not meet” for the reasons described above, this section of the application is inadequate.

Finally, also for the reasons stated above, the application is contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applies to operate.

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School’s Possible Points
REQUIRED APPENDICES	4	4

Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:

The CSD found this section to be complete.

Other Pertinent Information

During the Community Input Hearing the local school district, provided well composed remarks that indicated the local district did not support the proposed school. The school district’s remarks mirrored many of the findings above.

The applicant did have one supporter present who made remarks in support of the applicant. The supporter was a community member who indicated a desire for a local school.