



**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](http://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 New Mexico Gateway Academy applying for a state charter in Albuquerque, NM in the Albuquerque Public Schools school district to serve grades K-12 and represented by founders, Janet DeVesty, Susan Unser, and Mari Adkins. 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 |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Overall Score</b>                              | <i>136</i>      | <i>327</i>                         |
| • Education Plan/Academic Framework                           | 49              | 100                                |
| • Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework | 61              | 147                                |
| • Business Plan/ Financial Framework                          | 12              | 52                                 |
| • Evidence of Support   | 10              | 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 |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>EDUCATION PLAN/ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK</b>  | 49              | 100                                |
| <p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></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><b>Mission</b></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><b>Graduation Requirements</b></p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates high school graduation requirements that meet the state requirements including 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><b>Indicators/Goals</b></p> <p>The applicant provides goals that contain a limited amount of the key elements. While the applicant does provide measures and metrics for its proposed goals, it does not provide goals in the SMART format. Specifically, 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.</p> <p>The applicant's rationale for the proposed goals does not align with the mission and is limited and unclear.</p> <p>The applicant provides limited plans and methods for assessing each of the proposed goals. The methods lack clear actions, timelines, or pieces of data to be collected.</p> <p><b>Curriculum, Instructional Program, Student Performance Standards</b></p> <p>The applicant has not provided a clear and reasonable description of a curriculum that mostly aligns</p> |                 |                                    |

with the NMCCSS and the NM content standards and the school's mission. Instead, the applicant identifies that it might potentially use the K12, Inc. curriculum, but a curriculum will be selected through the procurement process after the charter application is approved. The applicant provides a limited description of what this process will entail, stating that it will select an "online grades K-12 curriculum best suited for this career-focused school." The applicant does not clearly provide information that would identify whether the selected curriculum will align with the NMCCSS and the NM Content Standards. The applicant also indicates that a career pathway curriculum has not been developed, stating that the pathways to be offered will be determined by the governing council and will depend on available curriculum. No plan is provided for how or when a curriculum will be created or selected.

The applicant does not provide relevant data to demonstrate it has a research based curriculum and instructional program. Instead, the applicant provides information from K12, Inc., but has identified both in the application and the community input hearing that it may or may not use the K12, Inc. program. The applicant also uses research from brick and mortar based CTE programs with no information about how those programs will translate to virtual learning.

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 it will provide a virtual learning platform with individualized learning plans, web-based conferencing for interactive classes, and required at-home parental support for elementary students. The applicant does not provide a description or overview of any specific instructional strategies or methods that will be implemented. The applicant's response in the application and in the community input hearing continues to raise concerns about whether the school will comply with open enrollment requirements, which do not allow any admission requirements. The applicant's requirement of a "learning coach" appears to be an admission requirement.

The applicant provides a limited explanation of how the proposed strategies will be effective with the target population. As stated previously, the applicant uses research from brick and mortar based CTE programs with no information about how those programs will translate to virtual learning. The applicant also provides information that says there is little conclusive research about the effectiveness of individualized learning plans. The applicant's information does not relate specifically to instructional strategies, as it is noted above that the applicant did not identify any specific instructional strategies.

The applicant does provide a clear description of how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student need. Instead, the applicant generally identifies that students who are below grade level will have interventions included on the IEPs, the applicant's response does not demonstrate an understanding of the difference between interventions and differentiation. The applicant's response also includes specific information about features of the K12, Inc. curriculum, but as it is unclear whether this is the learning platform that will be used it is not apparent how this information is relevant to this prompt.

### **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. While the applicant does clearly explain how

the school will provide services and supports to identified ELL students—including differentiated instruction and regular progress monitoring, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

In relation to students with IEPs, while the applicant does provide a clear explanation of how students will be identified, the applicant does not adequately describe practices and strategies the proposed school will implement to provide a continuum of services. Instead, the applicant makes assurances that it will comply with the legal requirements, and references the features of the K12, Inc. program that can help serve students with disabilities. The applicant does not provide any meaningful detail to understand how this proposed virtual school will provide a continuum of services to students with IEPs.

The applicant also provides only a limited description of how it will regularly monitor and evaluate the progress of students with IEPs. Instead, the applicant provides a brief statement about how oversight and monitoring is generally conducted in a distance learning setting. The response indicates there should be file reviews and monitoring timelines for a Manager of Exceptional Services, but it does not provide any detail about those reviews or timelines.

The applicant also provides a limited plan for how it will graduate students with IEPs. While the applicant's response identifies appropriate graduation options, it provides generalities and no detail about how those options will be implemented.

In relation to ancillary staffing, the applicant provides a very limited plan stating that they will contract with licensed professionals that may include CES. No additional information or detail is provided.

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. During the capacity interview, the applicant raised additional concerns about how the proposed school would provide services to students with 504 plans. Specifically, the applicant first stated accommodations would be implemented by the parents, then later indicated they would be provided by the school.

In relation to ELLs, the applicant provides a limited process for identifying ELLs. Specifically, the applicant's response includes statements that make it unclear when and to which students it will administer the ACCESS test. The applicant includes steps beyond simple administration of the home language survey, including "further investigation" and multiple administrations of the home language survey. These additional steps introduce a substantial lack of clarity into the applicant's proposed processes.

In relation to staffing to meet the needs of ELLs, the applicant provides a limited description of how it will staff and budget to meet the student needs. Specifically, the applicant stated that ELL students will be served by general education and special education staff. The applicant provides limited information about training for these staff, stating merely that professional development for working with ELLs is built into the professional development calendar. The applicant provides \$1500 for instructional support and materials for ELL instruction but does not explain why that amount is sufficient.

### **Assessment and Accountability**



The applicant does not adequately respond to the prompts regarding an assessment plan and how the applicant will use assessment data to inform instruction and for accountability purposes. While the applicant does provide a mostly clear explanation and description of what assessments will be administered at which grade levels, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant states that it will use Study Island or a comparable assessment program for formative assessment, and discusses program features of Study Island that can be used to inform instruction. However, as with the K12, Inc. information, the relevance of Study Island's features is unclear if that program is not used.

The applicant states that assessment data will be used to inform instruction, and clearly understands the importance of using data; however the applicant provides a very limited description or explanation of how this will be accomplished. In relation to the PSAT or PLAN assessments, the applicant states generally that students will receive feedback from the assessment administrator and the school will work with students to focus on areas of weakness. No details are provided about how this will be implemented. The applicant also states that the Scantron Performance Series, or a comparable assessment will be administered and assessment data will be used. However, again the applicant does not provide details about how the data will be used to inform instruction.

The applicant also provides only a limited description of corrective actions that will be taken in response to student achievement data that does not demonstrate acceptable student performance. The applicant provides details about individual corrective actions and the use of the RTI process, but provides very limited information about school-wide corrective actions. In relation to school-wide responses, the applicant states that the school will develop an Academic Plan. No meaningful detail is provided to understand how a plan would be determined, implemented, monitored or evaluated.

Finally, the applicant provides limited information about how student assessment and progress will be appropriately communicated to parents, the school's governing body, the authorizer, and the community. The applicant states it will be proactive in its communication, will enable parents and students to have access to data in the learning management system, will initiate regular conferenced with learning coaches, and will issue report cards twice a year. The applicant briefly identifies that the director will report on academic progress to the governing body and will annually prepare and distribute a progress report to all stakeholders. No detail is provided about what data will be reported to the governing body or how this will ensure academic progress and assessment data are appropriately communicated.

Because 76 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 |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND GOVERNANCE / ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK</b> | 61              | 147                                |

**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.

**Governing Body Creation/Capacity**

The applicant does not provide adequate responses to demonstrate the capacity to create a governing body that will oversee the initiation and operation of a public school. While the applicant does incorporate most of the key components of their governance structure by adequately outlining the roles and responsibilities of the members, providing adequate bylaws and a list of members that reflects the diverse skills necessary to oversee all aspects of the school; the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant provides only a limited process for plan for selecting new board members. The applicant provides general guidelines for a seven step process to select new board members, but provides no meaningful detail to understand how the potential members will be evaluated and screened to ensure they are quality members with appropriate qualifications. The applicant does not provide sufficient detail about the process to understand how it will be implemented. The applicant did provide a list of competencies that will be considered for board membership, the listed competencies appear to be relevant to governance of a public school, but it does fail to address qualifications related to online/virtual learning which appears to be a significant omission.

**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 identifies additional requirements for new board member to ensure they are familiar with the board's policies and processes, however no detail is provided about these

additional requirements to understand how they would be implemented.

The applicant provides a limited plan for annual self-evaluation. The applicant makes an assurance that it will conduct an annual evaluation facilitated by the board president, and identifies the purpose of the evaluation is continuous improvement. The applicant does not provide any meaningful detail about the evaluation and instead, states the tool for evaluation will be developed in the planning year.

### **Leadership and Management**

The applicant does not provide a clear plan for how the governing body will monitor school outcomes. Instead, the applicant states that on a monthly basis the board will consider operational, financial, and academic outcomes with limited detail on what information the board will review or what outcomes will be considered. The applicant provides greater detail on fiscal monitoring identifying the reports that will be reviewed, how they will be reviewed, and actions the council will take and for what purpose. No meaningful information is provided on how the governing body will monitor academic or operational performance.

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 indicates it will provide leadership characteristics, but instead, it identifies position responsibilities. The applicant provides a limited list of qualifications that does not fully reflect the school's mission as it does not address experience with virtual learning. The applicant also provides a limited plan to hire a head administrator that lists 11 steps without providing meaningful detail to understand how the steps will be implemented.

The applicant does not identify how an administrator will be evaluated, except to provide an evaluation rubric with no evaluation plan.

The applicant provides a limited description of how it will convey and delineate the roles and responsibilities of the head administrator, stating it will do so in the job description, during the interview, in the contract, and using the evaluation tool. The applicant does not provide meaningful detail to understand how these processes will be implemented.

The applicant provides a limited job description for the head administrator that does not include a list of responsibilities that are significant or unique to charter school leaders. Specifically, the job description does not address the responsibility to ensure compliance with the charter contract, interact with the PEC, or report achievement data to the PEC annually as part of the performance framework.

### **Organizational Structure of the School**

The applicant provides an organizational chart that does not completely align with the narrative and demonstrates an inadequate understanding of appropriate relationships between governance, support staff, and external agencies that are essential to the school. Specifically, the applicant's organizational chart indicates the licensed business manager, operations manager, technology manager, social worker, diagnostician, and therapy services will all report directly to the governing council. This does not align with the indicated best practices of the narrative, which identify the director as the governing council's only direct report. The organizational chart also does not address external agencies such as the PED and

PEC.

The applicant provides inadequate job descriptions that do not provide reporting lines.

The applicant provides a limited staffing plan that does not provide sufficient detail to understand how it will support timely implementation of the academic program. Specifically, no detail is provided about timelines for recruitment or hiring. Additionally, the applicant does not provide an explanation of how the staffing plan will be sufficient to meet the needs of the projected enrollment, especially in relation to special education and student counseling.

The applicant provides an inadequate calendar that does not demonstrate compliance with state requirements. Specifically, the applicant does not identify any days or hours for Kindergarten students. This may be because the applicant has provided a calendar from New Mexico Virtual Academy, rather than one created by the applicant. The applicant's narrative states that flexibility will be allowed in the daily schedule of students, but does not provide any additional detail. It is unclear how this would affect the proposed calendar and schedule.

The applicant provides a limited professional development plan. The applicant identifies the following professional development structures, without providing meaningful detail to understand how they would be implemented: individual professional development plans, pre-service professional development, new teacher training, instructional coaching, and weekly professional development.

### **Employees**

The applicant does not provide adequate responses to demonstrate the capacity to manage the employment requirements of operating a public school. While the applicant does provide a clear set of personnel policies that mostly complies with all applicable state and federal regulations and provides a clear employee grievance process, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant provides limited terms of employment and does not address how the school will address employee's recognized representatives. The applicant makes an assurance that if employees decide to organize the proposed school would comply with statutory and regulatory requirements. The applicant does not, however, identify what the requirements are, how it would comply with them, or how it would recognize the representatives.

The applicant does not provide a clear staff discipline process. The process described provides for substantial discretion in its application, without clear criteria to guide the use of that discretion. As a result, it is unclear whether the process ensures due process. The applicant's policy repeatedly makes assurances that it will comply with the School Personnel Act, but does not identify how it will comply with the identified requirements.

### **Community/Parent/Employee Involvement in Governance**

The applicant does not adequately describe school structures that provide meaningful parental, professional educator, and community involvement. The applicant's response provides information on the governing council, school advisory council, parent teacher organization, and parent and student

survey. The applicant provides some detail to understand how these structures would be a meaningful venue for parental participation, but the applicant does not provide detail on how participation would be facilitated for parents throughout the state. This information is important considering the proposed school's model and target population. The applicant did not address professional educator participation.

The applicant provides a limited grievance process that does not identify a process for receiving or processing complaints from the community, the identified process appears to be limited to students and parents.

### **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's policies make assurances that they will comply with the due process rights for students with disabilities, but provide no meaningful detail on how they will implement processes to ensure this compliance.

The applicant does not address alternative placements for students. Instead, the applicant cites the NMAC and states that students who are validly expelled are not entitled to receive any educational services. The applicant wholly fails to address the legal requirements regarding alternative educational placements for special education students.

### **Student Recruitment and Enrollment**

The applicant's response to the student recruitment and enrollment prompts are inadequate and raise substantial concerns about the applicant's understanding of, and ability to comply with, New Mexico charter school law.

The applicant does not describe an adequate outreach or recruitment plan. Instead, the applicant states it will develop an outreach plan that *may include* both online and offline strategies. The applicant provides no timelines and does not provide sufficient information to determine how the outreach would be supported by the budget.

The applicant describes a lottery process with some enrollment practices that may violate statute. Specifically, as stated earlier, the application contains statements throughout that indicate, in lower grades, parents must commit to acting as "learning coaches" in order for elementary students to be enrolled in the program. The applicant was given the opportunity to clarify this statement during the community input hearing, but did not provide any additional clarity on how this "requirement" would not act as an admission requirement. The applicant also wrote a letter after the community input hearing that provides no additional clarity on this matter. The applicant's letter indicates that personal circumstances may "preclude" parents from making the choice to enroll their students in the proposed school; this appears to indicate the parent involvement would be an admission requirement. This appears to violate open enrollment requirements, which do not allow charter schools to impose admission requirements.

Additionally, the application states that after a "student's enrollment is approved" the parent will receive enrollment materials. No information or detail is provided to understand what is meant by enrollment being approved; this statement raises further questions about whether the proposed school

will comply with open enrollment requirements.

### **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.

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 addresses the requirements of the open meetings act in its bylaws, but wholly fails to address the requirements of IPRA.

### **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.

### **Facilities/School Environment**

The applicant has clearly and comprehensively described its projected facility needs and desired school environment and has completed and submitted a facilities master plan that appears to have received approval from PSFA. However, the applicant does not meet all of the requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant 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.

Additionally, the applicant has stated there is no need for capital outlay funds, but the applicant has not addressed capital outlay needs for equipment.

Because 83 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, and 2) the application includes statements that indicate the proposed school may violate the open enrollment requirements identified in statute.

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 |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK</b> | 12              | 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 provides a completed 910B5 that contains some errors that may raise questions about the applicant's understanding of a capacity to implement New Mexico public School funding. Specifically, the applicant has not used the appropriate values and computations regarding projected MEM for each of the 4 years after the first year.

The applicant provides an inadequate five year budget that does not provide sufficient information to understand the proposed expenditures or to understand whether the budget supports the proposed mission or school's long term sustainability.

The applicant also does not provide an adequate budget narrative; failing to explain basic assumptions, how they are determined, reliable sources, or priorities.

The applicant provides a limited description of what budget adjustments could be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges. The applicant makes general statements about budget adjustments with no meaningful detail to understand if they are viable or realistic.

The applicant provides an incomplete salary schedule. Specifically, the applicant provides a salary schedule for New Mexico Virtual Academy, not the proposed school. Second, the document provides only minimum and maximum salaries for several positions, which does not constitute a salary schedule.

**Financial Policies Oversight, Compliance, and Sustainability**

The applicant does not provide financial policies and internal controls. Instead, the applicant identifies several legal requirements for operating a charter school, makes assurances that the proposed school will meet those requirements, and then states that financial and control policies will be developed.

The applicant does not provide internal control procedures. Instead, the applicant states that internal

control policies and procedures will be developed during the planning year. The applicant then provides an outline of the overarching internal controls that will be developed.

The applicant provides an inadequate description of staff necessary and appropriate to perform financial tasks. The applicant identifies that the licensed business manager will be the primary individual responsible for financial tasks, but also identifies the director and the office administrator as responsible for some tasks. The job descriptions provided for these positions do not align with the duties described in this section of the application. The applicant also does not identify appropriate qualifications for these positions.

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 discusses both committees and their responsibilities, but does not identify how they will operate in the context of the larger governance structure, except to state they will make recommendations to the larger body.

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, the applicant provides general statements about successful operations and actions it will take to sustain these successful operations.

Because 60 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) 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 | 10              | 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 meet the application requirements, for the reasons described.

**Uniqueness and Innovation**

The applicant has provided adequate evidence of the uniqueness of its educational program and



provided a compelling need for the proposed program. Specifically, the applicant has identified a lack of vocational education options throughout the state and no other online vocational education options.

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 describes two outreach events that appear to have been focused toward business people for the purpose of developing a governing board. The outreach does not appear to have been addressed to a broad audience.

**Community Support**

The applicant does not provide evidence that there is community and student support for the proposed school. The applicant’s response provides data from K12, Inc., the organization that the applicant may or may not use as a curriculum provider and learning platform. The data appears to demonstrate the number of inquiries regarding online education. None of the information provided identifies that any of these inquiries demonstrate support for the school proposed in this application.

**Community Relationships**

The applicant provides inadequate evidence that it has developed adequate networking relationships or resource agreements with local community agencies, groups, or individuals. Specifically, the applicant states it has contacted postsecondary institutions to establish dual credit programs and certification programs, but there is no description of how this contact has developed into relationships or resource agreements. Instead, the applicant’s response indicates these relationships will be developed during the planning year. The applicant also describes the two outreach meetings and the attendees, but does not describe networking relationships or resource agreements that were developed, except to identify the five board members that were identified. The letters provided by the applicants identify support for the opening of the school, but again do not describe networking relationships or resource agreements.

Because 75 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**

Fourteen people were in attendance at the community input hearing.

During the Community Input Hearing the local school district, in a well composed statement that aligns with much of the analysis by CSD, indicated the local district did not support the proposed school.

The applicant had approximately five supporters present who made remarks in support of the applicant. The supporters identified support for a career-focused online school.

Since the Community Input Hearing CSD has received two letters of support for the application. One letter is from a community member who supports the opening of the school because he believes career-focused education is needed in this state. The second letter is from one of the founders. In her letter she states she is clarifying misinformation that she was not given the opportunity to respond to at the hearing.