



**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 SAHQ Academy applying for a state charter in Albuquerque, NM in the Albuquerque Public Schools school district to serve grades 7-12 and represented by founders, Charlotte Rode and Mike Madonia. 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>159</i>	<i>327</i>
• Education Plan/Academic Framework	44	100
• Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework	66	147
• Business Plan/ Financial Framework	31	52
• Evidence of Support	12	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>	44	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>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 the goals with either the proposed measures or the mission and is limited and unclear.</p> <p>The applicant provides limited plans and methods for assessing each of the proposed goals, and the methods of measurement do not clearly align with the 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 aligns with the NMCCSS and the NM content standards and the school's mission. Instead, the applicant states it will purchase its core curriculum from Edgenuity, the proposed school's teachers will support that curriculum with classes and tutoring, and the proposed school will also use "open source digital curriculum like 'Khan Academy'" for advancement and remediation. The applicant further states that teachers will enhance the base curriculum with sports science and project based learning. The applicant does not identify it has developed curricula for the teacher led classes, tutoring, advancement or</p>		

remediation, sports science, or project based learning portions of the academic program, which account for more than half of the instructional day according to the school schedule. No plan is provided for how or when a curriculum will be created, except that the planning will be completed by May 2016 with enhancements in the spring of 2017.

The applicant provides a limited amount of relevant data to demonstrate whether it has a research-based curriculum and instructional program. The applicant provides anecdotal evidence from one New Mexico school that uses Edgenuity, but not the same educational model the proposed school would use, and from schools in Arizona and Texas that also do not use the same educational model. The applicant also provides limited evidence about project based learning and other design elements of its educational program. The data does not address particular curricular elements, as those have not yet been designed.

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 an instructional structure and instructional models, but does not identify strategies and methods. The applicant identifies that it will provide a virtual learning platform with personalized learning plans, small group classes and tutoring, and service learning and internships. The applicant does not identify the project based learning that was identified in the curriculum section. The applicant also does not provide a description or overview of any specific instructional strategies or methods the will be implemented. No meaningful detail is provided to understand how these instructional models will be implemented.

The applicant provides a limited explanation of how the proposed strategies will be effective with the target population. Instead, the applicant appears to provide a number of mottos with no detail about how they will be effective instructional strategies. The applicant's information does not relate specifically to instructional strategies, as it is noted above that the applicant does not identify any specific instructional strategies.

The applicant does not provide a clear description of how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student need. Instead, the applicant provides a limited description of the proposed school's RTI process. The applicant states that teachers will "employ techniques such as differentiation", but does not explain how this will be done. The applicant's response does not demonstrate an understanding of the difference between interventions and differentiation.

### **Graduation Requirements**

The applicant does not adequately address graduation requirements that meet state requirements. The applicant appears to identify outdated assessment requirements stating that students must "pass all components of the NM Competency Exam", which is no longer administered. The applicant does not address other assessment requirements including EOC exams and SBA/PARCC. The applicant was provided an opportunity to clarify its understanding of state graduation requirements at the capacity interview, but did not demonstrate an understanding of current state graduation requirements.

### **Special Populations**

In responding to the prompts requiring the applicant to describe how it will identify, serve, and monitor the progress of students with IEPs, ELLs, and 504 plans, the applicant does not adequately describe

specific 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 provide an explanation of the practices and strategies the school will employ to provide a continuum of services and ensure students' access to the general education curriculum. Instead, the applicant identifies legal requirements and states that during the planning year it will consult with appropriate individuals to assure the school is able to adhere to all legal requirements. The applicant generally references the NMPED Student Assistance Team Manual and IEP meetings, but does not provide any detail about how these processes would be implemented in the proposed school. This response indicates that the applicant has not yet identified practices and strategies the school will employ to provide a continuum of services.

The applicant's response in this section also raises questions about the capacity to comply with open enrollment requirements, as the applicant states that if "incoming students" have an IEP that does not already reflect a blended environment all stakeholders will meet to discuss blended learning and its ability to meet that student's needs. It is unclear when this process would happen and if it would happen prior to a lottery or enrollment. The applicant's response appears to indicate it would happen prior to enrollment as the response then describes what happens after enrollment is finalized.

The applicant does not provide a clear description of how the school will regularly evaluate and monitor the progress and success of students with IEPs to ensure attainment of IEP goals. Instead, the applicant references the general individualized education plan process for all students and then states that students with IEPs will have an additional layer of support with the special education coordinator. The applicant does not provide any detail on the process that will be implemented by the special education coordinator.

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 agencies that can supply ancillary service providers. No meaningful 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.

In relation to ELLs, the applicant provides inadequate processes for identifying, serving, and monitoring ELLs. Specifically, the applicant provides an inadequate process for identifying students because the applicant states that if an ELL student scores at a level of proficiency the school will no longer provide programs or services to that student. This is contrary to the law which requires the student be monitored for two years after achieving proficiency. Otherwise, the applicant provides a limited identification process that does not address what scores that will qualify students for ELL status, does not identify how students who do not identify on the home language service might otherwise be identified as needing ELL services, and does not address how screening will be completed for students who enter after the beginning of the year.



The applicant also does not provide an adequate explanation of how the school will provide supports and services to identified students. Instead, the applicant states that during the planning year it will consult with appropriate individuals to ensure the school is able to adhere to all requirements. This response indicates that the applicant has not yet identified how the school will provide services and supports to ELLs.

The applicant provides a limited description of how instruction would be differentiated for ELLs. The applicant states that digital delivery course work can include supports, but does not identify what they might be or how they would be implemented. The applicant states that in the PBL context teachers would establish a common lesson and then differentiate for ELLs; the applicant provides an example lesson for a secondary English classroom, which does not appear to apply to the PBL model the applicant previously referenced. The applicant also provides an explanation of ESOL, but provides no information about how or when ESOL would be implemented in the context of this proposed school.

The applicant also provides an inadequate plan to evaluate and monitor the progress of ELLs. Specifically, the applicant again states that if an ELL student scores at a level of proficiency the school will no longer provide programs or services to that student. This is contrary to the law which requires the student to be monitored for two years after achieving proficiency. Otherwise the applicant provides limited information to understand how monitoring would be carried out. The applicant states that the special education/ELL coordinator will provide progress monitoring throughout the school year using various measures and tools, but no meaningful detail is provided to understand how this would be implemented.

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 student needs. Specifically, the applicant states there will be special education/ELL coordinator, but does not provide any information about how it will ensure staff is qualified to meet the needs of ELLs.

### **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 or for accountability purposes. While the applicant does provide a clear explanation and description of what assessments will be administered at which grade levels and how those assessments will be used to inform instruction, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant provides a limited response regarding what corrective actions will be taken if the school falls short of achieving student academic achievement at the student and school wide level. The applicant states that a corrective action plan will be made 3 times a year in alignment with short cycle assessments and that it will include professional development. The applicant provides limited information about what would trigger the corrective action or how this would be implemented; the applicant states generally that teachers will develop processes. The applicant does not at all address corrective actions that would be implemented at the student level.

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 provides processes for communicating student achievement data to parents

and the governing body. However, limited detail is provided about both of these processes. The applicant also states it is aware of reporting requirements to the PEC, but does not describe how it will adequately report data to the PEC.

Because 86 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>	66	147
<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 be incomplete or inadequate, for the reasons described.</p> <p><b>Governing Body Creation/Capacity</b></p> <p>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 all the key components of their governance structure, adequately outlining the roles and responsibilities of the members, provides adequate bylaws, and provides 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.</p> <p>Specifically, the applicant provides only a limited process or plan for selecting new board members. The</p>		

applicant provides general guidelines for an eight 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 possess the appropriate qualifications. The applicant does not provide sufficient detail about the process to understand how each of the steps will be implemented. The applicant provided a list of expertise sought for board membership, the listed areas of expertise appear to be relevant to governance of a public school, but it does the applicant does not specify skills and qualifications; thus it is unclear whether the school's governance will be qualified to operate a public school.

### **Governing Body Training and Evaluation**

The applicant does not provide an adequate plan for governing body training or evaluation. Specifically, it is unclear whether the applicant understands current legal requirements for training, which state that training must be provided by the NMCCS or NMSBA. The applicant states only that council members will be "encouraged" to participate in NMCCS trainings.

Otherwise, the applicant provides a limited plan for training. The applicant identifies six topics new members will be trained in during the first year of service and states that these training will be provided in workshops, seminars, and conferences. While these are valuable details, other meaningful details are missing, specifically when these trainings will be provided. As evidence of this missing detail, the applicant states in its response that "council members will organize an orientation." The applicant also does not identify how its training plans will comply with the open meetings act.

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 and relevant committees will be responsible for monitoring operational, financial, and academic outcomes with limited detail on what information the board will review or what outcomes will be considered. The applicant does not address how this monitoring will ensure the school is meeting its mission.

The applicant does not provide a clear description of the leadership characteristics or qualifications of a desired head administrator and does not provide a clear plan to hire or evaluate a head administrator. Instead, the applicant does not describe leadership characteristics, and provides a limited list of qualifications that does not fully reflect the school's mission and proposed instructional plan as it does not address virtual learning, sports leadership, or project based learning. The applicant also provides a limited plan to hire a head administrator that identifies the phases of the hiring process, but does not provide meaningful details or timelines.

The applicant does not identify how an administrator will be evaluated, except to state that the administrator will be evaluated on effectiveness. No detail is provided about an evaluation plan.

The applicant also does not identify how roles and responsibilities will be conveyed to the administrator. Instead, the applicant simply states that the head administrator will be employed by the governing council and will adhere to the policies adopted by the council and the terms of the charter contract.

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

The applicant does not provide adequate responses that demonstrate the capacity to develop an organizational structure for a public school. While the applicant does provide clear job descriptions for most of the key staff, including clear reporting lines that mostly align with the organizational chart; the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant provides an organizational chart that does not completely align with the narrative and somewhat 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 501(c)(3) SAHQ Backers is a part of the school that is overseen by the Principal and is responsible for operations including facilities, maintenance, and security. There is no information in the narrative to understand this relationship or the SAHQ Backer's role in the organization. The applicant's organizational chart does not identify relationships with other essential external organizations including the PEC and PED.

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.

The applicant provides a school schedule that identifies the number of instructional days per year, but provides limited detail about the instructional day. The applicant identifies a 3 hour and 55 minute block for online and project times and a 3 hour block for electives, sufficient detail is not provided to understand the amount of instructional time that would administered. The applicant does not provide information to understand how the schedule will support high achieving outcomes for the target student population.

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: pre-service training, professional development activities throughout the year, and personal professional development plans.

### **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, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant's personnel policies appear to describe in detail all classes and terms of employment, but applicant fails to address how the school will address employee's recognized 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 provides a limited grievance policy. Specifically, the policy does not provide clear timelines.

### **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 school advisory council, community events, and the website and social media. The applicant provides some detail to understand how the school advisory council structure would be a venue for parental participation, but this venue would be limited to providing suggestions and feedback. It is unclear from the information provided how meaningful this structure would be. The other structures do not address meaningful participation in governance or operations. The applicant did not address professional educator or community participation.

The applicant provides a limited grievance process for receiving or processing complaints from the community and parents. Specifically, the applicant's "Complaint resolution" policy does not provide clear timelines and thus does not assure a timely and meaningful response. The applicant's response states that if a parent has a concern they can initiate the grievance process. It is unclear what that policy is.

### **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 directly cut and paste the NMAC provisions regarding the due process rights for students with disabilities, but provide no meaningful detail on how this proposed school will implement processes to ensure compliance with the copied requirements. Further, by copying and pasting the requirements the applicant has not clearly demonstrated an understanding of the requirements.

The applicant does not address alternative placements for students. Instead, the applicant states the legal requirements, although incorrectly stating that a change of placement is removal for 10 consecutive days or a series of removals that "constitute a pattern." A removal of 10 days in total constitutes a change in placement. The applicant does not, however, provide a plan or meaningful detail to understand how it would address alternative educational settings.

The applicant also states that students without IEPs who are expelled will be referred to another school; this statement demonstrates a lack of understanding concerning charter law, which provides that if a student is expelled from a charter school they are also expelled from the district in which the charter resides.

### **Student Recruitment and Enrollment**

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

law. While the applicant describes an adequate outreach or recruitment plan, with timelines, that appears to be supported by the budget, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant describes a lottery process with some enrollment practices that may violate statute. Specifically, as stated earlier, the applicant states that if “incoming students” have an IEP that does not already reflect a blended environment all stakeholders will meet to discuss blended learning and its ability to meet that student’s needs. It is unclear when this process would happen and if it would happen prior to a lottery or enrollment, it is also unclear how this would affect enrollment.

The applicant also appears to indicate that there would be an enrollment preference for students who were on the waiting list in prior years, which would also violate statute. Specifically, the applicant states that the waitlist will carry over from year to year and that students who participate in the new lottery process will be added to the end of the waitlist from the prior year. This does not align with the statute, which does not allow for enrollment preferences for students who were previously on the waitlist.

Finally, in both the application and during the capacity interview, the applicant provided unclear statements about the information that would be required from interested students prior to conducting a lottery. Specifically, the applicant’s response states that “all registration documents must be provided to SAHQ Academy prior to a potential student’s being entered into the lottery.” The applicant’s response does not provide sufficient information to understand what is meant by all registration documents. In the capacity interview, the applicant stated it would require information to demonstrate a potential student is eligible to enroll in APS schools; the applicant believed this to be a legal requirement for enrolling in a charter school located in the APS school district. When the applicant was corrected about the legal requirement, the applicant stated it would comply with all legal requirements. However, the applicant did not demonstrate an understanding of the legal requirements. During the community input hearing the applicant again expressed that it would comply with law, but did not provide any clarity about whether it understood what those requirements are.

### **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 comply with NMSA 22-8B-5.2, in that the policy states that a financial interest is not necessarily a conflict of interest indicates the governing board will decide if a conflict of interest exists and the policy appears to allow board members with a financial interest to participate in the selection award of contracts. Both of these provisions in the applicant’s policy appear to directly conflict with the requirements of The Charter School Act.

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 generally addresses some of the requirements of the open meetings act, but wholly fails to address the requirements of IPRA. The applicant also fails to address the requirements that the governing council adopt an annual resolution.

### **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 provided a limited description of the school’s potential capital outlay needs. Specifically, the applicant has described renovations and improvements that are needed but has not provided estimates, the applicant also has not addressed capital outlay needs for equipment.

Because 80 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
<b>BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK</b>	31	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 910B5 that clearly demonstrate and understanding of New Mexico public school funding and a five year budget that supports the schools growth plan and long term sustainability, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant 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. The applicant provides a salary schedule for teachers only; the applicant does not provide a salary schedule for any other staff.

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

The applicant does not demonstrate the capacity to manage public funds. While the applicant does provide clear internal control procedures, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant does not provide financial policies. Instead, the applicant states that financial policies will be developed and lists fifteen areas of the school's business that the policies will address.

The applicant generally identifies the appropriate staff to perform financial tasks. The applicant identifies the duties and qualifications of the head administrator, the business manager, and the bookkeeper. The applicant does not, however, identify staff to act as a certified procurement officer.

The applicant also does not provide an adequate description of how the governing body will provide fiscal oversight and oversight of the audit and finance committees. Instead, the applicant identifies the legal requirements, states that it will form audit and finance committees, and states that it will develop financial management policies. The applicant does not identify the governing body's role in oversight of the finance committee and the audit committee. There is no detail on how these committees will operate in the context of the school's overall governance and management.

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 defines the following concepts: strategic plan, operating plan, and succession plan. No goals are presented, and no strategies are presented for achieving goals.

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 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	12	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.

**Community Support**

The applicant provides adequate quantifiable data based evidence of support for the school among residents in the targeted community and among the targeted population.

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

**Outreach Activities**

The applicant provides general evidence that it has developed an outreach program, there is some evidence that the school has addressed a broad audience. The applicant states it has 1729 families on their mailing list and has conducted three information sessions since May 2014, but the applicant does not describe any outreach activities as required in the prompt.

**Community Relationships**

The applicant does not provide evidence of meaningful working relationships or resource agreements with local community agencies, groups, or individuals. The applicant identifies that it will develop relationships with local businesses and other organizations, but does not describe any meaningful working relationships that have been developed. The applicant has provided two limited letters of support that document planned relationships; the other letters indicate support for the school but no plans to develop relationships.

**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 has provided no meaningful comparison to other local schools in the area and identifies the use of strategies that are standard educational practice in many schools throughout the state.

Because 75 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” 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**

Nineteen 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 two supporters present who made remarks in support of the applicant. The supporters identified support for the SAHQ organization that already exists and indicated they would be interested in enrolling their children as students.

Since the Community Input Hearing CSD has not received any letters regarding this application.