



**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 Six Directions Indigenous School applying for a state charter in Gallup, NM in the Gallup McKinley County Schools school district to serve grades 6-12 and represented by founders, Lane Towery, Ben Soce, and Masika Sweetwyne. 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>180</i>	335
• Education Plan/Academic Framework	60	100
• Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework	72	155
• Business Plan/ Financial Framework	32	52
• Evidence of Support	15	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	60	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>Curriculum, Instructional Program, Student Performance Standards</p> <p>The applicant's initial response in the application describes a clear educational model with core curriculum design priorities, key mechanisms for executing the curriculum, and other curriculum support elements. It does not, however, describe a fully developed curriculum aligned with the NMCCSS and the NM Content Standards and does not provide a clear timeline and plan for the development of a curriculum aligned with the NMCCSS and the NM Content Standards. However, in a letter of support CSD received after the community input hearing, the applicant provides a clear and detailed plan for the development of a curriculum aligned with the NMCCSS and the NM Content Standards. In the letter, the applicant also provides an example PBL unit with NMCCSS. Based on the entirety of the information available, CSD believes the applicant has provided sufficient information to meet the application requirements.</p> <p>In the application, the applicant provides a clear overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that adequately support the school's mission and educational model with a clear explanation of how the methods and strategies will be effective with the target student population. In addition, the applicants response provides a clear description of how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student needs with at least one specific example.</p> <p>Graduation Requirements</p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates high school graduation requirements that meet state requirements and the applicant clearly explains variances from the state minimum requirements.</p> <p>The following areas of the applicant's response were found to be incomplete or inadequate, for the reasons described.</p>		

Indicators/Goals

The applicant does not adequately identify goals aligned to the mission and with a clear rationale for the goals as they relate to the mission and a clear plan for methods of assessment. While the applicant does provide goals that include most of the required key elements, including SMART format elements, measures and metrics, and at least a partial reflection of the mission, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant does not provide a clear rationale aligned to its mission for each of its goals; however, during the capacity interview and community input hearing the applicant did provide additional clarity around the rationale for each of the goals. The applicant does not address a plan, but does offer general methods of assessment for the goals. The applicant did not provide any additional clarity about a plan to assess and measure the goals in any of the meetings or in the written statement.

Special Populations

The applicant does not adequately respond to the prompts regarding how the applicant will address the needs of all special population students. While the applicant does provide a clear explanation and description of how the school will identify and monitor the progress of students with IEPs, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant makes assurances about providing services to students with IEPs using an inclusion setting, but the applicant does not clearly explain practices and strategies the school will employ to provide a continuum of services and ensure access to the general curriculum. The applicant's responses at the capacity interview and community input hearing, and in the letter of support do not provide additional clarity. Instead, the letter of support merely states that the school will adopt policies and develop procedures during the planning year.

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 CES and will work to determine student needs in the summer. No further detail is provided.

In relation to serving students with 504 plans, the applicant similarly identifies some of the legal requirements, and provides a very limited plan or description for how the proposed school would meet the legal requirements. The applicant states that these plans will be made by the SAT team and implemented by all staff. No further detail is provided.

In relation to ELLs, the applicant provides limited processes for identifying, serving, and monitoring ELLs. Specifically, the applicant provides a limited process that does not address 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's letter of support identifies that there should be a process for teachers to identify student with limited language abilities for ELL screening, but does not provide additional detail about what that process will be.

The applicant's response in the application provides limited information about how the school will provide services/supports to ELLs. Specifically, the applicant identifies several structures including a Language Assistance Team with a TESOL-endorsed ELL teacher, and ELA and Native Language teachers; professional development from the TESOL teacher, and a language intervention course. Limited detail is provided about how these structures will function. The applicant also states, without detail of how or when, that it will implement the SIOP model. The applicant does provide some limited information about differentiating to meet ELL needs through skills labs. The applicant repeats some of this information in the letter of support, but the letter does not provide any additional detail.

The applicant also provides a limited plan to evaluate and monitor the progress of ELLs. Specifically, the applicant states the Language Assistance Team will monitor ELL progress with short cycle assessment data, annual WIDA assessment data, and (as identified in the letter of support) in skills labs. Meaningful detail is missing to understand how this monitoring will 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 the students' needs. Specifically, the applicant states it intends to have a TESOL-endorsed teacher in its first year and will hire more, as appropriate. The applicant also generally notes that the professional development budget includes funds dedicated to ensure staff is able to meet ELL needs. Meaningful detail is missing to understand how this monitoring will be implemented.

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 clear explanation and description of what assessments will be administered at which grade levels and provides a clear plan that explains how student assessment and progress will be appropriately communicated to parents and the school's Governing Body, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant's response identifies the purpose of each assessment, but fails to identify how the assessments will be used to inform instruction with one exception—NWEA MAP. In relation to NWEA, the applicant states, without providing detail, that the assessment will be used to plan for interventions and will be differentiated based on individual needs.

The applicant also 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 indicates that annually the whole staff will engage in a reflection process to identify trends and underlying causes, and then will take corrective actions based on specific challenges and shortcomings. The applicant does not provide meaningful detail to understand how corrective actions would be implemented, what would trigger the corrective actions, who would implement them, and how their effectiveness will be assessed. On the individual student/classroom level, the applicant states a general process including reflection, peer critique, student remediation, teacher observations, and teacher coaching. The applicant does not provide meaningful detail to understand how corrective actions would be implemented, what would trigger the corrective actions, who would implement them, and how their effectiveness will be assessed.

Because 62 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” 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) address the needs of all students, including those determined to be at risk; 2) improve student achievement; or 3) 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	72	155

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.

Governing Body Creation/Capacity

The applicant provides adequate responses to demonstrate the capacity to create a governing body that will oversee the initiation and operation of a public school. Specifically, the applicant incorporates most of the key components of their governance structure adequately outlining the roles and responsibilities of the members and provides adequate bylaws. The applicant also provides a list of members that reflects the diverse skills necessary to oversee all aspects of the school and provides a clear process for selecting new members that is focused on the identified skills necessary to govern the proposed school. The applicant also enumerates qualifications that demonstrate how the school’s governance will be adequately qualified to operate a public school.

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

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 provides a limited plan for annual self-evaluation. The applicant makes an assurance that it will conduct an annual evaluation, which will include individual member evaluations and an evaluation of the entire body. The applicant does not provide any meaningful detail about the evaluation and instead states the tool for evaluation will be developed after the charter is approved.

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 provides a clear description of the head administrator's leadership characteristics, but provides only a limited description of the head administrator's qualifications; the only qualification identified is an administrator's license. The applicant also provides only a limited plan for recruiting and hiring a principal; the applicant provides a five step process with little meaningful detail to understand how the process will be implemented. The applicant does not address a plan to evaluate a head administrator, but summarily states that the principal will be evaluated by the governing council.

The applicant does not provide a plan for how the governing body will convey and delineate the roles and responsibilities of the school's head administrator. The applicant's response merely states the responsibilities of the head administrator and the executive director and states that the principal is selected and evaluated by the governing council, but no detail is provided about how roles and responsibilities will be conveyed or delineated.

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 a calendar and schedule that comply with state requirements and detail to understand how the calendar will support high outcomes for the target population; the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant provides a limited organizational chart that does not identify all relationships and external agencies that are essential to the school. Specifically, the applicant's organizational chart does not address the governing council committees, NISN, PED, or the PEC.

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

In the application, 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. However, in the letter of support CSD received after the community input hearing, the applicant provides a timeline for implementing the staffing plan including recruitment, interviews, hiring, and initial training. Based on the entirety of the information available, CSD believes the applicant has provided sufficient information to meet the application requirements for this prompt.

The applicant provides a limited professional development plan. The applicant identifies the following professional development foci, without providing meaningful detail to understand the structures with which they would be implemented: theories and philosophies of indigenous education, pedagogical practices in culturally responsive teaching, developing excellent curriculum, advisory practices, and pedagogical practices for skills labs. The applicant generally identifies some of the PD will be provided in two weeks of staff development prior to the start of the school year, they will have an established plan for PD during the school, they will implement PLCs, teachers will receive coaching throughout the year, and there will be a reflection at the end of the year. Meaningful detail is missing to understand how this professional development will be implemented.

Employees

The applicant's response, while identifying that it will address employees representatives by negotiating a collective bargaining agreement, does not clearly describe the employer/employee relationship and does not provide the terms of employment for all classes of employees. Instead, the applicant generally identifies the classes of employees and some legal requirements for each of the classes. Meaningful detail is not provided to understand the terms of employment.

The applicant provides a limited plan that states generally how and when personnel policies will be developed and how they will comply with state and federal statutes and regulations. In the letter of support received by CSD, the applicant stated these policies would be approved in December. Limited detail is provided to understand how these plans will be developed.

The applicant does not provide a clear staff discipline process. The applicant's response focuses primarily on termination, and provides only limited information on discipline. Specifically, the applicant states that the head administrator may use a number of discipline tools and lists four potential tools. The applicant's response also states that progressive discipline may be used. The process described provides for substantial discretion in its application, without clear criteria to guide the use of that discretion. As result, it is unclear wither the process ensures due process.

The applicant provides a limited grievance policy. Specifically, the policy is available only to salaried full-time employees. It is unclear if any of the schools will be hourly or part time, and why the policy is limited to salaried full-time employees. The policy also does not provide for an appeals process and states the governing council's decision is final.

Community/Parent/Employee Involvement in Governance

The applicant's responses do not adequately demonstrate the capacity to provide meaningful parental, professional educator, and community involvement. While the applicant does describe school structures that will provide meaningful parental, professional educator, and community involvement in the governance and operation of the school, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this

section of the application.

Specifically, the applicant provides a limited grievance process for receiving or processing complaints from the community and parents. The applicant's response contains general guidelines, but not a process that would assure a timely and meaningful response.

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 acknowledge the NMAC provisions regarding the due process rights for students with disabilities and make an assurance that the policies and practices will comply with the NMAC requirements, but provide no meaningful detail on how this proposed school will implement processes to ensure compliance with the requirements.

The applicant does not provide a plan for addressing alternative educational settings for eligible students. While the applicant does acknowledge some of the legal requirements for expelling a student with disabilities and briefly identifies interim alternative educational settings, the applicant does not provide a plan for making or addressing such placements.

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

In the application, the applicant provided a limited outreach and recruitment plan that did not appear to be supported by the budget. However, as part of the capacity interview, community input hearing, and letter of support submitted after the community input hearing, the applicant clarified the information provided in the application. The applicant identified the recruitment activities to be implemented and identified that these activities will be funded as part of the NISN fellowship obtained by the school's founder. Based on the entirety of the information available, CSD believes the applicant has provided sufficient information to meet the application requirements for this prompt.

In the application, the applicant provided a limited description of the lottery procedures that raised some concerns about the applicant's understanding of lottery requirements. As part of the capacity interview, community input hearing, and letter of support submitted after the community input hearing, the applicant clarified the information provided in the application that had raised concerns. The applicant does not, however, provide a clear lottery description with meaningful detail to understand how the lottery will be implemented.

Legal Compliance

The applicant does not demonstrate a capacity to comply with legal requirements. While the applicant provides a clear conflict of interest policy that demonstrates an understanding of the requirements of the law and demonstrates an adequate understanding of and capacity to comply with the open meetings act, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this section of the application.

Specifically, the applicant does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of and capacity to comply with the inspection of public records act. The applicant’s response very generally identifies the IPRA, but does not provide meaningful detail to understand how the proposed school would comply with the requirements of the act.

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 states it will follow statutes and regulations. Limited detail is provided to understand how the applicant will meet student transportation needs.

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 that it will contract for food services, utilize USDA funding, and offer breakfast, lunch, and a snack. The applicant makes the additional assurance that all meals will comply with USDA requirements. The applicant proposes that they will become a FoodCorps program site. Substantial details are missing from the applicant’s response, which makes the response limited.

Facilities/School Environment

The applicant’s responses do not adequately demonstrate a capacity to address all school facility needs. While the applicant does provide evidence that the PSFA has provided approval to the facilities plan and does provide evidence that it has researched potential facilities and made significant efforts to identify a viable facility, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

Specifically, the applicant did not describe its projected facilities needs and desired school environment. Additionally, the applicant provided a limited description of the school’s potential capital outlay needs and did not provide adequate estimates for facility maintenance, repair, and equipment needs.

Because 78 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.

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School’s Possible Points
BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	32	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 provides a 910B5 that demonstrates an adequate understanding of New Mexico Public School funding and a 5 year budget that adequately supports the schools plan, and provides a clear salary schedule for most key staff that complies with state requirements, the applicant does not meet the other requirements of this area of the application.

The applicant's budget narrative is limited as it does not explain how basic assumptions in the narrative were determined using reliable sources.

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.

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 and internal controls. Instead, the applicant states that financial and control policies will be developed and provides some general principles that will guide the policies. The applicant then describes the responsibilities of the governing council and the finance committee. In the letter of support sent to CSD, the applicant indicates financial policies will be approved in December.

The applicant generally identifies the appropriate staff to perform financial tasks. The applicant identifies the duties of the principal, the executive director, the business manager, and the business support specialist. The applicant does not, however, identify staff to act as a certified procurement officer. The applicant also does not identify the qualifications of those positions.

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 that it will contract with a skilled business manager through NISN and identifies that the school's governing body will have a finance committee and an audit committee. There is no detail on how these committees will operate in the context of the school's overall governance and management. The applicant did not identify the legal oversight by the governing body or committees.

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 indicates some goals but does not identify strategies for achieving them, and identifies some strategies but no goals to accompany them.

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.

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	15	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.

Outreach Activities

The applicant provides clear evidence that it has developed a comprehensive and cohesive outreach program that has reached a broad audience. This was also evidenced by the substantial turn out at the community input hearing.

Community Relationships

The applicant demonstrates evidence that it has developed meaningful working relationships or resource agreements with local community groups or individuals. Specifically, the applicant has provided evidence of networking relationships and resource agreements with the National Indian Youth Leadership Project and the NACA Inspired Schools Network (NISN). In particular the NISN relationship will provide substantial support including a salary for the executive director for the planning year of the school and ongoing support including professional development, curriculum development support, and business and governing council development services.

Uniqueness and Innovation

The applicant provides adequate evidence of the uniqueness, innovation, or significant contribution of its educational program. Specifically, the applicant addresses culturally responsive teaching, to meet the needs of the population in the Gallup area. The applicant specifically contrasts this to the programs implemented in local schools.

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

Community Support

The applicant does not provide sufficient measurable, quantifiable and qualitative data-based evidence of broad-based support for the school among residents in the targeted community. The applicant has clearly qualitative support in the community, which was also evidenced by the substantial turn out at the community input hearing. The applicant has not, however quantified that support. The applicant responded in the community input hearing that it has not been able to quantify support for its program.

Because 25 percent of the applicant’s responses were evaluated as “partially meets” for the reasons described above this section of the application is inadequate.

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

Twenty-eight people were in attendance at the community input hearing, it appears that all of those attendees were in support of the opening of the school.

During the Community Input Hearing there were no representatives from the local school district, and CSD has not received any input from the local school district.

The applicant had approximately ten supporters present who made remarks in support of the applicant. Many of the supporters identified themselves as parents of potential students, community members who supported the school, or potential collaborators with the school.

Since the community input hearing, CSD has received one letter of support for the application. As described in other sections of this recommendation, the letter was a letter of support from the applicant. In the letter the applicant provided additional information in response to CSD’s initial evaluation.

CSD believes the applicant’s relationship with the NACA Inspired Schools Network (NISN) is very notable and, if the application is approved will be a great asset to the school. NISN will provide the school

founders with high quality professional development and training, mentoring and coaching, early stage supports to help launch a successful school, and access to established community partnerships with a vast array of highly effective organizations throughout the nation and Native American communities. NISN has a highly experienced and professional staff that will support the school founders in all aspects of school start up including: facilities, governance, operations, staffing, and curriculum development.