



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 OF EDUCATION

SUSANA MARTINEZ  
GOVERNOR

August 31, 2016

Katie Poulos  
300 Don Gaspar  
Santa Fe, NM, 87150

Dear Public Education Commissioners:

Enclosed is the Final 2016 Charter School Application Final Analysis and Recommendation for Hozho Academy applying for a state charter in Gallup, NM in the Gallup-McKinley School District to serve grades K-12 and represented by founders, Patrick Mason, Rachel Mason, and Arita Yazzie. 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Katie Poulos".

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

1. Complete Planning Year Checklist
2. Board of Finance Designation
3. PFSA Certification of Facilities
4. Correct Deficiencies Identified in New Application Analysis

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>	186	271
• Education Plan/Academic Framework	52	72
• Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework	88	131
• Business Plan/ Financial Framework	27	40
• Evidence of Support	15	24
• Required Appendices	4	4
<b>Capacity Interview Score</b>	60	88
• Education Plan	8	12
• Leadership & Governance	19	24
• Facility	6	8
• Finance	8	12
• Planning Year	3	4
• Individualized Question	16	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>359</b>

## 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, but may reference these in the Recommendation and Final Analysis 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>	52	72
<p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></p> <p><b>The CSD found this section to be complete and adequate. The applicant scored “meets” or “exceeds” in 19 areas in this section. The applicant scores “partially meets” in 1 area in this section.</b></p> <p>Overall, the application presents a robust educational plan. The plan presents a very thorough academic program aimed at incorporating a Classical Liberal Arts curriculum and a curriculum that will support the cultures of the four-corners area.</p> <p><b>The following area of the applicant’s response were found to be incomplete or inadequate, for the reason described.</b></p> <p>While the application provided a clear explanation of how students identified as English Language Learners (ELL) will be supported; the applicant provided a limited description of the school’s process for evaluating and monitoring the progress of English language learners.</p> <p><b><u>Overall, this section of the application is adequate as more than 70% of the responses were rated “meets” or “exceeds” and fewer than 3 areas were rated “partially meets” and fewer than 1 area was rated “does not meet.”</u></b></p>		

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND GOVERNANCE / ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK</b>	88	131
<p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></p> <p><b>The CSD found this section to be complete and adequate. <i>The applicant scored “meets” or “exceeds” in 21 areas in this section. The applicant scored “partially meets” in 2 areas and “does not meet” in 1 area in this section. The following areas of the applicant’s response were found to not meet the application requirements, for the reasons described.</i></b></p> <p>While, the applicant does provide a job description and clear plan for when they would like to hire, the applicant’s response does not meet the NM requirement to hire an administrator who hold the required NM licensure.</p> <p>The applicant does not delineate the separate process of enrollment and registration. CSD noted that the applicant appears to be asking for information that is not allowable <u>before</u> registration. The applicant has not included any recruitment or marketing plan to ensure equal access to the proposed school and to support the school in meeting enrollment goals. There is no budget support for marketing.</p> <p>The applicant plans to offer food services. However, a limited plan to support these services was provided. Specifically, the applicant provides several alternatives for how lunch may be provided, but does not describe what the determination will be based upon.</p> <p><b><u>Overall, this section of the application is adequate as more than 70% of the responses were rated “meets” or “exceeds” and fewer than 3 areas were rated “partially meets” and fewer than 1 area was rated “does not meet.”</u></b></p>		

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
<b>BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK</b>	27	40
<p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></p> <p><b>The CSD found this section to be complete and adequate. <i>The applicant scored “meets” or “exceeds” in 5 areas in this section. The applicant scored “partially meets” in 1 areas and “does not meet” in 1 area in this section. The following areas of the applicant’s response were found to not meet the application requirements, for the reasons described.</i></b></p> <p>The following areas of the applicant’s response were found to be inadequate for the reasons described.</p> <p>The information in this application regarding the description of staff necessary to perform financial tasks is incomplete and does not include a timeline, job search or recruitment process for any financial staff. The response addresses the principal and his/her responsibility to hire appropriate staff; however sufficient financial staff to implement internal control processes is not described or identified.</p> <p>The applicant provided a limited description of how the Governing Body will provide legal and financial oversight. Additionally, the applicant provided a limited description that lacks clear details of how the Governing Board committees will operate in the context of the proposed school’s overall governance &amp; management.</p> <p><b><u>Overall, this section of the application is adequate as more than 70% of the responses were rated “meets” or “exceeds” and fewer than 3 areas were rated “partially meets” and fewer than 1 area was rated “does not meet.”</u></b></p>		



Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	17	24

**Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:**

The CSD found this section to be complete and adequate. *The applicant scored “meets” or “exceeds” in 3 areas in this section. The applicant scored “partially meets” in 1 area in this section. The following areas of the applicant’s response were found to not meet the application requirements, for the reasons described.*

The response provides limited information on data collected that indicates community member opinions on education and school generally. However, the data collected does not specifically solicit or demonstrate support for the proposed school. It is unclear how many responses were received; thus the review team cannot identify if there is adequate support.

**Overall, this section of the application is adequate as more than 70% of the responses were rated “meets” or “exceeds” and fewer than 3 areas were rated “partially meets” and fewer than 1 area was rated “does not meet.”**

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
Appendices	4	4

**Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:**

The application provides all of the required appendices.

**Other Pertinent Information**

During the July, 20<sup>th</sup> Community Input Hearing the local school district did not express opposition to the application. The applicant had approximately three supporters who made remarks in support of the applicant.

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview and public input hearings, the applicant(s) demonstrated the capacity to implement the education and governance/management plans as described in the application.