

Name of Proposed School *Academic Opportunities Academy—Deming*

Team Members:

Rachel Stofocik and Brad Richardson (Team Leads)
Doug Wine
Greta Roskom
Mary Scofield
Gilbert Mondragon

APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM ANALYSIS SCORE SUMMARY

Please note that two review teams were responsible for Academic Opportunities Academy as this applicant school submitted five uniform applications for five distinct locations in New Mexico: Alamogordo, Anthony, Carlsbad, Deming, and Las Cruces. One review team was assigned the first three locations while the other team was responsible for the remaining two. In order to ensure a thorough analysis, both teams met to determine the applicant school’s capacity and application quality. The reviews are the same, despite unique locations, as there was no difference between the five applications.

SECT. NO.	APPLICATION RUBRIC SECTION	POINTS RECEIVED	APPLICANT SCHOOL’S POSSIBLE POINTS
I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2	4
II.	EDUCATION PLAN/ ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK	49.91	94
III.	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE/ ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK	48.5	72
IV.	BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	9.5	18
V.	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	2	10
VI.	REQUIRED APPENDICES	2	2
	OVERALL SCORE	113.91	200

CHARTER APPLICATION EVALUATION RUBRIC: TEAM ANALYSIS 2012

The Charter Application Evaluation Rubric (“Rubric”) will be used to determine whether the Application meets, partially meets, or does not meet the application requirements of law and the authorizer. It can also be used by the applicant to guide the writing of the Application. The reviewers must objectively review each indicator in order to provide an overall assessment of the Application components.

The Rubric will be used to determine whether the Application may be approved, approved with conditions, or denied. A chartering authority may deny an application if:

- The application is deemed incomplete or inadequate.
- The application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter Schools Act (NMSA 1978 §22-8B-6(K)(2011).
- The proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was involved with another charter school whose charter was denied or revoked for fiscal mismanagement or the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was discharged from a public school for fiscal mismanagement.
- 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.
- 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.

Please note the following definitions:

Incomplete:

- No information is provided in response to some or all of the prompts
- Prompts are met, but overall the responses lack meaningful detail or would require additional information to demonstrate an understanding of the key issue or concept to be addressed.
- Section not thoroughly explained and demonstrates lack of preparation.
- Information is inaccurate that reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the key concept to be addressed by the section.

Inadequate:

- The response raises concerns about whether the applicant understands the request and the basic issue raised by the request.
- Responses raise substantial concerns about the applicant’s ability to meet the requirement in practice.
- The founder’s overall plan for the school is difficult to comprehend and/or presents an unrealistic plan for the operation of a school or any aspect of the school.
- The response is difficult to comprehend.
- The section does not align, or the reviewer cannot ascertain whether the response aligns with the overall plan articulated.

Please Note: If an applicant school’s response to one of the questions is labeled “incomplete” or “inadequate” it should receive a score of zero for that section.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
Executive Summary	The summary demonstrates a cohesive and comprehensive plan for the contemplated school and addresses all of the elements requested in the application.	The summary articulates a plan, but leaves out information that would explain some of the required elements for the executive summary.	The summary is confusing, incomplete and does not address most of the required elements for the executive summary.	<i>See summary.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The model or focus of the proposed school is clearly stated.	The model or focus of the proposed school is not clearly stated.	A model or focus of the school is not provided.	<i>See summary.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments			
	<p><i>The review team agreed that this summary is extremely comprehensive when it stands alone. However, it is not cohesive in that it does not pull everything together seamlessly. Also, as the entire application is read, it is clear that this summary does not reflect or appropriately summarize what the school developers actually propose. Particularly, there are several items listed in this summary that are not within the entire application.</i></p>			

Score: 2 out of 4 possible points

II. EDUCATION PLAN

- A. SCHOOL SIZE
- B. VISION
- C. MISSION

Evaluation Criteria. The vision and mission statements describe the purpose for the school and express the ideal, long-term impact, focus, scope and scale of the school.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.A. School Size	The applicant provides all of the required information.		The applicant does not provide all of the required information.	Adequate information provided.
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
II. A and B. Vision and Mission	The mission statement clearly states the purpose for and goal of the school, and explains how the school will reach that goal. The mission statement clearly translates into measurable and achievable goals, the selected curriculum, operations, and all aspects of the school.		A mission statement is stated but does not clearly translate into measurable and achievable goals, the selected curriculum, operations and all aspects of the school.	The review team agrees that this is not a mission statement. It offers information on how they will achieve the mission, but does not really offer a mission that is measurable or ambitious.
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	A coherent vision of what the school hopes to look like in the future is evident (long-term goals) and sustainable.		The vision is stated, but does not provide a clear picture of what the school will look like if it is achieving its goals.	The review team determined that this vision does provide a picture of some of the programs that it plans to offer, but as a coherent vision, it lacks clarity.
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	The review team would like to see a stronger statement of unique need for this school in this particular area, and then a description of how it would differ from other schools in the area.			

Score: 3 out of 6 possible points

D. GOALS

Evaluation Criteria. The school has clearly stated ambitious, but attainable educational goals that are aligned with the school’s mission. The goals are specific, measurable (based on identified indicators and expected performance levels that can be measured by a reliable instrument).

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance				SCORE: 1
	The school has appropriate and manageable student academic performance goals that are rigorous and reflect high expectations. Goals meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measurable, but there may be too few or too many goals for the school to manage successfully or are insufficiently rigorous. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable academic performance goals; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team determined that this goal could not be “managed successfully”(11).</i>
				SCORE: 2
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the school’s mission or vision.	The goals do not tie to the school’s mission or vision.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
				SCORE: 1
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>The review team agreed that this goal is not “attainable”(P. 11).</i>
				SCORE: 1.33
	The school has appropriate and manageable student academic growth goals that are rigorous and reflect high expectations. Goals meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measurable, but there may be too few or too many goals for the school to manage successfully or are insufficiently rigorous and do not reflect high expectations. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable academic growth goals; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team decided to average the individual scores for this section, as some agreed that this goal was not clear or succinct while others believed it was sufficient as written.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the school's mission or vision.	The goals do not tie to the school's mission or vision.	<i>The review team agreed that while the applicant's chosen assessment provides probability measures of growth and achievement (PP. 12-13), those measures do not lead to the goal of 96% proficiency by the end of two years (P. 11).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>The review team agreed that this goal is not "attainable."</i>
II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gaps	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address how the school will address achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between student subgroups; and the goals meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has stated goals, that only partially describe how the school will address achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between student subgroups, or that are insufficiently rigorous. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address student achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between student subgroups; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team determined that the applicant appears to lack understanding of "subgroups," as they do not mention subgroups.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the school's mission or vision.	The goals do not tie to the school's mission or vision.	<i>Subgroups are not described.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>Subgroups are not described.</i>	

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.D.(4) Attendance	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address attendance and meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measurable, but only partially address student attendance or are insufficiently rigorous. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address student attendance or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team agreed that the school's plan, in effect, to dis-enroll students whose absences might jeopardize the school's attendance goal is inappropriate. Further, the school cannot, as stated, "return students [with excessive absences] to the public schools" (p. 14).</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the school's mission or vision.	The goals do not tie to the school's mission or vision.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1.58
II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address recurrent enrollment that are rigorous and reflect high expectations. Goals meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measurable, but only partially address recurrent enrollment or are insufficiently rigorous. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address recurrent enrollment issues; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team decided to average the individual scores for this section, as all team members agreed that these goals are rigorous, but some questioned that they are manageable.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the mission or vision of the school.	The goals do not tie to the mission or vision of the school.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1.5
II.D.(6) College Readiness	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address college readiness that are rigorous and reflect high expectations. Goals meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measurable, but only partially address college readiness or are insufficiently rigorous and do not reflect high expectations. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address college readiness; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team decided to average the individual scores for this section, as all team members agreed that this goal is rigorous, but some questioned whether it was manageable. "75% year one"; "99.5% year five."</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the mission or vision of the school.	The goals do not tie to the mission or vision of the school.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1.5
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>The review team decided that this goal, as written, lacks clarity and makes it difficult to determine its measurability.</i>
II.D. (7) Graduation Rate	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address graduation rates that are rigorous and reflect high expectations.	The school has goals that are measurable, but only partially address graduation rates or are insufficiently rigorous and do not reflect high expectations. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address graduation rates; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team determined that because the applicant is excluding "students who have disabilities"(p. 15) from their four-year graduation cohort, this goal is "insufficiently rigorous." Special education students do not necessarily need to be excluded from their graduation rate goals.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the mission or vision of the school.	The goals do not tie to the mission or vision of the school.	<i>This goal appears not to be aligned with the school's mission and vision.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>The review team agreed that the goal presented will not lead to a "sufficient plan"—eliminating "students with disabilities."</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address the growth of the lowest 25% of students in reading and math that are rigorous and reflect high expectations. Goals meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measurable, but only partially address the growth of the lowest 25% of students in reading and math, or are insufficiently rigorous and do not reflect high expectations. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals that address the growth of the lowest 25% of students in reading and math; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team determined that this goal is “rigorous” but not “manageable.” There is a lack of evidence that this model is effective with this student population (16).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the mission or vision of the school.	The goals do not tie to the mission or vision of the school.	<i>The review team agreed that due to the lack of clarity in the goal it is challenging to know whether this goal clearly aligns to the mission or vision.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>The review team agreed that this goal is not “specific,” as it does not address the full range of grade levels offered (16). The review team agreed that due to lack of specificity this goal is not measurable.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team determined that the applicant school has set extremely high expectations; however, it does not pair those expectations with sufficient resources, funding, and most importantly, the personnel to support the proposed model. For example, the application states a student:teacher ratio to be 30:1 (p. 10.)</i></p>			

Score: 28.91 out of 48 possible points

E. ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS

Evaluation Criteria. The school has clearly stated ambitious, but attainable organizational goals that are aligned with the school’s mission. The goals are specific, measurable (based on identified indicators and expected performance levels that can be measured by a reliable instrument).

Topic	Ranking			Comments &References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.E Organizational Goals	The school has appropriate and manageable organizational goals that are rigorous and reflect high expectations.	The school has organizational goals that are measureable, but there may be too few or too many goals for the school to manage successfully or are insufficiently rigorous.	The school’s organizational goals are not measurable; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	SCORE: N/A
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: N/A
	The school’s stated organizational goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The school’s stated organizational goals do not clearly tie to the school’s mission or vision.	The school’s stated organizational goals do not tie to the school’s mission or vision.	
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: N/A
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			

Score: 0 out of 0 possible points

F. CURRICULUM

G. GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS (If Applicable)

Evaluation Criteria: The school uses a clearly defined, research-based curriculum with the potential to raise the achievement of the intended student population and that is aligned with NM State Standards.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.F.(1) Philosophy	The philosophical approach and curriculum framework are clearly presented and clearly aligns with the school's stated mission and goals.	The philosophical approach and curriculum framework are partially defined and/or the alignment with the school's stated mission and goals is unclear.	The philosophical approach and curriculum framework are not clearly presented and do not align with the school's stated mission and goals.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that this philosophy is "unclear" because it is disjointed (pp. 16-17). It is unclear how these philosophies work together or reflect the mission and vision?</i>
II.F.(2) Research/Data	Research provided on the proposed instructional practices supports the use of this philosophy or approach to achieve high student outcomes.	Research provided on the proposed instructional practices is partially relevant, limited, unreliable or not valid.	Research on the proposed instructional practices is not provided.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that research links are provided, but there is no narration that demonstrates how the curricular philosophy helps promote high student achievement (pp. 18 – 19).</i>
II.F.(3) Curriculum Description	A description of the curriculum is provided and reflects an organized, cohesive curriculum for all grade levels, and aligns with the school's mission and educational philosophy.	A description of the curriculum is provided, but only partially aligns with the school's mission and educational philosophy.	The description of the curriculum does not align with the school's mission and educational philosophy; or a description of the curriculum is not provided.	SCORE: 0 <i>The review team agreed that this section does not provide a description of the proposed curriculum. Instead the application states that the school "plans to follow the state curriculum." Since New Mexico does not have a state curriculum (only standards), the review team was unable to determine what the proposed school's curriculum will be. Further, the review team was unable to locate the names and descriptions of the elementary level content areas or secondary level courses to be offered by the proposed school.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.F.(4) Curriculum Research	Clear research-based evidence of the success of the chosen curriculum when used with the target population is included.	Research-based evidence provided on the chosen curriculum is partially relevant, limited, unreliable, or not valid.	Research to support the chosen curriculum is not provided.	<i>The review team determined that some relationship exists between the provided research and the target population the proposed school intends to serve (e.g., bi-lingual education, career academies, and world languages, pp. 20 – 22). However, without a curriculum description to review, the team was unable to determine how precisely the research reflects the school curricular offerings.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.F.(5) Curriculum Overview	A Scope and Sequence and course offerings are provided. A timeline detailing curriculum development, including who will do that work, is provided.	Course offerings or Scope and Sequence are provided but do not sufficiently align with the school’s mission and educational philosophy. A timeline describing curriculum development is provided but may provide insufficient detail.	The Scope and Sequence or course offerings are not provided; and/or a timeline outlining the curriculum development is not provided.	<i>The review team agreed that a listing of standards does not qualify as a scope and sequence.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.F.(6)(7) Development Timeline / Instructional Program	A clear plan is in place to develop the school’s instructional program; responsible staff and deadlines are identified.	A limited plan is in place to develop the school’s instructional program; responsible staff may be identified.	No plan is in place to develop the school instructional program; no responsible staff is identified.	<i>The review team discovered an inconsistency in the plan, which renders it a “limited plan.” In the school’s first year the application suggests all the lessons and learning activities for the first four months of the school year will be developed in a database (p. 23). This does not comport with what is suggested in the timeline found on page 22, Sect. II.F(6).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.F.(8) Alignment Timeline	There is sufficient evidence that the chosen curriculum is aligned with NM State Standards, or an adequate timeline for aligning the curriculum is provided.		There is no evidence that the chosen curriculum is aligned with NM State Standards, nor is a timeline for aligning the curriculum with NM State Standards provided.	<i>The review team determined that the applicant school identified the standards but still does not have a concrete curriculum or an alignment timeline.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.G.(1) (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver	High school graduation requirements, if applicable, are clearly articulated, meet state requirements, support the mission of the school, and are rigorous and reflect high expectations.	High school graduation requirements are insufficiently described, or do not support the mission of the school, or are not rigorous and do not reflect high expectations.	High school graduation requirements are not provided; or they are provided but do not meet state requirements.	<i>The review team calculated that students enrolled at the proposed school will need 34 credits to graduate high school. (The school's requirements appear to exclude New Mexico History, which is mandatory). Following this plan, without New Mexico History, students would not be able to graduate high school. Finally, even with New Mexico History added, students would have a difficult time graduating in four years.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: N/A
	Waivers, if applicable, state what the waiver is and why school is seeking it.		Waivers, if applicable, are included but without explanation.	<i>The review team would like to note that the applicant school would need a waiver if it did not plan to offer New Mexico History.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team agreed that this section overall is very limited. Many integral components are not mentioned. For example, this section fails to comprehensively address several important components of the proposed school's curriculum: the elementary component of the proposed school; the transition to the Common Core standards; the resources needed to support its graduation requirements; and an explanation of how the school plans to execute this extremely ambitious plan for educating their secondary students (34 credits at a 90% mastery rate).</i>			

Score: 7 out of 16 possible points

H. INSTRUCTION

Evaluation Criteria: The school identifies quality methods and strategies that have been demonstrated to be effective in meeting the needs of the targeted student population. For unique or innovative practices, the charter school applicant presents a compelling rationale for their effectiveness.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.H.(1) Instructional Strategies	The school's proposed instructional practices support and are aligned with the school's mission, vision and educational philosophy	The school's proposed instructional practices partially align with the school's mission, vision, and educational philosophy	The connection between the school's proposed instructional practices and the school's mission, vision, and educational philosophy has not been established.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that some of what is provided could be considered an instructional strategy. However, some is not, such as "physical education, curriculum mapping database" etc.(pp 26-27).</i>
II.H.(2) Effectiveness	Evidence of the effectiveness of the proposed methods/ strategies with the target student population is included.	Evidence of the effectiveness of the proposed methods/ strategies with the target student population is not clearly stated.	Evidence of the effectiveness of the proposed methods/ strategies with the target student population is not provided.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that there appears to be no narrative or description of how the proposed school's elementary students will be taught (p. 28).</i>
II.H.(3) Differentiated Instruction	The school describes how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student needs, and examples are provided.	The school describes how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs, but there are no examples.	The school does not sufficiently describe how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs, and there are no examples.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that what is provided lacks specificity (p. 29).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team determined that there is inadequate research provided to support the instructional model proposed in this application.</i>			

Score: 3 out of 6 possible points

I. SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Evaluation Criteria: The school has plans in place to meet the legal requirements and individual needs of those determined to be special needs students (including gifted students), English Language Learners, at-risk students, or those students performing below grade level.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.1.(1)(a) – (d) Special Education				SCORE: 1
	The school demonstrates a clear understanding of and capacity to meet all legal requirements regarding identifying, providing an appropriate continuum of services, and monitoring students that are receiving special education services, including students who are gifted.	The school demonstrates a partial understanding of and capacity to meet state and federal requirements regarding students receiving special education services, including students who are gifted.	The response does not demonstrate an understanding of and capacity to meet state and federal requirements regarding students receiving special education services, including students who are gifted.	<i>The review team agreed that the applicant did not explain how they will use Universal Design for Learning to serve the proposed school's student population (p. 29).</i>
				SCORE: 1
	The school has a plan in place to meet all legal requirements to regularly evaluate and monitor progress of special education students to ensure attainment of IEP goals.	The school has a partial plan in place to meet the needs of students with IEPs; but details are not provided.	The school has no stated process in place to monitor students with IEPs.	<i>The review team agreed that while the applicants appear to know the law, they do not describe how they will apply it at the proposed school.</i>
				SCORE: 1
	The school provides a complete plan for graduating students with special education needs (if applicable) that is in compliance with Federal and State regulations.	There is an incomplete plan for graduating students with special education needs (if applicable).	The plan for graduating students with special education needs (if applicable) is not provided; or the plan provided is not in compliance with Federal and State regulations.	<i>The review team agreed that this section lacked sufficient detail.</i>
				SCORE: 1
The school has identified the appropriate staff and ancillary services to adequately meet the needs of special	The school has identified some of the staff needed to meet the needs of special education and ELL students. An	The school has not identified appropriate staffing to adequately address the needs of special populations;	<i>The review team agreed that this plan is not adequately developed and has not demonstrated the personnel capacity to meet the needs of these two student populations.</i>	

	education and ELL students, and provides an explanation for how they will be adequately budgeted.	explanation is provided indicating how they will be adequately budgeted.	or the plan for how they will be budgeted is not provided; or the budget does not appear adequate.	<i>The budget for this section appears insufficient (Appendix K, pp. 1-2). There is provision for only one special education teacher for 400 students.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
II.1(2) Students with 504 Plans	The school demonstrates understanding and capacity to meet all legal requirements regarding students with Section 504 Plans.		The school does not demonstrate understanding and capacity to meet all legal requirements regarding students with Section 504 Plans.	<i>The review team agreed that while the application addresses the curricular needs of students with 504 plans through the curriculum mapping database, it fails to address the medical needs of students with 504 plans, which also fall within the Americans with Disabilities Act (p. 30).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.1 (3)(a)-(e) English Language Learners (ELL)	The school has a plan in place to identify and meet the needs of English Language Learners. Intervention strategies are fully described	The school has a partial plan in place to identify and meet the needs of English Language Learners. Intervention strategies are partially described.	The school has no plan in place to identify or meet the needs of English Language Learners.	<i>The review team agreed that a limited plan was provided for identifying ELL students. However, intervention strategies are not fully described (p. 30).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The school describes how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student needs and examples are provided.	The school describes how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs, but there are no examples.	The school does not sufficiently describe how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs, and there are no examples.	<i>The review team observed that the proposed school's plan appears to address the needs of ELL students through differentiation by hiring Spanish-speaking staff, who may not necessarily be certified (p. 30).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The school has a plan in place to meet all legal requirements to regularly evaluate and monitor the progress of English Language Learners.	The school has a partial plan in place to meet the needs of English Language Learners; but details are not provided.	The school has no process in place to monitor the progress of English Language Learners.	<i>The review team agreed that enrollment in a 50/50 dual language program does not ensure that the learning needs of all ELL students will be addressed.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	The budget reflects allocation(s) for resources, staffing, and training to serve the needs of ELL students.	The budget reflects some of the costs involved in addressing ELL students; however, sufficient detail is not provided.	The budget does not reflect costs involved in addressing the needs of ELL students.	<p><i>The review team agreed that the budget appears inadequate for the following services:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bilingual or TESOL endorsed teachers;</i> • <i>Testing;</i> • <i>ELL supplies;</i> • <i>Curriculum (p. 31).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team agreed that the proposed school plans in this section were insufficiently developed and appears insufficiently resourced.</i></p>			

Score: 7 out of 18 possible points

J. ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Evaluation Criteria: The school has appropriate assessments in place to evaluate student needs, the effectiveness of the educational program, and progress toward school goals. The school will use the assessment data to affect teaching and learning to improve student achievement, or meet other goals of the school.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.J.(1) Measuring Organizational Goals (if applicable)	A comprehensive list of assessments that will specifically measure organizational goals that align with the mission of the school is provided.	A partial list of assessment tools to measure organizational goals is provided. The assessment tools only partially align with the mission of the school.	A list of assessment tools to measure organizational goals is not provided; or the assessment tools do not align with the mission of the school.	SCORE: N/A
II.J.(2) Assessments to Measure Academic Goals	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	A comprehensive list of assessment tools that measure academic goals is provided and align with the mission of the school. Grade levels to be assessed and anticipated schedule or frequency of assessing is provided.	A list of assessments is provided; however, the list only partially aligns with the mission of the school. The grade levels to be assessed and anticipated schedule or frequency of assessing is not sufficiently addressed.	A list of assessments is not provided, or the list of assessments do not align with the mission of the school; or the grade levels to be assessed, anticipated schedule or frequency of assessing is not addressed.	<i>The review team noted that this section lacked necessary information about the grade levels to be assessed, and the anticipated schedule or frequency for assessing (p. 31).</i> <i>Also, it is unclear why the application references Indiana State Standards.</i>
II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Self-Monitoring	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	Strategies to monitor all students and to take appropriate corrective actions are clearly defined, including interventions and a plan to close the achievement gap between student subgroups.	A plan for taking corrective action is only generally described.	There is no evidence of a plan for corrective action, or the plan does not address what adjustments the school will make based upon grade-level or school-wide data.	<i>The review team agreed that no corrective action plan is described (p. 32).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	<p>Remediation/At-Risk Students The school demonstrates understanding and capacity to meet all legal requirements regarding identifying, providing an appropriate range of services, and monitoring students who are struggling. Student Assistance Teams and Response to Intervention strategies for the 3 tiers are fully described.</p>	<p>Remediation/At-Risk Students The school has a partial plan in place that complies with legal requirements to identify and meet the needs of students who are struggling and to identify students with special needs. Student Assistance Teams and RTI are mentioned but details are not provided.</p>	<p>Remediation/At-Risk Students The school does not provide a plan that complies with legal requirements; or the plan does not demonstrate the capacity to meet the needs of remedial or at-risk students.</p>	<p>The review team agreed that no remediation plan is provided (p. 31-32).</p>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	<p>School-Wide Practices The school has provided a comprehensive plan to analyze data, identify school-wide practices that need to be changed, and implement the necessary adjustments in order to improve student outcomes.</p>	<p>School-Wide Practices The school has described a plan to analyze data and identify school-wide practices in need of change; however, the plan does not include effective structures or processes for implementation.</p>	<p>School-Wide Practices The school does not provide a plan.</p>	<p>The review team agreed that no school-wide practices are provided (P. 31-32).</p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
II.J. (5) Reporting on Progress	<p>The school provides a plan that explains how student assessment and progress will be appropriately communicated to parents, the school’s Governing Council, the school’s authorizer, and the broader community.</p>	<p>The school provides a plan, but it does not include communication of student assessment and progress to all identified parties.</p>	<p>There is no plan provided to communicate assessment results or student progress.</p>	<p>The application appears to not provide a plan to ensure that communication about student assessment and progress would occur with all stakeholders (p. 32).</p>

Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team agreed that this section lacked sufficient plans.</i></p>

Score: 2 out of 10 possible points

III. ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND GOVERNANCE

A. GOVERNING BODY CREATION/CAPACITY

Evaluation Criteria: The composition of the Governing Body (“GB”) reflects a wide range of expertise, knowledge and experience, and demonstrates the capacity to oversee a successful school (i.e., assure student success, develop, implement, oversee the management of public funds, and oversee the school’s compliance with legal obligations)

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
II.A.(1) Governance Description	The roles and responsibilities of the GB members are specifically outlined, and there is a clear description of the separation between the roles and responsibilities of the GB and the roles and responsibilities of the school’s administrator.	There is a partial description of the roles and responsibilities of the GB and the roles and responsibilities of the school’s administrator; or the description is either inappropriate or does not sufficiently address the distinction between roles.	There is no description provided of the roles and responsibilities of the GB and the roles and responsibilities of the school’s administrator.	<i>The review team agreed that the description provided frequently blurs the lines of responsibility between management, governance, and stakeholder involvement (32-35).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.A.(2) Description of Founders' Expertise	<p>The applicant's expertise demonstrates relevant qualifications and experience in areas that are important to implementing the proposed plan.</p>	<p>The applicant has some relevant experience in operating a public school or business, but does not demonstrate how that experience is relevant to implementing the plan for a charter school.</p>	<p>The applicant does not have experience in operating a public school or private business and has not otherwise demonstrated that the applicant has the capacity to implement the planned charter school.</p>	<p>The review team researched Academic Opportunities Academy in order to determine if the proposed model described in this application has met with success elsewhere. There is one similarly named private school in EL Paso, Texas, serving between 9 – 14 students that is administered by the developers of this application. (This information is missing from the founders' experience section); however, the team located this information in the resumes elsewhere in the application.</p> <p>The review team also reviewed the resumes of the proposed schools' two identified founders. The team is concerned that the scope of opening five holistic and complex dual-language schools offering grades 1 – 12, each with enrollment caps of 400, demands founders/ implementers with documented expertise and successful experiences in opening and managing such schools.</p> <p>While the team agreed that the founders resumes reveal broad professional experiences, including military, general contracting, pastoral work, education, scholarship, teaching, and school administration, no evidence was provided that these founders have successfully undertaken such a large-scale project as contemplated in the Academic Opportunities Academies applications.</p>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
II.J.(3) Description of Prospective Governance Expertise	GB members are listed with qualifications. Membership reflects (or will reflect) diverse experiences and skills necessary to oversee all aspects of the school.	GB membership reflects (or will reflect) some diversity of experience and skills.	GB membership reflects a lack of diverse experiences and skills, or no list is provided.	<i>The Review Team noted that no prospective members of the schools' governing bodies were identified. Rather, the application suggests that these will be identified at a later date. (p. 39).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.A.(4) GB Selection of Members	The process described for selecting new GB members is focused on selecting leaders who have the skills necessary to govern the proposed school.	The process described for selecting GB members attends to the method of selection, but only vaguely addresses the qualifications for membership.	A plan to recruit GB with identified skill sets is not provided; or no specific needs or qualifications for GB members are listed.	<i>The review team agreed that the applicant school generally addresses governing body membership qualifications (p. 39). However, no mention is made of the diverse needs of a charter school's governing body, such as finance, previous successful experience as a charter school administrator or with charter school governance, law, human resources, public relations or marketing, etc.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team recognizes the value of the founders' professional experiences, especially in education. The team is concerned, however, that these general experiences may not be sufficient to support the scale of opening and administering five relatively large and complex schools. The team is not clear if the application contemplates five individual governing bodies, or one governing body overseeing all five schools (referenced in the application as "the New Mexico Board"). The application does not clearly describe how the two founders will successfully transition onto the governing body or bodies of the five schools.</i></p> <p><i>The founders have laid plans for a close, working relationship between the school's governing body and the community. However, the plan does not draw clear lines between governance, advisory, and administration. Nor has the plan adequately balanced the community voice (in the body of the Community Advisory Group) in decision-making without creating potential conflicts. The Community Advisory Group's role may also serve to confuse reporting lines for the school administration.</i></p> <p><i>The application reveals little understanding of New Mexico charter school governance requirements.</i></p>			

Score: 3 out of 8 possible points

B. GOVERNING BODY TRAINING AND EVALUATION

Evaluation Criteria: There is an ongoing and comprehensive plan for Governing Body trainings, evaluations, and continuous improvement and complies with state requirements.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.B.(1) Governance Training	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	There is a plan for GB training that complies with state requirements and is supported by the budget.		There is no plan for GB training, or the training does not comply with state requirements, or the plan is not supported by the budget.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.B.(2) Governance Evaluation	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	There is a plan for an annual self-evaluation of the GB that reflects that body's effectiveness and focuses on continuous improvement.	There is an incomplete or partial plan for an annual self-evaluation of the GB; or the plan as described appears insufficient.	There is no plan for evaluating the GB.	<i>The team had concerns that a plan of self-evaluation may not adequately provide for an evaluation of the governing body's overall effectiveness.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team agreed that the application's governance body's training plan does comply with state requirements; however, the self- evaluation proposal is inadequate because there is no plan to evaluate the governance body's overall effectiveness (p. 44).</i>			

Score: 3 out of 4 possible points

C. LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Evaluation Criteria: There is clear description about the roles and responsibilities of the Governing Body vs. those of the school’s administrator; administrator employment process; and structure of the board to provide rigorous oversight and support.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.C.(1) Monitoring	The provided plans describing the Governing Body demonstrate its capacity to monitor the operational, financial and academic success of the school, to ensure the school is meeting its mission and to sustain a quality school.		The provided plans describing the Governing Body do not demonstrate its capacity to monitor the operational, financial and academic success of the school, to ensure the school is meeting its mission and to sustain a quality school.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate response provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.C.(2)(3) Head Administrator Selection/ Evaluation	The administrator’s qualifications are clearly described. Evidence of a plan to hire and evaluate a highly qualified administrator is provided.	The administrator’s qualifications are described; however, there is no description of a process for hiring and evaluating the administrator.	The administrator’s qualifications are not described, and there is no description of a process for hiring and evaluating the administrator.	<i>The review team determined that there was not process in place for hiring and evaluating the administrator.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team agreed that this section on Leadership and Management causes concern, as these founders plan to open five distinct schools in five different cities in southern New Mexico.</i>			

Score: 3 out of 4 possible points

D. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

Evaluation Criteria: The school’s organizational chart and accompanying descriptions clearly delineate and justifies the roles and responsibilities and lines of authority and reporting within the school.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.D.(1) Organizational Structure	The school’s organizational chart and narrative description clearly reflect the relationship between administrative, teaching, and support staff.	The organizational chart and narrative description identifies staff, but the relationships are not clear.	The organizational chart is not provided; or the chart or narrative does not demonstrate an understanding of appropriate relationships between staff.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that the relationship between the Community Advisory Group, the Governing Body, and the Administration is unclear, and two volunteer groups to oversee the school is complicated and difficult to manage (c.f., Appendix E).</i>
III.D.(2) Job Descriptions	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that not all job descriptions are provided, the listing of licensure requirements is not consistent, and the job descriptions are general and limited, especially considering the specific needs called for by the school’s complex program (Appendix D).</i>
III.D.(3) Staff Evaluation	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.D.(4) Staffing Plan	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0 <i>The staffing plan as provided is inadequate to support effective implementation of the educational program/ curriculum.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
	The staffing plan is aligned with the budget and projected enrollment.	The staffing plan partially aligns with the budget and projected enrollment.	The staffing plan does not align with the budget and projected enrollment.	<p><i>The staffing plan does not appear to align with the budget, as the application proposes a student: teacher ratio of 30:1.</i></p> <p><i>The application also proposes to pay teachers at state minimum salaries (180-day assumption) for a 227-day contract for teachers working nine-hour days, and providing only four personal days (43).</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
III.D.(5) School Day/Year	The school calendar and schedule demonstrates compliance with state requirements and are sufficient to ensure successful implementation of the educational program/ curriculum.	The school calendar and schedule do not comply with state requirements, or are not sufficient to ensure successful implementation of the educational program/ curriculum.	The school calendar and schedule are not provided.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.D.(6) Professional Development Plan	A plan for Professional Development is provided that supports the implementation of the school's educational plan, mission, and goals, and meets state requirements.	A partial plan for Professional Development is provided that partially supports the implementation of the school's educational plan, mission, and goals; or the development plan does not meet state requirements.	No Professional Development Plan is provided.	<i>The review team noted that there is no training discussed for the curriculum mapping database software, which is by the applicant's own assessment, is critical to managing the proposed school's goals, students' 504 Plans, etc. (p. 44-46).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluatio	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team agreed that the applicant school's organizational chart and delineation of roles is inadequate considering the complexity of the educational proposal presented. In addition, it appears that the staffing plan suggested to execute this plan is insufficient.</i>			

Score: 6 out of 14 possible points

E. EMPLOYEES

Evaluation Criteria: The school provides an explanation of the relationship between the school and the employees, establishes policies; including an employee discipline and grievance processes.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.E.(1) Employer/Employee Relationship	The school provides a clear description of the terms of employment for all classes of employees and how the school will address employees' recognized representatives.		The school does not provide a clear description of the terms of employment for all classes of employees and how the school will address employees' recognized representatives.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team does not understand what is meant by the application asserting that employees would be represented by the Community Advisory Group (p. 46). In addition, the application states that the school will be a "non-union shop." It is not the leadership's decision whether teachers unionize or not. It is the teachers' collective decision.</i>
III.E.(2) Personnel Policies	Personnel policies and procedures are provided and there is a plan to ensure that the policies align with the mission of the school and comply with all applicable federal and state regulations; or there is a defined plan for developing these policies.		Personnel policies and procedures are not provided and there is no plan for ensuring policies will be developed and that they will align with the school's mission and comply with applicable federal and state regulations.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that these policies are insufficient and focus on issues that are not essential (e.g., assault).</i>
III.E.(3) Staff Discipline Process	A staff discipline process is provided that is clear and follows an appropriate route for due process.		There is no staff discipline process provided that is clear and follows an appropriate route for due process.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that the staff discipline policy is not consistent with New Mexico's due process (p. 46 and appendix E).</i>
III.E.(4) Grievance Process	An employee grievance process is provided that is clear and follows appropriate legal guidelines.		An employee grievance process is not provided.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team agreed that the grievance process is not consistent with New Mexico's due process (p. 47 and appendix E).</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluatio	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team agreed that the employee section was insufficient to be in accordance with New Mexico State and Federal Laws.</i></p>

Score: 4 out of 8 possible points

F. COMMUNITY/PARENT/EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE.

Evaluation Criteria: The applicant provides a clear process for including the community, parents and employees in the governance of the school and a stated process for receiving and responding to concerns.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.F.(1) Community involvement.	The plan clearly describes meaningful parental, professional educator, and community involvement in the governance and operation of the school and includes how their involvement will help to advance the school’s mission and vision.	There is a partial plan to involve parental, professional educator, and community in the governance and operation of the school.	There is no description of parental, professional educator, and community involvement in the governance and operation of the school.	The review team agreed that there is insufficient clarity about the structure and role of the Community Advisory Group (CAG) in the application. For example, “employees will be represented by the CAG” (p. 46); it is also the body that develops policies, including the student discipline policies (p.48). Yet, it is also described in the application as an advisory body (p. 1 of Appendix E). Thus, there is a “partial plan” to involve the community.
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.F.(2) Complaint Resolution	The applicant provides a plan to receive and process concerns and complaints from the community and parents that assures a timely and meaningful response from the school administration and/or the GB.	A plan to receive and process concerns is provided, but it does not address how the concerns will be resolved by the school administration and/or the GB.	No plan to address community and/or parent complaints is provided.	The review team agreed that this section presents a confused plan that will compromise the head administrator’s ability to ensure that complaints are handled confidentially, and that complaints will be resolved in a timely way, consistent with school policies (pp. 47-48).
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team agreed that the plans in place regarding community/parent/employee involvement were not sufficiently developed or explained.</i>			

Score: 2 out of 4 possible points

G. STUDENT POLICIES

Evaluation Criteria: The applicant understands the legal requirements for student discipline which is demonstrated by providing a student discipline policy that is in accordance with the Student Rights and Responsibilities rule of the NMPED.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	There is a description of the Student Discipline Policies that complies with the Student Rights and Responsibilities set forth in the Public Education Department rules and regulations. An explanation is provided of how the school will take into account the rights of students with disabilities.	There is a partial description of Student Discipline Policies that complies with the Student Rights and Responsibilities set forth in the Public Education Department rules and regulations. A partial explanation is provided of how the school will take into account the rights of students with disabilities.	There is no description of the Student Policies or the policies provided; or the description does not comply with the Public Education rules and regulations.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1.5
III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	The application and/or student discipline policy describes how the school will address alternative educational settings for eligible students who are long term suspended or expelled that is consistent with the Students' Rights and Responsibilities.	The application and/or student discipline policy describes how the school will address alternative educational settings for eligible students, but fails to demonstrate an understanding of the school's legal obligations.	The application does not address alternative educational settings for eligible students.	<i>The review team noted that the alternative placement provision is not in the student policies.</i> <i>The review team noted that no alternative placements or provisions for off-campus suspensions or exclusions is made (48).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>See above comments.</i>			

Score: 3 out of 4 possible points

H. STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT

Evaluation Criteria: Outreach activities to increase awareness of the school to families are in place. Lottery and Enrollment policies reflect compliance with state statutes, and are fair and equitable.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The school has a comprehensive outreach and recruitment plan that is likely to be effective in attracting students from the targeted population. The recruitment /enrollment timelines presented are reasonable.	The school has an outreach and recruitment plan, but it may not be effective in attracting students from the targeted population; or the timelines for recruiting/enrolling students do not appear reasonable.	The school does not provide an outreach and recruitment plan designed specifically for the targeted population.	Adequate information provided.
III.H.(2) Lottery Process	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
	The lottery procedures are clearly explained and comply with state statutes. Tentative dates are provided.	The lottery procedures are partially explained. Tentative dates may or may not be provided.	The lottery procedures are not explained or do not comply with state statutes. Tentative dates are not provided.	The review team noted that home language survey questions may not be asked prior to enrollment, as it might be viewed as a form of screening students (p. 50).
III.H.(3) Enrollment Process	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The school has a clear description of the enrollment process that is in full compliance with state statutes.	The school has an enrollment process that is in partial compliance with statutes.	No description of the enrollment process is provided; or the enrollment process is not in compliance with statutes.	Adequate information provided.
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
The school has described conditions for dis-enrollment of students that comply with legal and state requirements.		Conditions identified for dis-enrollment of students are not stated or do not comply with legal and state requirements.	Adequate information provided.	

Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>In general, the review team agreed that this section represented a sound plan for student enrollment and recruitment.</i></p>

Score: 7 out of 8 possible points

I. LEGAL COMPLIANCE.

Evaluation Criteria. Legal compliance with the Open Meetings Act and Inspection of Public Records Act and conflicts of interest law are explained.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
III.I(1) Conflict of Interest	The Conflict of Interest Policy is provided and demonstrates an understanding of the issue and requirements of the law.		The Conflict of Interest Policy is not provided or does not comply with requirements.	<i>While the conflict of interest policy provided in this section meets requirements, the potential for a conflict of interest remains between the proposed school's Community Advisory Group and the school's governing body. Additionally, the state's expanded definition of family needs to be included in the definitions section of the policy. Finally, the proposed school identifies itself as a tax exempt organization, rather than a state agency.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
III.I(2) Transparency	There is an explanation of how the school will comply with the Open Meetings Act (agendas posted 24 hours in advance, quorums, executive or closed session procedures, etc.) and Inspection of Public Records Act (meeting minutes, accessibility to public records, etc.)	There is a partial explanation of how the school plans to comply with the Open Meetings Act and Inspection of Public Records Act.	There is no explanation of how the school plans to comply with the Open Meetings Act and Inspection of Public Records Act.	<i>The review team noted that the application provides a partial explanation of the Open Meetings Act—"appropriately advertised" but does not state that they will comply with the Open Meetings Act or the Inspection of Public Records Act (p. 52).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Please see above comments.</i>			

Score: 3 out of 4 possible points

J. EVIDENCE OF PARTNERSHIP/CONTRACTOR RELATIONSHIP (If Applicable).

Evaluation Criteria. The application describes any third party relationships that will have a legal impact on the school if entered after approval. A copy of any and all proposed agreements is attached.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.I.(1). Third Party Relationships	The application describes in sufficient detail all third-party relationships that are considered integral to accomplishing the mission and vision of the school and demonstrates an understanding of the legal implication of the relationship to the school.	The application partially describes third-party relationships, but does not tie the relationship to the school’s mission and vision. The applicant does not does not sufficiently demonstrate the legal implications of the proposed relationship.	The application mentions important third-party relationships but does not describe how the relationship is tied to the mission and vision of the school or provide an explanation of the legal relationship of that third-party to the school.	SCORE: N/A
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: N/A
III.I.(2) Proposed Agreement	A proposed formal agreement or memorandum of understanding between the school and the prospective third-party is provided.		No proposed agreement or memorandum of understanding between the school and the prospective third-party is provided.	
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluatio	Summary/Comments:			

Score: 0 out of 0 possible points

K. WAIVERS.

Evaluation Criteria. Waiver requests are presented clearly and demonstrate alignment with the school’s mission and educational plan.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.K.(1)(2) (3) Waivers	The school has provided a list of state laws or policies for which a waiver is requested, including a rationale for why the waiver is being requested.		The school has provided a list of state laws or rules for which a waiver is requested; however, the rationale for the waiver is not included.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: N/A
	(This is to be completed only by schools seeking local district authorization.) The school has provided a list of authorizer policies for which a waiver is requested including a rationale for why the waiver is being requested.		(This is to be completed only by schools seeking local district authorization.) The school has provided a list of authorizer policies for which a waiver is requested; however, the rationale for the waiver not included.	
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
	The requested waivers align with the school’s proposed autonomy and its mission, and that alignment is clearly described.	The waivers align with the school’s proposed autonomy, but no clear alignment of the requested waivers with the school’s mission is described.	The requested waivers do not align with the school’s mission.	
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Adequate information provided.</i>			

Score: 4 out of 4 possible points

L. TRANSPORTATION AND FOOD

Evaluation Criteria: The school considers the transportation and food services for the students and develops adequate plans to address those needs.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.L.(1)Transportation	The school states whether or not it plans to offer transportation to its students. If yes, the school has provided a clear description of how transportation will be provided that is supported by the proposed budget.	The school has stated whether or not it plans to offer transportation to its students. If yes, the school has provided only a partial description of how student transportation will be provided. The plan is supported by the budget.	The school has not stated whether or not it plans to offer transportation to its students. Or, if stated, the school does not provide a description of how student transportation needs will be met; or the plan is not supported by the budget.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.L.(2)Food Services	The school states whether or not it plans to offer food services to its students. If yes, the school has provided a clear description of how food services will be provided that is supported by the budget.	The school states whether or not it plans to offer food services to its students. If yes, The school has provided a partial description of how student food services will be provided. The plan is supported by the budget.	The school has not stated whether or not it plans to offer food services to its students. Or, if stated, the school does not provide a description of how the food services will be met; or the plan is not supported by the budget.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	

Evaluator Comments and Questions

The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.

Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Adequate information provided.</i>

Score: 4 out of 4 possible points

M. FACILITIES

Evaluation Criteria: The proposed description of the facility and plan for proposed capital outlay needs provides sufficient detail to demonstrate capacity for implementation and support of the school program.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.M.(1) Projected Facility Needs	The applicant has attached appropriate documentation from the Public School Facilities Authority (PSFA) director that demonstrates the applicant’s proposed capital outlay needs are in alignment with New Mexico public school facility requirements.		The applicant did not attach appropriate documentation from the PSFA director that demonstrates the applicant’s proposed capital outlay needs are in alignment with New Mexico public school facility requirements.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.M.(2) Facility Plan	The application provides evidence that efforts have been made to begin a search for an appropriate facility in the desired geographic location.	The application provides some evidence that school facility requirements must be met, but no efforts have begun to locate an appropriate facility in the desired geographic location.	The application does not provide evidence that the school has begun to consider it facility needs.	SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.M.(3) Projected Facility Costs	A detailed description of the school’s proposed capital outlay needs, including projected requests for capital outlay assistance, is provided, and is sufficient to support the school program. The school provides a realistic projection for facility maintenance, repair and equipment needs.	A detailed description of the school’s proposed capital outlay needs, including projected requests for capital outlay assistance, is provided but may not be sufficient to support the school program. The school identifies facility maintenance, repair and equipment needs, but does not provide for these costs in the projected budget.	A description of the school’s proposed capital outlay needs, including projected requests for capital outlay assistance, is not provided or is not sufficient to support the school program.	SCORE: 1 <i>The review team noted that there was an effort to find a loan and that is not permitted of charter schools in the state of New Mexico.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>See comments above.</i>

Score: 5 out of 6 possible points

IV. BUSINESS PLAN

A. BUDGET

Evaluation Criteria: The school budget is based on realistic revenue and expenditure projections, valid assumptions, and supports the mission and educational program of the school.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
IVA(1)910B5 Worksheet	The applicant has provided a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet using appropriate values and computations for each year of the 5-year budget plan.	The applicant has provided a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet for each year of the 5-year budget plan; however, there are minor mistakes in the computations.	The applicant did not provide a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet for each year of the 5-year budget plan, or the worksheet provided contains substantial errors, demonstrating a lack of understanding about New Mexico public school funding.	SCORE: 2
IVA(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	A five-year budget that aligns with the school's 5-year growth plan, including staffing, facilities, educational program and mission of the school is provided, and demonstrates the financial capacity to support the school program.	A five-year budget is provided; however, it only partially aligns with the staffing, facilities, educational program or mission of the school.	The budget provided does not adequately address staffing, facilities, educational program or the school mission; or a budget is not provided.	SCORE: 1

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
IVA(3) Budget Narrative	The budget narrative is provided that explains basic assumptions, how those were determined based on reliable sources, and identifies priorities that are consistent with the school’s mission, educational program, staffing and facility.	A limited budget narrative explanation is provided. Budgetary assumptions are flawed, or there is minimal connection to the school’s mission, educational program, staffing or facility.	Little or no detail is provided in the budget narrative, OR there is no connection to the school’s mission, educational program, staffing or facility.	<i>The review team agreed that the narrative provided is too limited to be considered reliable (pp. 54-59).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
IVA(4) Strategies for Budget Control	The school provides a description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges. The adjustments are viable and realistic.	The school provides a description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges; however, the adjustments may not be viable or realistic.	The school does not provide a description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges, or the description of the adjustments is not viable or realistic.	<i>The review team was concerned with the personnel strategies for budget control as the staffing plan is already inadequate and limited, as previously noted (59).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1.5
IVA(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	A proposed salary schedule is provided for key staff, including teachers and administrators that complies with state requirements.		A proposed salary schedule for key staff is provided; however, the salaries for teachers and administrators do not comply with state requirements.	<i>The review team determined that the salary levels are not correct (Appendix L).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>See comments above.</i>			

Score: 6.5 out of 10 possible points

B. FINANCIAL POLICIES AND OVERSIGHT, COMPLIANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY

Evaluation Criteria: Financial policies are in place that reflect generally accepted accounting practices, including compliance, adequate oversight and reporting.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
VB(1)(2) Financial Policies and Internal Controls	Financial policies and internal controls are included, are sufficient, and comply with requirements and financial best practices. The policies demonstrate the financial capacity to support the school program.	The financial policies and internal controls are provided, but are deficient or do not comply with generally accepted accounting principles and financial best practices. The information provided does not demonstrate that the applicant understands New Mexico public school finance laws.	The school does not describe or address the financial policies.	SCORE: 0 <i>The application does not appear to contain financial policies. There is no mention of mandatory audit and finance committees. The applicants do not appear to understand the state's role in finance and budget (p. 60).</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	Comments & References SCORE: 2
IV.B.(3) Financial Personnel	The school has identified the appropriate staff to perform financial tasks, and the staff positions are supported in the organizational structure and in the budget. Qualifications and responsibilities for those positions are provided.	The school has identified staff to perform financial task that is supported by the organizational structure and budget; however, qualifications and responsibilities are not provided.	The school's organizational structure or budget does not provide enough staff support to conduct business services.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 1
IV.B.(4) Financial Oversight	A description of how the GB will provide proper legal and fiscal oversight is provided, including a description of required audit and finance committees. Clearly stated financial controls demonstrate an understanding of the required GB oversight and financial reporting.	A description of GB oversight is provided, however, the plan lacks important specifics and/or a clear recognition of the legal and financial obligations of a charter school.	There is no clear plan for financial oversight and/or the applicant demonstrates substantial weakness in understanding the fiscal oversight obligations of the GB.	<i>The review team noted that there is no budget for the described monthly external auditor. There is no mention of how the governing body will review these documents, and there is insufficient information provided regarding financial policies in general (p. 61).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
IV.B.(5) School Sustainability	The school has provided clear evidence that it has considered the sustainability of the school by describing long-range goals and strategies that will help build the school’s capacity in areas such as governance, finance/budget, facilities, community relationships, student enrollment, charter compliance, 501(c)3, mission and vision, and performance objectives.	The school has provided some evidence that it has considered the sustainability of the school by describing long-range goals and strategies that will help build the school’s capacity in areas such as governance, finance/budget, facilities, community relationships, student enrollment, charter compliance, 501(c)3, mission and vision, and performance objectives.	The school has provided no evidence that it has considered the sustainability of the school by describing long-range goals and strategies that will help build the school’s capacity; or the evidence provided calls into question the long-term sustainability of the school.	<i>The review team noted that the application prompt calls for a long-term goals or position, but the response provides only short-term (6-month) adjustments. Additionally, the applicants do not appear to understand that budgeted revenue is provided by the state (p. 61).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Overall, the review team agreed that this section demonstrates a lack of understanding of state requirements with regards to financial policies and school funding.</i>			

Score: 3 out of 8 possible points

V. EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT

Evaluation Criteria. The applicant demonstrates community support for the proposed school through community partnerships, business relationships, and resource agreements. The school clearly describes all community outreach activities designed to reach a broad audience. The application demonstrates not only a sufficient community interest in the school, but also a sufficient demand for the school’s proposed program or model. Aggregate data for prospective students are provided.

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
V.A Outreach Activities				SCORE: 1
	The application describes all outreach activities and future outreach plans. Described outreach activities are designed to reach a broad audience and are sufficient to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity for to enroll.	The application provides a description of outreach activities; however, the described outreach activities may not reach a broad audience and, thus, not provide all students with an equal opportunity to enroll.	The application provides no description of outreach activities, nor does it provide any evidence that the school developers have conducted any exploratory community outreach.	<i>The review team noted that the outreach activities were extremely limited (p. 64).</i>
V.B. Evidence of Support				SCORE: 1
	The applicant has provided sufficient evidence of community support for the school by providing data regarding interest demonstrated by the targeted population or other evidence of support (not just anecdotal).	The applicant has provided limited evidence of community support for the school or that there are, in fact, students and/or families interested in enrolling.	The school has not provided evidence that there is actual community and student support for the proposed school.	<i>The review team noted that there is limited evidence of support – five families (P. 64).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
V.C. Community Ties	The application provides a description of ties to the community and evidence of an understanding of the community and student needs that the school intends to serve.		The application does not demonstrate ties to the local community and/or any evidence that it is familiar with the community and student needs that the school intends to serve.	<i>The review team sees no evidence of specific ties to any of the five communities in which the applicants are proposing to open schools (pp. 64-65).</i>
V.D. and F. Community Relationships <i>Optional evidence of support.</i>	The applicant demonstrates that it has developed networking relationships and/or other resources or agreements with community persons or entities. (This differs from the formal partnership agreements that are integral to the school's operations, as described in Section III.J(1) of this application.) Letters or other documentation of support are provided.			<i>The review team noted that while a list is provided, there is no explanation of potential partnerships or networking relationships (p. 65).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 0
V.E. Uniqueness of Proposed School	The applicant provides evidence that if there are public schools that serve the same grade levels in the geographic area in which the school plans to locate, the school can demonstrate that its education plan is unique or substantially different and thus is able to provide a needed option for students and families.		The applicant identifies at least one other public school serving the same grade levels in the geographic area in which the school plans to locate; but is unable to demonstrate the uniqueness of its education plan or provide other evidence of need in the targeted community.	<i>The review team found that there is no discussion of any of the other public schools in the areas in which the applicants plan to locate. Also there is no described “uniqueness” or other evidence of need in the target communities.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Overall, the review team agreed that this section revealed inadequate evidence of support for this school in this community.</i>			

Score: 2 out of 10 possible points

VI. REQUIRED APPENDICES

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	SCORE: 2
VI. Appendices	The application contains all of the required appendices.	The application contains the most significant appendices, but omitted others.	The application omits the appendices; or the appendices it includes are not the most significant ones.	
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			

Score: 2 out of 2 possible points

Score Summary

Section Number	Description	Elements	Possible	Score
I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			
		Element 1	2	1
		Element 2	2	1
		Section Total	4	2
II.	EDUCATION PLAN			
		II.A. School Size	2	2
		II. C. Mission	2	0
		II. B. Vision	2	1
		Section Total	6	3
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 1	2	1
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 3	2	1
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 1	2	1.33
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 2	2	1
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 3	2	1
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 1	2	0
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 2	2	0
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 3	2	0
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 1	2	1
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 3	2	2
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 1	2	1.58
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 3	2	2
		II.D.(6) College Readiness, Element 1 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1.5
		II.D.(6) College Readiness, Element 2 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		II.D.(6) College Readiness, Element 3 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1.5
		II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 1 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1
		II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 2 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1

	II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 3 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 1	2	1
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 2	2	1
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 3	2	1
	Section Total	48 – OR – 36	28.91 / 48
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 1 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	N/A
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 2 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	N/A
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 3 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	N/A
	Section Total	6 – OR – 0	0 / 0
	II.F.(1) Curriculum Philosophy	2	1
	II.F.(2) Curriculum Philosophy/Approach Research/Data	2	1
	II.F.(3) Curriculum Description	2	0
	II.F.(4) Curriculum Research	2	1
	II.F.(5) Curriculum Overview	2	1
	II.F.(6) & (7) Curriculum Development Timeline & Instructional Program	2	1
	II.F.(8) Curriculum Alignment Timeline	2	1
	II.G.(1) & (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver, Element 1	2 – OR – 0	1
	II.G.(1) & (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver, Element 2	2 – OR – 0	N/A
	Section Total	18, 16 OR 14	7 / 16
	II.H.(1) Instructional Strategies	2	1
	II.H.(2) Instructional Effectiveness	2	1
	II.H.(3) Differentiated Instruction	2	1
	Section Total	6	3
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 1	2	1
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 2	2	1
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 3	2	1
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 4	2	1
	II.I.(2) Students with 504 Plans	2	0
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 1	2	1
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 2	2	1
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 3	2	1
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 4	2	0
	Section Total	18	7
	II.J.(1) Measuring Organizational Goals, If Applicable	2	N/A
	II.J.(2) Assessments to Measure Academic Goals	2	1

		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Self Monitoring	2	0
		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Remediation & At-Risk Students	2	0
		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / School-Wide Practices	2	0
		II.J.(5) Reporting on Progress	2	0
		Section Total	12 – OR – 10	1 / 10
III	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE	III.A.(1) Governance Description	2	1
		III.A.(2) Description of Founders’ Expertise	2	1
		III.A.(3) Description of Prospective Governance Expertise	2	0
		III.A.(4) GB Selection of Members	2	1
		Section Total	8	3
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Training	2	2
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Evaluation	2	1
		Section Total	4	3
		III.C.(1) Leadership & Management: Monitoring	2	2
		III.C.(2)(3) Leadership & Management: Administrator Selection/Evaluation	2	1
		Section Total	4	3
		III.D.(1) Organizational Structure	2	1
		III.D.(2) Job Descriptions	2	1
		III.D.(3) Staff Evaluation	2	2
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 1	2	0
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 2	2	0
		III.D.(5) School Day / Year	2	2
		III.D.(6) Professional Development Plan	2	1
		Section Total	14	7
		III.E.(1) Employer/Employee Relationship	2	1
		III.E.(2) Personnel Policies	2	1
		III.E.(3) Staff Discipline Process	2	1
		III.E.(4) Grievance Process	2	1
		Section Total	8	4
		III.F.(1) Community Involvement	2	1
		III.F.(2) Complaint Resolution	2	1
		Section Total	4	2
	III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	2	2	

		III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	2	1.5
		Section Total	4	3.5
		III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	2	2
		III.H.(2) Lottery Process	2	1
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 1	2	2
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 2	2	2
		Section Total	8	7
		III.I.(1) Legal Compliance: Conflict of Interest	2	2
		III.I.(2) Legal Compliance: Transparency	2	1
		Section Total	4	3
		III.J.(1) Evidence of Partnership: Third Party Relationships (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	N/A
		III.J.(2) Evidence of Partnership: Proposed Agreement (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	N/A
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	0 / 0
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 1	2 – OR – 0	2
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 2 -- DISTRICT AUTHORIZATION ONLY)	N/A	N/A
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 3	2 – OR – 0	2
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	4 / 4
		III.L.(1) Transportation (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		III.L.(1) Food Service (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	4 / 4
		III.M.(1) Projected Facility Needs	2	2
		III.M.(2) Facility Plans	2	2
		III.M.(3) Projected Facility Costs	2	1
		Section Total	6	5
IV	BUSINESS PLAN	IV.A.(1) 910B5 Worksheets	2	2
		IV.A.(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	2	1
		IV.A.(3) Budget Narrative	2	1
		IV.A.(4) Strategies for Budget Control	2	1
		IV.A.(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	2	1.5
		Section Total	10	6.5
		IV.B.(1)(2) Financial Policies and Internal Controls	2	0
		IV.B.(3) Financial Personnel	2	2
		IV.B.(4) Financial Oversight	2	1
		IV.B.(3) School Sustainability	2	0
		Section Total	8	3

V	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT			
		V.A. Outreach Activities	2	1
		V.B. Evidence of Support	2	1
		V.C. Community Ties	2	0
		V.D. & F. Community Relationships (Optional Evidence of Support)	2	0
		V.E. Uniqueness of Proposed School	2	0
		Section Total	10	2
VI	REQUIRED APPENDICES			
		VI. Appendices	2	2
		Section Total	2	2