

2010 CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION FINAL ANALYSIS

School Name: Achieve Academy

Review Date: 8/27/10

I. CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

The Charter School Mission Statement should communicate the essence of the school to stakeholders and to the public and should provide the focal point to which all other sections of the school’s plans align. In addition, the proposed charter school and its mission must be in the best interest of the students and community that it proposes to serve.

ANALYSIS: CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Mission Statement</u> The mission is stated in broad terms, especially in regards to the methods the school will use, i.e., the application does not define language contained in the mission such as “empower and career education.”</p> <p><u>Achievement of Mission/Goals</u> Applicants do not discuss how the school will know if it is achieving its mission. The applicants do not explain how enrolling the first year’s projected number of students or providing 100% of students with core and elective curriculum establishes an ambitious outcome for this school.</p> <p>Goal 3 is not specific as to which assessments will be used. A rationale for how the Student Information Database will measure this goal is not provided.</p> <p>Goal 4 is a process goal that will not directly relate to how the school will know if it is achieving its mission. The applicants do not explain how the Student information database will provide evidence of accomplishment.</p>	<p>P 11 <i>[Written response from applicant includes a dictionary definition that was not in the application. This does not provide clarity for the mission.]</i></p> <p>Mission goals 1 and 2, P 11 <i>[Written response attempts to revise measures of mission accomplishment that are not part of the application.]</i></p> <p>P 11 <i>[Written response contains new information: a revised goal and changes the purpose for assessing students.]</i></p> <p>P 11 <i>[Written response clarifies what would be in the student database but does not address the concern]</i></p>

<p>Goal 6 is not specific in regards to what is meant by “<i>integrated classroom</i>.” The application used the terms “integrate” and “inclusion” interchangeably.</p> <p>Assuming goals 4 and 5 will be assessed on a yearly basis, the following goals are not time-specific: 2, 3 and 6.</p> <p><u>Explanation of Need</u> The application describes the need for at-risk students with disabilities to receive career education in a work environment as an alternative to dropping-out; however, it fails to describe what about the traditional school environment leads to drop-outs, unsuccessful transitions and how the proposed school specifically addresses these needs.</p>	<p><i>for evidence of accomplishment.]</i></p> <p>P 11 <i>[Written response explains applicant’s intent for the use of those terms.]</i></p> <p>P 11 <i>[The date(s) of goal accomplishment is not clarified in the written response to this concern.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 12-14 <i>[Applicants provide an explanation that was not part of the application.]</i></p>
--	---

II. EDUCATIONAL PLAN

The educational plan should describe who the school expects to serve; what the students will achieve; how they will achieve it; and how the school will evaluate performance. It should provide a clear picture of what a student who attends the school will experience in terms of educational climate, structure, materials, schedule, assessment and outcomes.

ANALYSIS: CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Philosophy and Approach to Instruction</u></p> <p>The applicants summarize research to support the Outcomes Based Educational (OBE) approach, but fall short in providing a proper citing of the studies thus making the references incomplete.</p> <p>Throughout the application, the terms “<i>inclusion</i>” and “<i>integrated</i>” are used interchangeably but are not defined. There is no description of what the integrated classroom looks like and how the integrated classroom will address individual needs. The application fails to make a connection between the needs identified in the IEP and the support that will be provided in the integrated classroom. It <u>may</u> be possible for all of the students needs to be met in this type of setting. However, it is not possible to determine if the setting is appropriate since the applicant</p>	<p>see Bibliography in Appendix E and P. 19 <i>[Written response confirms the omitted reference.]</i></p> <p>throughout the application <i>[Written response provides a textbook definition and applicant’s use of those terms, but does not address the concern for how the applicant</i></p>

<p>fails to describe this setting or the vocational setting and the manner in which the needs will be met.</p> <p>The application makes the assumption that all special education students learn best in an inclusion setting. Predetermining the Least Restrictive Environment—rather than leaving that decision to the IEP team—puts the school at risk of not providing the appropriate education to the very students they hope to attract.</p> <p>Applicants fail to explain how the school’s approach to instruction of the core curriculum solely through the use of an online courseware (E2020) is likely to result in improved educational performance of students when many of the students are likely to need curriculum at a lower level or may not be able to work independently. No other core curriculum was identified.</p> <p><u>Description of the Curriculum</u> Applicants do not provide a detailed description of the E2020 curriculum with a scope and sequence.</p> <p>The application states that “<i>the full curriculum is provided in the appendices of this proposal</i>” however it was not.</p> <p>How the Life Centered Career Education (LCCE) curriculum will be utilized is not clear. On page 23, the application suggests that LCCE <u>is</u> the Career Education curriculum, then on page 24 it states that LCCE “<i>will be used as a reference for teaching various competencies.</i>”</p> <p>A detailed description and scope and sequence of the Career Education Curriculum (or a specific plan for developing it) are not articulated.</p>	<p><i>fails to describe this setting or the vocational setting and the manner in which the needs will be met.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 15-16 <i>[Written response does not clarify how the school will determine and place students in an LRE.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 16-18 <i>[Written response does not clarify how students who do not have the skills to access the online curriculum will be accommodated.]</i></p> <p><i>[Written response contains new information that was not included in the application.]</i></p> <p>P 30 <i>[Applicants response includes additional information about E2020 that was not included in the application.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 23-24 <i>[The written response does not clarify how the LCCE curriculum will be utilized.]</i></p> <p>P 26 <i>[Applicant provides new information about the LCCE curriculum that was not</i></p>
---	---

<p>Application states that “<i>the family may contribute to every competency in the LCCE curriculum</i>” but does not describe what that means or how that will occur. Provisions for supporting the parents in that role are not evident.</p> <p>Other curricular approaches stated on page 27 include “<i>character counts, yoga, dance, music, art...and Center for Self-Advocacy training modules</i>” however the application does not expand on how these represent a different approach to instruction, how they fit in, nor how the actual curriculum would be written, implemented, and/or assessed with regards to alignment to the standards.</p> <p><u>Alignment with NM Standards</u></p> <p>This section does not describe an alignment document of the selected curriculum or a process that will be used to align the proposed/developed curriculum with New Mexico Content Standards and Benchmarks and Performance Standards.</p> <p><u>Strategies and Methods</u></p> <p>The application fails to provide an explanation of how the core curriculum (E2020) will meet the needs of all students, particularly since the school plans to purchase the curriculum at the 6th grade level. The applicant failed to present a core curriculum for students whose skills fall below the 6th grade level.</p> <p>Though applicants anticipate students graduating from AA via the Ability Program of Study (p 28) it does not provide specific detail about the strategies and methods for developing or implementing the functional curriculum coursework. The applicant does not explain how the 24 hours of course credit will be obtained by the students whose graduation is dependent on the “functional coursework.”</p> <p>The application correctly states that students graduating via the Career Readiness Program of Study need to achieve competency in <u>all areas</u> of the Employability and Career Development Standards and Benchmarks (p28), however, the explanation of the school’s career readiness curriculum addresses only two of the ten required standards (p 36-37). There is no rationalization of why only two are addressed or how the other eight will be dealt with.</p>	<p><i>included in the application.]</i></p> <p>P 27 <i>[Written response does not clarify parent role or the support for their role in contributing to the curriculum.]</i></p> <p>P 28 <i>[Written response does not clarify how these additional curricular pieces fit in or how the actual curriculum would be written, implemented, and/or assessed with regards to alignment to the standards.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant deso not address the absence of the description of the alignment process in their response.]</i></p> <p><i>[The written response did not address the curriculum for students whose skills fall below the 6th grade level.]</i></p> <p>P 28 <i>[Written response does not satisfy concern for how the school will develop and implement the functional curriculum coursework.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 36-37 <i>[Written response does not clarify how the other 8 career readiness standards will be addressed.]</i></p>
---	--

<p>The discussion of professional development makes the assumption that “AA staff would come with a plethora of information around teaching and learning with a variety of instructional strategies and methods for the school” (P 39), and does not elaborate on how the school would support teachers with professional development to implement the online courseware within a special education setting.</p>	<p>P 39 [Written response does not satisfy concern for teacher professional development.]</p>
<p>There is no explanation of which organizations the following statement is referring to: “<i>The sharing of disciplines and prior experiences will assist <u>staff from both organizations</u> in implementing the functional outcomes based curriculum that AA is endorsing.</i>” [Emphasis added]</p>	<p>P 39 [Written response clarifies this statement.]</p>
<p>The application states that staff orientation “<i>may include... an overview of LCCE curriculum</i>” but does not explain how an overview is sufficient information for staff to utilize the curriculum.</p>	<p>P 40 [Written response does not clarify how staff will be able to utilize the curriculum with limited information.]</p>

ANALYSIS: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Length of School Day and School Year</u> Applicants provide contradictory information about the number of instructional hours students will receive. Though six hours are stated, the proposed schedule (8-3) is actually 7 hours. No explanation for the discrepancy is provided.</p>	<p>P 41 [Written response clarifies the concern.]</p>
<p><u>Grade Levels, Class Size and Projected Enrollment</u> Applicants fail to provide a rationale for phasing-in the full enrollment and for having only thirty students in the first year of school.</p>	<p>P 42 [Applicant provides an explanation that was not part of the application.]</p>
<p><u>Graduation Requirements (if applicable)</u> Applicants provide a chart with the total number of graduation credits (for the standard graduation pathway) that is miscalculated. The totals on page 43 should be twenty-four rather than thirteen.</p> <p>The application does not explain the graduation requirements for students graduating via the career readiness or ability program of study.</p>	<p>P 43 [Written response confirms the mistake.]</p> <p>[Written response does not provide an explanation for the graduation requirements.]</p>

ANALYSIS: STUDENT PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Student-centered SMART Goals</u> The student performance expectations are not written as SMART goals</p>	<p>Pp. 44-45</p>

<p>and are lacking specificity, especially with regard to measures and timeline for achievement.</p> <p>Student Performance Goal #2 is the same as Organizational Goal #3. It is non-specific and lacks clearly defined quantitative student performance expectations.</p> <p>Goals 2 and 3 are not student-centered; the percentage of students that have a career assessment or an Individual Career Plan (ICP) completed is dependent upon the school staff whose responsibilities are to ensure they are in place. The application also states that the student information system will be used to measure student achievement of these goals, but it does not explain how that is possible.</p> <p>Applicants do not provide information about, or a definition of, the “Exit Plan” referenced in Goal 3.</p> <p><u>Alignment</u> The applicant failed to explain how Goal 1 aligns to the school’s mission and is not just a statement of following federal requirements.</p>	<p><i>[Written response completely revises goals, introducing new information not contained in the application.]</i></p> <p>P 45 <i>[Written response revises this goal, but does not satisfy the concern for a lack of clarity.]</i></p> <p>P 45 <i>[Written response contradicts the response to the concern for student performance goal #2 above.]</i></p> <p>P 45 <i>[Written response does not clarify the “Exit Plan.”]</i></p> <p>P 44 <i>[Written response does not provide clarification of alignment.]</i></p>
--	---

ANALYSIS: PLAN FOR EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Types of Assessments</u> Applicants present the New Mexico-required assessments but apparently are unaware of changes to the New Mexico High School Competency Exam format and the grades tested through the NMSBA.</p> <p>Although the applicants describe that NWEA-MAPS will be administered 3-4 times per year, the plan for using this assessment lacks meaningful detail. The application does not discuss which populations would be administered the short-cycle assessments or how the data will be used.</p> <p>The applicant fails to discuss a plan for how the school will use alternate assessments for some populations. Though other means of tracking student progress in the career education program is introduced in another part of the application (e.g., the Vocational Training and Performance Profile is briefly mentioned on P 31) significant detail about the use of this and other alternate assessments is missing.</p>	<p>Pp. 45-46 <i>[Written response confirms the mistake.]</i></p> <p>P 47 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p><i>[Applicant provides new information about tracking student progress that was not included in the application.]</i></p>

<p><u>Timeline for Achievement</u></p> <p>Applicants intend for students to be tested with the short cycle assessment only in grades 9 and 11 while the state requires students to be tested in tenth grade as well. 22-2C-4.1 NMSA 1978 6.19.7.8 NMAC</p> <p><u>Corrective Action</u></p> <p>The response to this prompt suggests the school would have both a <i>leadership team</i> and an <i>analytical team</i> as part of the procedures for collecting, analyzing, and communicating school and student data to school staff and conducting and presenting the results of a needs assessment, however, nowhere in the application is the definition or composition of these teams discussed.</p> <p><u>Remediation</u></p> <p>The remediation response describes the development of an Academic Improvement Plan (AIP) for students not meeting standards. It is not clear in the description, however, how this remediation plan will be utilized with both general education and special education students. As it is stated, there is the potential for special education students to maintain an IEP, an ICP and an AIP.</p> <p><u>Additional Assessments</u></p> <p>The response does not differentiate assessments for students in the Career Readiness and Ability Pathways. The application makes no mention of the required Statewide College and Workplace Readiness Assessments requirements in alignment with 22-2C-4.1B NMSA 1978.</p> <p><u>Documentation and Reporting</u></p> <p>The application does not elaborate on how the parent teacher conferences will be structured and/or scheduled.</p>	<p>P 47 <i>[Written response confirms the mistake.]</i></p> <p>P 48 <i>[Written response clarifies team composition.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 48-49 <i>[Written response clarifies the intent to use an AIP with both Special Ed and general education students.]</i></p> <p>P 49 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 49 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
--	--

ANALYSIS: SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Modifications to meet Individual Student Needs</u></p> <p>The application does not specify the types of modifications to the proposed educational program that the school might use to meet individual student’s needs.</p> <p>The application states that ELL students will receive services by contracting “with a partner charter high school,” but does not mention who the partner school is or how this arrangement will work.</p>	<p>P 50 <i>[Written response does not clarify the types of modifications.]</i></p> <p>P 50 <i>[Written response does not clarify the arrangement.]</i></p>
<p><u>Outline of Special Education Plan</u></p>	<p>P 56</p>

<p>The application mentions the possibility of placing a student in an Interim Alternative Educational Setting (IAES) as required by law, however, it does describe how this would be structured.</p> <p>Applicants describe the school’s Least Restrictive Environment as an integrated classroom setting—rather than leaving that decision to the IEP team as required by law. Applicants do not make provisions for implementing an IEP of a student entering the school whose setting is defined as segregated or separate. This omission demonstrates a lack of understanding of a school’s obligation to serve individuals with disabilities within a public school environment.</p> <p><u>Access to Ancillary Services</u> While the application states that the school anticipates the need to provide ancillary services, it does not elaborate on how they will be provided.</p>	<p><i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 57 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 61 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
---	--

III. FINANCIAL PLAN

The Financial Plan should provide a description of how the school leadership intends to manage the school’s finances, including assurances that public funds will be used appropriately and in compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements and laws. It should present a clear picture of the school’s financial viability including the soundness of revenue projections; expenditure requirements; and how well the school’s budget aligns with and supports implementation of the mission and educational plan.

ANALYSIS: BUDGET

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Revenue Projection Form 910B5</u></p> <p><u>5-Year Budget Plan</u> NOTE: though the operating budget spreadsheet shows a red “NO” under the question “Is the Budget Balanced” for years 4 and 5, they actually are balanced. The revenue and expenditures for those years are the same, and this appears to be a glitch in the form.</p> <p><u>Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions</u> Applicants enter projections for special education students in the completed 910B5 (for year 1) but do not provide an explanation for how the number of C and D level students was determined.</p> <p>Applicants fail to describe the assumptions (the numbers of C & D level special education students) that went into SEG revenue calculations for years two through five.</p>	<p>Pp. 118-119</p> <p>Appendix C, 910B5 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Appendix C: Pages 115-116 <i>[Written response does not clarify the numbers of C & D</i></p>

<p>The narrative for revenue expenditure assumptions does not sufficiently explain how the figures were determined.</p> <p>The start-up costs outlined on page 63 are inadequate and incomplete as they provide minimal detail and do not identify major categories of spending for opening a new school, such as equipment purchases, instructional supplies and materials. The information on Salaries and Benefits lacks detail with regard to the breakdown of personnel, merely indicating that “A large part of this [\$337,000] is due to Administrative Salaries...”</p> <p>It is unclear, given the number of staff identified, how the school will meet all subject-area, highly-qualified status and endorsement requirements.</p> <p>Spending priorities do not support the educational plan. Only budgeting for two teachers with 27 special education and 3 regular education students may not be sufficient to meet the requirements for class load limits for the varying degrees of special education services.</p> <p>The fact that the school’s core curriculum is computer-based implies that the school will be heavily dependent on computers to deliver this curriculum. However, the narrative explains: “Although we do not have a lot of money in the budget to purchase computers in Y1 we will seek donations of used computers...” which raises significant questions about how the school intends to be able to deliver on its plan as well as why the applicants chose not to identify computer hardware as a priority.</p> <p><u>Revenue Sources Other Than SEG Funds</u> The applicant is uncertain about the sources of funds it might be eligible to receive. The response to this prompt seems to demonstrate a lack of preparation and limited understanding of all available resources for a start-up charter school.</p> <p><u>Expenditure Assumptions for Other Than SEG Funds</u> Applicant did not respond to this prompt.</p>	<p><i>level students for years two through five.]</i></p> <p>P 62 <i>[Written response provides new information that was not contained in the application.]</i></p> <p>P 63 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Appendix D, P 118 <i>[Written response does not address concern for HQT and endorsements.]</i></p> <p>Appendix C (P 115) for Special education projections Appendix D for Expenditures (Pp. 118-119) <i>[Written response does not clarify how the 2 teachers will meet the requirements.]</i></p> <p>See NOTE on page 63. <i>[Applicant indicates that failing to provide computers in the first year was a mistake and written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 63-64 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 64 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
--	--

ANALYSIS: FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Fiscal Management Plan</u> The plan for fiscal management is significantly lacking and does not provide a clear picture of how the school will manage its fiscal responsibilities.</p>	<p>P 65 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Internal Control Procedures</u> The description for internal control procedures is inadequate and incomplete, lacking significant detail as to how these controls will be implemented at the school.</p>	<p>Pp. 65-66 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Annual Audit of Financial Operations</u> Applicants provide an assurance of compliance with annual audit requirements, but do not provide enough information to demonstrate understanding of the process for state-chartered schools.</p>	<p>P 66 <i>[Written response does not clarify the applicant's understanding.]</i></p>

IV. GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Governance/Management Plan should provide an understanding of how the school will be governed and managed. It should present a clear picture of the school's governance and management practices, what roles and responsibilities various groups and individuals will have, and how those groups will relate to one another. The Plan should outline how decisions are made at the school site, and provide a convincing picture of the school leadership's capacity to successfully operate the school. In addition, the governing body of a charter school is, first and foremost, publicly accountable for student academic performance and the expenditure of public funds.

ANALYSIS: GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Governance and site-based management structure</u> The application contains an insufficient description of the relationship between the governing body and the school's administration.</p>	<p>P 67 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
<p>The limited description of the governance structure is centered on the governing board of Adelante, its partner organization. The explanation of the over-all school governance and site-based management structure is inadequate and incomplete.</p>	<p>P 67 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Organizational chart and narrative description</u></p>	

<p>The partner organization has an equal relationship with the school’s Governing Council and with the Administrator and states that these entities “will communicate and receive varied levels of support from Adelante Development Center, Inc.” The nature of this support is not described, nor is the impact that this relationship will have on the overall management of the school explained.</p>	<p>P 67 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
<p>The organizational chart does not include the committees and the school advisory council (which are mentioned in the following section) nor does it illustrate where contract service providers fit into the organizational structure.</p>	<p>P 67 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: DESCRIPTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Governing Body policies and procedures</u></p> <p>The number of members that can sit on the AA Governing Council is not specified. The powers and duties of GC officer positions are not described. The application makes no mention of professional development of the board and does not describe the criteria and process for selecting a head administrator.</p> <p>Applicants suggest that the school may borrow and incur indebtedness—which is contrary to state law.</p> <p><u>List of governing body members and qualifications</u> Members of the governing body include staff and members of the board of Adelante Development Center, Inc. Plans are also for the school to contract with Adelante (see page 78). This appears to create a real (or at a minimum perceived) conflict of interest, and raises a concern for a potential violation of procurement code.</p> <p><u>Staff, families, and community involvement in governance</u></p>	<p>Pp. 68-69 <i>[Applicant does not provide a written response to this concern.]</i></p> <p>P 69 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 74-76 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: PARTNERSHIPS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Partner organization and contact information</u></p> <p><u>Nature and purpose of partnership</u> There appears to be a real (or at a minimum perceived) conflict of interest that would exist if AA contracts with Adelante for services while board and staff of Adelante also serve on AA’s Governing Council.</p>	<p>P 78 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>

<p><u>Partner organization involvement with school governance</u> The applicant fails to address this prompt however it appears that at least two of the five members of the AA board include a current Adelante staff and board member.</p>	<p>Pp. 74-76</p>
--	------------------

Evidence of formal partnership agreement

ANALYSIS: SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

<u>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions</u>	Reference
<p><u>Job descriptions for all organizational chart positions</u> The organizational chart reflect that the administrator and governing board have direct relationships with the partner organization, however this relationship is not articulated in any amount of detail as to make it understandable; the administrative authority of the principal needs more definition.</p> <p>The business manager’s job description is inadequate. It goes significantly beyond serving in the capacity of a manager of accounting and/or bookkeeping as mentioned in 6.63.12.8 NMAC, responsible for the preparation and presentation of all financial documentation and budget maintenance and makes little mention of the competency requirements enumerated in 6.63.12.9 NMAC, with the only budget related functions being procurement and account reconciliation. Additional duties described in the application include administering first aid and prescription medications, coordinating substitutes, and responding to inquiries from parents.</p> <p>The teacher job description is not aligned to the educational plan. It states that teachers must “ensure their classroom is reflective of the school-wide theme and incorporate the theme as appropriate” however nowhere in the educational plan does the application make mention of school-wide themes. Additionally, the description makes no mention of responsibilities related to the facilitation of an online curriculum.</p> <p>The responsibilities for tracking high school credits, creating and updating transcripts, and reporting to STARS—all of which are significant operational functions—are not contained in any of the job descriptions. There is also no mention of technology-related responsibilities in a school heavily dependent on a technology-based curriculum.</p> <p><u>Years 1-5 staffing plan with pupil-teacher ratio supporting educational plan</u> The projected pupil teacher ratio is made with the maximum caseload for each teacher, leaving little room for adequate student/staff caseloads to appropriately address student needs identified in the IEPs as required by NMAC 6.29.1.9 H.</p>	<p>P 67 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 81-82 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 82 <i>[Written response clarifies applicant use of the phrase “school wide theme”.]</i></p> <p><i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 84 <i>[Written response does not clarify the how the staffing plan will adequately meet the needs of students.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>School’s personnel policies and procedures</u> The draft <i>Employee Guidelines</i> (found in Appendix A) make reference to the “<i>Executive Director</i>” (page 100) and “<i>Board of Governors</i>” (page 105). These positions have not previously been referenced and are not included in the organizational chart.</p> <p><u>Proposed salary schedules for all employees</u> The application does not provide schedules—rather it provides the initial salaries for staff. How licensure levels, levels of education, and years of experience will be factored in is not evident.</p> <p><u>Evaluation process for staff</u> Description does not make it evident that applicants understand the requirements of the NM School Personnel Act and the licensure competencies. It makes no mention of the competencies or criteria that will be considered in the evaluation of staff, the processes necessary for licensure advancement, and misidentifies the PDP as a “personal development portfolio.”</p> <p><u>Staff discipline process</u> Though it makes an assurance to conform with state requirements, the application does not describe the school’s staff discipline process.</p>	<p>Pp. 100 & 105 <i>[Written response acknowledges the mistake.]</i></p> <p>P 85 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 85-87 and Appendix A pp. 101-102 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 87 <i>[Written response does not clarify the school’s staff discipline process.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES AND DISCIPLINE POLICY

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>School enrollment policies and procedures</u> The “<i>applications for enrollment</i>” referenced in this section to be eligible for the lottery and enrollment is not defined, however it states that “<i>lottery applicants will be eligible for consideration for only one grade based on a transcript evaluation.</i>” This practice is out of compliance with state and federal guidance which recommends that applicants not be required to submit transcripts in order to be enrolled in the lottery.</p> <p><u>Description of lottery process</u> The description provided lacks an explanation of the timeline for admission. The only reference to a timeline comes on page 87 which mentions open enrollment will begin in “late Fall or in the first year – early Spring.”</p> <p><u>Description of proposed student discipline policy</u> A statement is made that AA’s student discipline policies will comply with applicable laws, however these policies and procedures are not described.</p>	<p>P 88 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 87-89 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 89 <i>[Written response does not clarify the student discipline</i></p>

<p><u>Proposed student discipline procedures (appendix)</u></p> <p>The application does not provide procedures that must be followed with student that have IEPs.</p> <p>The student handbook in Appendix B has a communication policy that states, "...all students, staff and visitors are asked to make an attempt to use sign language when communicating." This policy seems out of place as there is no previous mention of the use of sign language in the application.</p> <p>The proposed discipline procedures state that the school will consistently address students' misbehavior and inform parents. However, the main form of communication with parents and means of addressing behavior problems is the use of "Behavior Slips." The application provides no other method of consistently informing parents of student misbehavior.</p>	<p><i>policies and procedures.]</i></p> <p><i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>P 109</p> <p>P 109 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>
---	--

ANALYSIS: FACILITIES – IF “NO”

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Explanation of needs of a facility that will support educational plan</u></p> <p>Applicant does not explain how the needed space for the entire school was estimated to be 10,000 square feet.</p> <p><u>Reasonable plan to identify and secure an adequate facility</u></p> <p>The applicant has not stated that all facility acquisition will be in accordance with competitive procurement procedures. Therefore, a plan to utilize the expertise of Adelante in facility acquisition raises concern for a potential conflict of interest.</p> <p><u>Proposed capital outlay needs</u></p> <p>It is unclear how applicants determined that the anticipated initial capital outlay needs for the school facility will be \$1.2 million.</p>	<p>P 92 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Pp. 91-92 <i>[Written response does not clarify the role of Adelante, Inc. in the acquisition of a facility.]</i></p> <p>P 92 <i>[Written response provides new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: OTHER STUDENT SERVICES

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Transportation</u></p> <p>Applicant does not address how transportation to and from work sites for students will be accomplished.</p> <p><u>Food Services</u></p> <p><u>Student access to other services</u></p> <p>The description does not provide a list for which types of ancillary</p>	<p>P 92</p>

<p>services the school will contract nor does it provide a plan for how it will secure contracts. Although it states some services may be conducted off-site, it provides no explanation as to why.</p>	<p>P 93 [Written response provides new information.]</p>
---	--

V. REQUIREMENTS

The Requirements section of the application addresses the necessary arrangements that school leaders must make to define the respective legal liability and responsibility of the governing body and the Public Education Department. These requirements include, but are not limited to, securing appropriate insurance coverage and identifying waivers that will be sought by the school from the Public Education Department.

ANALYSIS: WAIVERS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>List of waivers that will be requested from PED</u> Applicants state they “are not aware of any PEC policies or requirements, but if there are any PEC policies in place at this time, the applicants request a waiver from all of them” [emphasis added]. This response demonstrates a significant lack of understanding of the waiver concept and the alignment of potential waivers and the educational plan proposed.</p> <p><u>Other waivers not pertaining to PED waivers that will be requested from PED; must include applicable statute and/or state rule to be waived</u> Applicants provide the same statement as above, demonstrating a lack of awareness of the statute and rules by which it must comply.</p>	<p>P 94 [Applicants acknowledge that the statement was incorrect.]</p> <p>P 94 [Applicants acknowledge that the statement was incorrect.]</p>