

Name of Proposed School: Electus Academy

Date of Application Team Analysis: 18 July 2012

Team Members:

Brad Richardson (Team Lead)

Mary Scofield

Greta Roskom

APPLICATION TEAM ANALYSIS SCORE SUMMARY

SECT. NO.	APPLICATION RUBRIC SECTION	POINTS RECEIVED	APPLICANT SCHOOL'S POSSIBLE POINTS
I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2.66	4
II.	EDUCATION PLAN/ ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK	100.59	112
III.	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE/ ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK	57.44	68
IV.	BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	15.33	18
V.	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	7	10
VI.	REQUIRED APPENDICES	2	2
	OVERALL SCORE	185.02	214

Electus Academy, Application Team Analysis

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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
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>The team agreed that the summary was generally well written and conveyed in broad brush stroke a sense of the school's intended program, i.e. a college preparatory program based on a modified, modularized approach to student-choice theory. In addition, students will be asked to focus their studies within disciplines, similar to college "majors." The summary did not, however, provide the team with a clear connection between this approach and the described student population from which the proposed school would draw (p.2). The summary also did not convey how this model is practicable at the scale requested by the applicants.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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 below.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments			
	<p><i>While the model as described appears innovative and distinctive, the team questioned the application's claims that no other public high schools in the area provide "a free, college preparatory program with extensive areas of study in comparison to local private schools..." One thinks of charter schools, such as AIMS@UNM and Cottonwood Classical Preparatory School, among others that have growing reputations for providing just this. Arguably, the approaches of these schools differ.</i></p> <p><i>Some team members expressed concern about the practicability of a curricular innovation that, when brought to the proposed scale, will challenge the school in terms of sustaining its own model (How does the school support the necessary development, staffing, and scheduling of multiple choices?), its handling of transferring students (How does the school create transportable and identifiable credits and transcripts, as well as ensure accurate student placements), and handling its reporting requirements (How does the school report its schedules, courses, etc., into the state's STARS system and grade reporting to parents).</i></p>			

Score: **2.66** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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.	<i>The vision lacks concision, offering instead a “tour” of the proposed school as a visitor might see it (pp.3 – 4).</i> <i>This “tour” provides a clear picture of what the school look might look like, but nothing about long-term goals and sustainability.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The model as described appears innovative, student-centered, with opportunities for curricular breadth, depth, and richness. The team expressed concern about sustaining such a model at the proposed school scale. The vision did not appear to include long-term aims.</i>			

Score: **5** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance				TEAM SCORE: 1.5
	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 measureable, 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 first performance goal does not appear to reference a reliable instrument (assessment). The team assumed that this goal is linked to goal number 2, and that the instrument to be used is the total pass rate on school-developed end of course assessments. (p.5)</i> <i>The second performance goal appears to examine the scores achieved on each end of course assessments. (p. 5)</i> <i>Goal three examines performance on what appears to be the New Mexico state assessment – 80% of students (only those grade levels tested?) will score proficient in all measured categories (math, science, reading and social studies) (p. 6)</i>
				TEAM 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>The described seminars form the focal point of the school’s mission of improved student outcomes based on student choice.</i>
			TEAM 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>Exit exams are intended to be linked to New Mexico standards.</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 1.5
II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth	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 measureable, 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 growth projected in goals 1 & 2 (revisited) are only measured at the end of the charter term, and examine the overall student pass rate in end of course seminars (pp.6 – 7).</i> <i>Growth in goal 3 (revisited) does set ambitious growth targets and can be measured annually (p.7).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gaps	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 team agreed that the goal is too general ("...an average difference in achievement of no more than 5%...") to be managed and monitored (p. 7). There is no description of how the school will address achievement gaps.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 team expressed a measure of concern that although the end of course exams (aligned with the school's mission) are meant to be linked directly to New Mexico state standards, they may not be appropriately rigorous. No assurance is provided how the test developers plan to ensure this.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>Again, the metrics of this goal are not clear ("...an average difference in achievement of no more than 5%..."). The goal does not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting it.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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 team agreed that the goal appears manageable and there is a plan to monitor attendance, which should lead to success. The team expressed some concern about the ambitiousness of the target, >95%.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 goal appears to require the school to track students after they graduate from high school in order to measure those who require remedial courses at post-secondary institutions.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
II.D.(7) Graduation Rate	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 school proposes to graduate 95% of its grade 9 class in 2017 (4-year cohort). The team assumes this goal intends that of the total number of grade 9 students enrolled, at least 95% of them would remain with the school and graduate by the end of their grade 12 year. (This goal appears to implicate recurrent enrollment rates.)</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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 team would like to have seen a monitoring plan that both annually tracks the attrition rate of its class of 2017 and addresses recurrent enrollment, should the attrition rate compromise this goal (p. 9).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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 team agreed that this goal does not lead to a sufficient plan for monitoring progress towards meeting the goal, nor does it speak to how the school will address the needs of this group (p.9).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The team appreciated the innovative nature of the educational program – an individualized curriculum as a variation on individualized instruction. The ambitiousness of the goals raises some unanswered questions of how the school intends to manage them, i.e., what will the school do to address the needs of the implicated groups and what does the school intend to do if students are unable to meet the goals?</i>			

Score: **41.8** 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	Evaluator Comments and Questions			
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The review team appreciated an organizational goal that focused on the learning needs and interests of its students. The team observed that the school developers have acknowledged several organizational challenges (e.g., STARS reporting and scheduling), hence the justification for two academic counselors.</i>			

Score: **6** out of **6** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>The research described here is the same as what is described above. The team could not find the requested research on the curriculum (seminars & lectures), although the team acknowledges that both are linked.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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 team had some concern about the weight given to the lecture format in a program model that is based on student choice theory, i.e. the seminars.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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 team expressed some concern that the application lacked detail about how the various seminars and lectures combine to ensure that all students will meet state graduation requirements. This recalls concerns expressed earlier about the challenge the school will face to ensure its non-traditional model fits within the more traditionally expressed state requirements.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>No waivers are sought.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The meaning of the school model appears to reside in the strength, richness, and differentiation of the seminars, while the common lectures provide students with practice learning for the more traditional college/university instructional approach. Maintaining that meaning, that balance may be precarious. Widespread use of lectures is fairly easy to fall back on, while developing and sustaining a diverse menu of differentiated and compelling seminars are challenging.</i></p> <p><i>The Sudbury Model shows that choice theory works with small populations. The team is not clear from the application how the model works on a large scale, such as that contemplated by Electus Academy. The choices a large public school has to make in order to make this model work as expected are important considerations.</i></p> <p><i>How will the school ensure the appropriate balance between maintaining a full schedule of meaningful and challenging seminars and the more traditional lectures, especially when financial times are tough? Also, how will the school ensure that the appropriate combination of the seminars' themes and approaches are available to the students who need them at the scale suggested by the enrollment cap. Consider that the school developers are positing that differentiated curriculum stands in the place of differentiated instruction. The team assumes that a limit on the availability of differentiated seminars requires teachers to differentiate instruction nevertheless, especially for students who, due to schedule limitations, are required to enroll in courses whose approaches are not necessarily their strengths.</i></p>			

Score: **14.32** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.33 <i>The application provides an assertion that differentiated curriculum (as a variation on differentiated instruction) is effective, rather than evidence. This section raises the question who the target student population is, although the Executive Summary indicated that no particular population is targeted, only those interested in a college preparatory program.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions

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

Evaluation	Summary/Comments:
	<p><i>The team notes that the application gives some attention to supporting the Albuquerque Hispanic student population (Application, p.49), but wonders if and how the school might adapt the seminars' themes and approaches, to support the interests and needs of all students. In addition, while the proposed school will offer a college preparatory program, the students will doubtless come with a variety of learning needs. The application's premise is that the student-choice model will address this, but the team would have appreciated plans that describe how the school will ensure that all needs will be supported, especially if (when) the model becomes limited as it scales up.</i></p> <p><i>There is no mention of health and mental health support services, curious given the "whole child" emphasis of the school's model. Perhaps this is embedded in the customized curriculum.</i></p>

Score: 5.33 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.1.(1)(a) – (d) Special Education	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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.66 <i>The team noted that assurance only is given of providing ongoing education, rather than a plan (p. 54).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	The school has identified the appropriate staff and ancillary services to adequately meet the needs of special education and ELL students, and provides an explanation for how they will be adequately budgeted.	The school has identified some of the staff needed to meet the needs of special education and ELL students. An explanation is provided indicating how they will be adequately budgeted.	The school has not identified appropriate staffing to adequately address the needs of special populations; or the plan for how they will be budgeted is not provided; or the budget does not appear adequate.	
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
II.(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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
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 team expressed concern that application does not appear to include a clear plan for identifying ELL.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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 team noted that the budget does not anticipate ELL students. If the school is relying on differentiated seminars to support the needs of ELL students, then the team would have expected such a description.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	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.	<i>See the note above.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The program model's seminars appear ideally suited to meet the needs of special education and ELL students. The team would have appreciated reading the school developers' plans for ensuring that some seminars will be available each "term" (4.5 weeks) for special needs students, and to ensure that the school will have the required capacity for this, in terms of qualified teachers both developing and delivering these seminars, as well as providing support for students who may struggle with the mandatory lectures.</i>			

Score: **14.99** 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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.66 <i>The team recognized the need for surveying students to help the school determine general interests. However, the team would like to have seen tools that would help balance student interests with student needs.</i>
II.J.(2) Assessments to Measure Academic Goals	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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Self-Monitoring	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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.66 <i>The team agreed that the application did not provide clear corrective action plan.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	<p><i>Remediation/At-Risk Students</i> 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><i>Remediation/At-Risk Students</i> 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><i>Remediation/At-Risk Students</i> 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><i>The response is adequate.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	<p><i>School-Wide Practices</i> 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><i>School-Wide Practices</i> 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><i>School-Wide Practices</i> The school does not provide a plan.</p>	<p><i>The response is adequate.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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><i>The team expressed concern that significant reliance on on-line reporting may limit parental access to important data about the progress of their children.</i></p>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The state may require the choice of an approved short cycle assessment. The team is also concerned that the proposed school's reliance on on-line communication about the school and reporting on student performance may limit access to the school and important information about their children to only those with regular on-line capacity.</i>

Score: **10.32** out of **12** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 2</p> <p><i>The response is adequate.</i></p>
III.A.(2) Description of Founders’ Expertise	The applicant’s expertise demonstrates relevant qualifications and experience in areas that are important to implementing the proposed plan.	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.	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>TEAM SCORE: 1.66</p> <p><i>The team noted that the developers have public school administrative experience but have never opened or managed a charter school. That said, the team understands that the intent of the developers are to return to the classroom and perhaps hold a curriculum director position with the school, appropriate to their experience.</i></p>
III.A.(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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 1.5</p> <p><i>There appears to be no one on the prospective governing council with a finance background.</i></p>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The governing body does not appear to include someone with a finance background. The developers' expertise is in curriculum and program, but not in school administration. The team understands from the plans that the governing body would hire a qualified and experienced administrator.</i>			

Score: **7.16** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.B.(1) Governance Training	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
III.B.(2) Governance Evaluation	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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 response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>No concerns were noted.</i>			

Score: **4** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>No concerns were noted.</i>			

Score: **4 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
				TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 1.83
III.D.(2) Job Descriptions	Job descriptions are provided for all key staff.	Job descriptions are provided for most key staff.	Job descriptions are not provided.	<i>The reporting lines and qualifications (education, licensure, etc.) are not included in the job descriptions (appendix D).</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 2
III.D.(3) Staff Evaluation	A clear process is provided for evaluating teacher effectiveness that is tied to student performance and the school’s mission and goals.	The process is provided for evaluating teachers; however, it is unclear how the teacher evaluation process is tied to student performance or the school’s mission and goals.	No clear process is provided for evaluating teacher performance.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 2
III.D.(4) Staffing Plan	The staffing plan demonstrates a sound understanding of staffing needs and appears viable and adequate for effectively implementing the educational program/curriculum.	The staffing plan is provided but does not demonstrate enough support to effectively implement the educational program/curriculum.	The staffing plan is not adequate to support effective implementation of the educational program/ curriculum.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 2
	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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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>If understanding and implementing the ideas of Robert Marzano (teaching strategies and professional development) is important to supporting the mission and goals of the school, the review team asked why he is not mentioned elsewhere in the text.</i> <i>Further, the team noted the application’s emphasis on teacher professional development, and wondered why so few days were devoted to professional development. Perhaps PD is built elsewhere in the school day/week?</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The leadership council is not formally depicted on the organizational chart, though the members of that group are placed on the same level within the organizational chart (p.83). Neither is the Administrative Executive depicted in the organizational chart, although this role is described in the narrative.</i>			

Score: **13.49** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 0.66 <i>There is no strong description of the desired relationship between employees and the school.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.66 <i>Attention needs to be given to a more thorough development of personnel policies.</i> <i>Paid military leave raises concern about double pay and a possible conflict with the state's anti-donation law.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 0.66 <i>The process as described does not provide for "due process". Decisions appear to be made, "...at the discretion of the principal." (p. 96)</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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>Attention needs to be given to a more thorough development of a grievance process.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Personnel policies require greater attention than is evidenced by those in the application.</i>			

Score: 3.98 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 1</p> <p><i>The team agreed that the application does not provide for a formal parent advisory body, though the school developers are clear that they welcome such a body (p. 85), and that there are many opportunities for volunteering as well as formal parental input into the leadership committee (administrative) and the governing body (governance).</i></p> <p><i>The application appears to place too much emphasis on electronic communication with parents and other community members. The team agreed that the school developers should consider various forms of communication to ensure equal access to all aspects of the school's life (p. 85).</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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.	<i>The role of the governing council in complaint resolution should be included as the locus of a final appeal or if the complaint implicates the head administrator.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The team remains concerned that the school developers place too heavy a reliance on technology for communication, and worry that this may create unequal access to the school and its provision for important parental and community input. The team expected to see a formal parent advisory body.</i></p>			

Score: 2.66 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 Polices 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.	<i>The team would like to have had an explanation of how the school will take into account the rights of students with disabilities.</i>
III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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 response is adequate.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions

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

Evaluation	Summary/Comments:
	<i>The team appreciated that the school's suspension time process appears pro-student and pro-academic, with students allowed to work at home. Also, see concerns noted above.</i>

Score: **3.66** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 that markets to the targeted population.	<i>While student recruitment and school promotions on social media outlets is innovative and low cost, there remains a concern about equal access of some families to the school, especially those with limited or no access to on-line communication.</i>
III.H.(2) Lottery Process	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
III.H.(3) Enrollment Process	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
III.H.(3) Enrollment Process	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.33
	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.	<i>There is no description of school-initiated dis-enrollments.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The team remains concerned that the school developers place too heavy a reliance on technology for communication, and worry that this may create unequal access to the school.</i>

Score: **5.99** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>Finance reports are public information and must be available to the public. Such records are to be posted on the state "sunshine" portal.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>Finance reports are public information and must be available to the public. Such records are to be posted on the state "sunshine" portal.</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.J.(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.	TEAM SCORE: N/A
III.J.(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.	TEAM SCORE: N/A
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>These items do not apply to this school.</i>			

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 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 wavier 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.	TEAM SCORE: N/A
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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 wavier 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: N/A
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>These items do not apply to this school.</i>			

Score: 0 out of 0 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Buses should help the school meet its attendance goals.</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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The response is adequate.</i>

Score: **6** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
				TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
				TEAM 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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
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 response is adequate.</i>
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>There are concerns about the school’s salary schedule, which appear inconsistent with state guidelines, especially in terms of licensure requirements.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>There are concerns about the school’s salary schedule, which appear inconsistent with state guidelines, especially in terms of licensure requirements.</i>			

Score: **9** 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 type="checkbox"/>	
				TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
				TEAM 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>The response is adequate.</i>
				TEAM 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>No provision is made for the required Governing Council Finance and Audit Committees.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
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.	<p><i>The plans for two sets of approvals for expenditure types (Academic and administrative) include an approval of the “Administrative Executive” – as distinct from the Principal. The “Administrative Executive” however, does not appear in the school’s organizational chart, though it appears in the job description. (The job descriptions do not include qualifications or licensure requirements, so it is difficult to assess the level at which this position works.)</i></p> <p><i>The plan does not clearly address 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.</i></p>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>See the note above.</i>			

Score: **6.33** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
V.A. Outreach Activities	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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>The team is again concerned about the effect of the proposed school's reliance on technology in terms of how it may limit equal access to the school.</i>
V.B. Evidence of Support	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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>Same concern noted as above.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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>Assurance is given that community support and relationships have been and will continue to be built for purposes of building the school's capacity to offer "majors". However, no evidence of these relationships is provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The team remains concerned about the reliance on technology to communicate with parents who may or may not have ready access. This may affect the parents' ability to respond quickly to essential school communication, which may in turn have an impact on the school's ability to meet some of its performance goals.</i>

Score: **7** out of **10** possible points

VI. REQUIRED APPENDICES

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM 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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The response is adequate.</i>			

Score: 2 out of 2 possible points

Score Summary

Section Number	Description	Elements	Possible	Score
I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			
		Element 1	2	1.33
		Element 2	2	1.33
		Section Total	4	2.66
II.	EDUCATION PLAN			
		II.A. School Size	2	2
		II. C. Mission	2	2
		II. B. Vision	2	1
		Section Total	6	5
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 1	2	1.5
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 3	2	2
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 1	2	1.5
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 3	2	2
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 1	2	1
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 2	2	1.66
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 3	2	1
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 1	2	1.66
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 3	2	1.66
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 1	2	2
		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	2
		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	1.66

	II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 1 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
	II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 2 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
	II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 3 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1.5
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 1	2	2
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 2	2	1.66
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 3	2	1.33
	Section Total	48 – OR – 36	41.8 / 48
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 1 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	2
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 2 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	2
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 3 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	2
	Section Total	6 – OR – 0	6
	II.F.(1) Curriculum Philosophy	2	2
	II.F.(2) Curriculum Philosophy/Approach Research/Data	2	2
	II.F.(3) Curriculum Description	2	2
	II.F.(4) Curriculum Research	2	1
	II.F.(5) Curriculum Overview	2	2
	II.F.(6) & (7) Curriculum Development Timeline & Instructional Program	2	1.66
	II.F.(8) Curriculum Alignment Timeline	2	2
	II.G.(1) & (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver, Element 1	2 – OR – 0	1.66
	II.G.(1) & (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver, Element 2	2 – OR – 0	N/A
	Section Total	18, 16 OR 14	14.32 / 16
	II.H.(1) Instructional Strategies	2	2
	II.H.(2) Instructional Effectiveness	2	1.33
	II.H.(3) Differentiated Instruction	2	2
	Section Total	6	5.33
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 1	2	2
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 2	2	2
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 3	2	1.66
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 4	2	2
	II.I.(2) Students with 504 Plans	2	2
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 1	2	1.33
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 2	2	2
	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	1
	Section Total	18	14.99

		II.J.(1) Measuring Organizational Goals, If Applicable	2	1.66
		II.J.(2) Assessments to Measure Academic Goals	2	2
		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Self Monitoring	2	1.66
		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Remediation & At-Risk Students	2	2
		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / School-Wide Practices	2	2
		II.J.(5) Reporting on Progress	2	1
		Section Total	12 – OR – 10	10.32 / 12
III	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE	III.A.(1) Governance Description	2	2
		III.A.(2) Description of Founders' Expertise	2	1.66
		III.A.(3) Description of Prospective Governance Expertise	2	1.5
		III.A.(4) GB Selection of Members	2	2
		Section Total	8	7.16
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Training	2	2
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Evaluation	2	2
		Section Total	4	4
		III.C.(1) Leadership & Management: Monitoring	2	2
		III.C.(2)(3) Leadership & Management: Administrator Selection/Evaluation	2	2
		Section Total	4	4
		III.D.(1) Organizational Structure	2	2
		III.D.(2) Job Descriptions	2	1.83
		III.D.(3) Staff Evaluation	2	2
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 1	2	2
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 2	2	2
		III.D.(5) School Day / Year	2	2
		III.D.(6) Professional Development Plan	2	1.66
		Section Total	14	13.49
		III.E.(1) Employer/Employee Relationship	2	0.66
		III.E.(2) Personnel Policies	2	1.66
		III.E.(3) Staff Discipline Process	2	0.66
		III.E.(4) Grievance Process	2	1
		Section Total	8	3.98
		III.F.(1) Community Involvement	2	1
		III.F.(2) Complaint Resolution	2	1.66
		Section Total	4	2.66

		III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	2	1.66
		III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	2	2
		Section Total	4	3.66
		III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	2	1.66
		III.H.(2) Lottery Process	2	2
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 1	2	2
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 2	2	.33
		Section Total	8	5.99
		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	N/A
		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	N/A
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	0 / 0
		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	2
		Section Total	6	6
IV	BUSINESS PLAN	IV.A.(1) 910B5 Worksheets	2	2
		IV.A.(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	2	2
		IV.A.(3) Budget Narrative	2	2
		IV.A.(4) Strategies for Budget Control	2	2
		IV.A.(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	2	1
		Section Total	10	9
		IV.B.(1)(2) Financial Policies and Internal Controls	2	2
		IV.B.(3) Financial Personnel	2	2
		IV.B.(4) Financial Oversight	2	1
		IV.B.(3) School Sustainability	2	1.33

		Section Total	8	6.33
V	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT			
		V.A. Outreach Activities	2	1
		V.B. Evidence of Support	2	1
		V.C. Community Ties	2	2
		V.D. & F. Community Relationships (Optional Evidence of Support)	2	1
		V.E. Uniqueness of Proposed School	2	2
		Section Total	10	7
VI	REQUIRED APPENDICES			
		VI. Appendices	2	2
		Section Total	2	2