

2010 CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION ANALYSIS

School Name: **The GREAT Academy**

Review Date: 8/27/10

I. CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

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

ANALYSIS: CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Mission Statement</u></p>	
<p><u>Achievement of Mission/Goals</u></p> <p>The organizational goals do not fully meet the required SMART Goal criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first goal fails to identify a specific measurable target, i.e., “by how much will the graduation rate surpass the state average?” • The second goal fails to specify a tool or method by which achievement will be measured. • The third goal fails to specify which AYP goals will be met. • The fourth goal needs to specify what is meant by “participate” and to identify a tool or method by which achievement will be measured. • The fifth goal fails to include a timeframe or target date for achievement. 	<p>page 15 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information. Only clarifications that were requested in the preliminary analysis are permissible.]</i></p>

<p><u>Explanation of Need</u></p> <p>The Explanation of Need section fails to provide sufficient information to understand how the demographics presented specifically relate to a need for the proposed charter school and to better understand the specific student and community population within which the school will be located. The Albuquerque area demographics vary greatly by quadrants, zip codes and/or school attendance areas and the proposed location of the school is only identified as within the Albuquerque Public Schools district.</p>	<p>page 18 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
--	---

II. EDUCATIONAL PLAN

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

ANALYSIS: CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Philosophy and Approach to Instruction</u></p>	
<p><u>Description of the Curriculum</u></p> <p>E2020 has been selected for delivery of the core curriculum. Insufficient information is provided to understand how the GREAT Academy will provide for delivery of the virtual curriculum and how learning will be monitored and supported. The narrative does not address who the teacher(s) of record will be for the virtual courses.</p> <p>Gifted Education is included in the curriculum narrative; professional development for gifted education is also referenced. The proposed revenue Form 910B5 indicates a projected enrollment of 25% C and/or C-Gifted students. This implies that a curriculum will be developed; however, a description of the process, timeline and resources to be utilized for the development of this curriculum is not provided.</p> <p>The leadership curriculum based on Joseph Rost's definition consists of four basic components. The application states that students will take a component to the leadership course in each of three years, 10-12th grade. Insufficient information is provided to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the four components will be included by taking one component in each of three years; • if a leadership curriculum based on Rost's definition exists or if 	<p>pages 31-33 <i>[The applicant's written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p> <p>page 35 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfied the concern.]</i></p> <p>pages 38-41 <i>[The applicants' written response satisfied the concern regarding leadership components. However, the applicant's written response</i></p>

<p>the leadership curriculum must be developed by the school. If the curriculum is to be developed, a description of the process, timeline and resources to be utilized for development of this curriculum is not provided.</p> <p>Insufficient information is provided in this section to determine a scope and sequence of course offerings that will be taught in a face-to-face instructional format at The GREAT Academy. In addition, any curriculum development that would be required for these courses is not identified and a plan for development that includes a description of the process, timeline and resources to be utilized is not provided.</p>	<p><i>did not clarify the concern regarding a leadership curriculum.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Alignment with NM Standards</u></p>	
<p><u>Strategies and Methods</u></p> <p>Some curricular strategies and methods are listed; however, a clear descriptive example of the curricular strategies and methods in action in the classroom is not provided.</p>	<p>page 47 <i>[The applicant's written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Length of School Day and School Year</u></p> <p>The length of the school day and school year are not completely defined. Instructional hours are stated as <u>approximately</u> 7.5 per day. Although the applicant states that the school will be open M-Thurs, 12 hours/day (9AM – 9PM) with Fridays and Saturdays reserved for student make-up attendance, make-up work and for additional interventions. The applicant also states that The GREAT Academy reserves the right to choose, during the planning year, between a 5-day school week and a 4-day school week. A sample 4-day school calendar is included as Exhibit B. Insufficient information is provided to clearly understand how the Educational Plan will be managed in terms of instructional hours, length of school day and length of school year.</p> <p>The description of how the proposed length of the school day and school year supports the Educational Plan is inadequate. The description focuses on meeting the personal needs of the students rather than supporting the Educational Plan.</p>	<p>page 49 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information and repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p> <p>page 49 <i>[The applicant's written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>

<p><u>Grade Levels, Class Size and Projected Enrollment</u></p> <p>The application does not provide a rationale for the grade-level phase-in plan.</p>	<p>page 50 <i>[The applicant's response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Graduation Requirements (if applicable)</u></p> <p>The application does not provide a description of how the proposed requirements that differ from the New Mexico Graduation Requirements support the school's educational plan.</p> <p>The application states that each student will be required to have six high school core credits completed prior to entry. No information is provided to clarify how the school will provide access to students who have been in a home-school setting or who have not earned six high school units (English, Algebra I, social Studies, Science and two electives).</p>	<p>page 50 <i>[The applicant's response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>pages 47 and 50 <i>[The applicant's response provided new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: STUDENT PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

<p>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions</p>	<p>Reference</p>
<p><u>Student-centered SMART Goals</u></p> <p>The student-centered goals are not specific, not clearly and concisely stated and not easily understood. The goals do not meet the requirements of the SMART Goal format.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first goal requires more specificity as it indicates that 75% of GREAT Academy students will meet or exceed SBA proficiency standards. The SBA is only administered at the 11th grade level. • The second goal requires more specificity to understand specifically what is being measured. • The third and fifth goals do not provide enough information to ascertain the degree of participation required on the part of students to meet the goal. • The fourth goal is missing a target date or timeframe for achievement and is not clearly stated. 	<p>page 51</p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response satisfied the concern.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response provided new information and repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>

<u>Alignment</u>	

ANALYSIS: PLAN FOR EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Types of Assessments</u></p> <p>Several types of assessments are presented; however, a clear picture of a systematic and comprehensive plan for measuring student progress toward achievement of the NM Standards and the school’s student performance expectations fails to emerge from the narrative provided. Insufficient specific information is provided to understand when the types of assessments will be given, what kind of data will be extracted and how the data will be managed.</p>	<p>pages 51-57 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>
<p><u>Timeline for Achievement</u></p>	
<p><u>Corrective Action</u></p>	
<p><u>Remediation</u></p> <p>The information does not provide a clear remediation plan, including a timeline for implementation. The application refers to the use of the SATELLITES case management system (level 2 of the RTI framework) if a student’s performance falls below a final grade of “C” in one or more of the core competencies. No clear information is provided in this section in regard to remediation strategies or options prior to receiving one or more final grades below “C”.</p> <p>In the section on Special Populations, pages 60-61, a description of Tier I strategies is provided and the use of the E2020 as a curriculum is noted as providing ample opportunity for students to master the standards. However, because delivery and monitoring of the E2020 curriculum is not adequately addressed in the application, it is not possible to determine how the specific Tier I strategies listed on pages 61-62 will be implemented for E2020 course remediation at The GREAT Academy.</p>	<p>pages 53-57 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p> <p>pages 60-63 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Additional Assessments</u></p>	
<p><u>Documentation and Reporting</u></p>	

III. FINANCIAL PLAN

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

ANALYSIS: BUDGET

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<u>Revenue Projection Form 910B5</u>	
The GREAT Academy includes a projection of 25% of its students in the C & C-Gifted category and 8% in the A/B Reg/Gifted category. No rationale is provided to substantiate these projections.	Form 910B5 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
The projected SEG revenue for each of the 5-years indicated on the 910B5s does not match the revenues upon which the 5-Year Budget Plan is based.	Form 910B5 and Budget Plan <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
<u>5-Year Budget Plan</u>	
The Five-year Budget Plan is <u>not balanced</u> .	5-Year Budget Plan <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
Administrative salaries exceed instructional salaries for the first year of operation. (including benefits: \$290,805 administrative / \$258,720 instructional)	5-Year Budget Plan and graphs. <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
The lines of authority within the administrative structure are not provided. The Governance-Management Plan indicates that the Director of Operation and Director of Academics will be hired by the Board of Directors and both positions are shown as equal in authority on the organizational chart. However, the positions are budgeted as 1.0 FTE Principal/Director and 1.0 FTE Assistant Principal, implying that one position is equivalent to an Assistant Principal in authority.	5-Year Budget Plan and pages 92-93, 101 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
The amount budgeted for rental of land and building is not adequately explained by the narrative. (\$336,000 in the first year increasing to	5-Year Budget Plan <i>[The applicant’s written</i>

<p>\$474,000 in the fifth year)</p>	<p><i>response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions</u></p> <p>The budget narrative and the 5-Year Budget Plan fail to align. Insufficient information is provided in the budget narrative to understand how budgetary figures were determined. The staffing included in the budget narrative does not clearly align with positions funded by the Budget Plan. Totals indicated in the narrative under “Other Professional Services, Other Contracted Services and Operation and Maintenance of Plan do not align with totals included in the Budget Plan. Object codes are used in the assumptions on page 73 that do not appear on the 5-Year Budget Plan format.</p> <p>Totals for Other Contract Services increase and decrease longitudinally over the 5-year period with no clear rationale: year 1- \$ 18,000; Year 2 - \$30,000; Year 3 - \$40,000; Year 4 - \$12,000; Year 5 - \$2,000.</p>	<p>Pages 73-74 and 5-Year Budget Plan <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>5-Year Budget Plan <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Revenue Sources Other Than SEG Funds</u></p>	
<p><u>Expenditure Assumptions for Other Than SEG Funds</u></p>	

ANALYSIS: FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Fiscal Management Plan</u></p>	
<p><u>Internal Control Procedures</u></p>	
<p><u>Annual Audit of Financial Operations</u></p> <p>The annual audit of financial operations as described does not address a state-chartered charter school as a component unit of the NMPED audit.</p>	<p>pages 90-91 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>

IV. GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

ANALYSIS: GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Governance and site-based management structure</u> The application states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The Board of Directors will hire the Director of Operations and the Director of Academics and approve all policy. The Director of Operations and Director of Academics, with assistance from BOD members, will hire all other employees and oversee the operation of the school, and all other leaders will be responsible for areas as described in their individual job descriptions.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“It exercises leadership through the formulation and adoption of policy as well as hiring, establishing the duties, evaluating, the Director of Operations and Director of Academics.”</p> <p>Only one head administrator may be hired and evaluated by the school’s governing council and that head administrator is solely responsible for all hiring and firing of the school’s employees. [6.80.4.7K NMAC].</p> <p>The application provides that “Board of Directors members shall be entitled to receive \$75.00 per day pursuant policy to the per diem and of \$0.35 per mile or the going rate consistent with the mileage policy.” The proposal to pay governing body members a per diem for attending meetings is not prohibited by the charter Schools Act. However, it is not a good practice because the law, Section 22-5-5 NMSA 1978, states that “the members of a local school board shall serve without compensation.”</p>	<p>page 92</p> <p>page 93</p> <p>pages 92, 93 and 101 (Organizational Chart) <i>[The applicant’s response does not clarify the concern that the governing body will hire more than one administrator.]</i></p> <p>page 94</p>

<u>Organizational chart and narrative description</u>	
<p>The organizational chart presented on page 101 illustrates a reporting structure for the proposed school that is not in compliance with law. The Board of Directors oversees two positions (Director of Operations [DOO] and Director of Academics [DOA]) which violates the requirement for one head administrator as the Chief Executive Officer of the school [6.80.4.7K NMAC]).</p> <p>Additionally, the Business Manager reports to the Executive Secretary/Business Office Assistant and classroom teachers report to the school counselor/student data coordinator. Insufficient information is provided to adequately explain the organizational structure represented by the chart.</p>	<p>page 101 <i>[The applicant’s response does not clarify the concern that the governing body will hire more than one administrator.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information and repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: DESCRIPTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

<u>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions</u>	Reference
<p><u>Governing Body policies and procedures</u></p> <p>On page 107, the application states: “Board members will be appointed by a committee comprised of the Director of Operations, Director of Academics, parents and teachers” To place the Directors and teachers in a position to approve who they will be accountable to in the organization undermines the oversight responsibilities of the governing body.</p> <p>The criteria and process that will be used to select the school’s head administrator are not provided. Only evaluation is discussed.</p> <p>The duties stated for the Board of Directors overlap with the responsibilities of the head administrator and undermine the authority of the school’s head administrator for the day-to-day operation of the school. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Building relationships with the students of the GREAT Academy”; • “Offering consultation to Great Academy students on research topics, research procedures, connections to Industry and University programs and individuals, etc.” 	<p>page 107 <i>[The applicant’s written response confirmed the intention to implement this process.]</i></p> <p>page 97</p> <p>page 98 <i>[The applicant’s written response verified the intention for Board Members to build relationships with students.]</i></p> <p>page 98 <i>[The applicant’s written response verified the intention for Board Members to offer consultation to students.]</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Offering expertise to the Academy leadership.” • “[Board members] will also be actively engaged in the learning on campus. They are seen in the classrooms, labs and resource rooms. They are seen on campus working with the students. . .” 	<p>page 98 <i>[The applicant’s written response verified the intention for Board Members to offer expertise to leadership.]</i></p> <p>page 103 <i>[The applicant’s written response verified the intention for Board Members to be actively engaged in the learning on campus.]</i></p>
<p><u>List of governing body members and qualifications</u></p>	
<p><u>Staff, families, and community involvement in governance</u></p> <p>An explanation of the nature and extent of staff, families, and the community involvement in the governance of the school, and how they will be notified of the opportunity to participate in the school governance is not provided.</p> <p><i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>	

ANALYSIS: PARTNERSHIPS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Partner organization and contact information</u></p> <p>Eleven potential partnerships are identified. However, most, do not meet the definition of a partnership as defined in the application glossary.</p> <p>Based on the school’s intended provision of dual credit for students, it will be necessary to develop a Memorandum of Agreement with an institution or institutions of higher learning. A blank copy of the Memorandum is included as Exhibit K. However, the application does not indicate with which of the institutions The GREAT Academy intends to develop an agreement.</p>	<p>pages 112-113</p> <p>pages 112-113, Exhibit K <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Nature and purpose of partnership</u></p> <p>A description was not provided to address this prompt in the application.</p>	<p><i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>

<p><u>Partner organization involvement with school governance</u></p> <p>A description was not provided to address this prompt in the application.</p>	<p><i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Evidence of formal partnership agreement</u></p> <p>Evidence of a formal partnership agreement was not provided.</p>	<p><i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Job descriptions for all organizational chart positions</u></p> <p>The application states: “The DOO and DOA have the decision making power at the GREAT Academy.” See Governance/Management Structure subsection above for details of analysis regarding dual leadership and dual hiring by Board of Directors.</p>	<p>page 113 <i>[The applicant's response does not clarify the concern that the governing body will hire more than one administrator.]</i></p>
<p><u>Years 1-5 staffing plan with pupil-teacher ratio supporting educational plan</u></p> <p>The narrative information is inadequate to provide a comprehensive understanding of how the school's proposed staffing and pupil-teacher ratio supports the educational plan. The short narrative provided on page 114 simply states that the school will hire staff to achieve a PTR of 30:1. To address the years 1-5 staffing plan, the narrative refers the reader to the budget spreadsheet. No additional information is provided.</p>	<p>page 114 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>School's personnel policies and procedures</u></p> <p>The following passage on page 115 indicates that the Board of Directors is involved in the discipline of employees and students which is contrary to law:</p> <p>“Any decision of the DOO or DOA in which a student and/or employee of the school has been aggrieved may be appealed to a committee made up of three members of the Board of Directors appointed by the Chairperson. The Board does perform as a hearing authority in such cases which may be appropriate. This applies to decisions made by the DOO or DOA as they pertain to policies established through the Board</p>	<p>page 115</p>

<p>relative to student and/or employee issues only relating to performance, policy adherence, etc... Policies, procedure, conduct of students, faculty shall initially be handled procedurally through the DOO and all decisions not covered under board policy shall be considered final.”</p>	
<p><u>Proposed salary schedules for all employees</u></p> <p>On page 116, the application attempts to address due process and proposed salary schedules by inserting selected excerpts from the statute: 10-9-6 Public Officers and Employees and 22-10A-4. The first excerpt is not complete and is incomprehensible in the context of the application requirements. The second excerpt is primarily a description of the New Mexico licensure framework for teachers and does not address the requirement for the school’s proposed salary schedules.</p> <p>On page 118, proposed salary schedules are again addressed, but not provided. The school intends to negotiate all employment contracts individually while complying with the minimum salary requirements. However, a proposed salary schedule is required as part of the contents of application for a start-up charter school. Additionally, the Training and Experience (T&E) Index for the proposed charter school is based on a salary schedule adopted by the school’s governing body and is an essential part of establishing the proposed budget. A salary schedule was not provided.</p>	<p>page 116 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p> <p>page 118 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>
<p><u>Evaluation process for staff</u></p> <p>The description of the staff evaluation is presented as an assurance, discussion of licensure and salary levels, and fails to provide specificity in addressing the process for evaluation.</p>	<p>page 119 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the application.]</i></p>
<p><u>Staff discipline process</u></p> <p>The explanation of the school’s staff discipline process that provides for due process is inadequate. Staff discipline is not described in the application narrative, but is briefly referenced in the Proposed Personnel Policies and Practices, Exhibit G. However, the reference provided only allows the administrator to use progressive discipline and does not provide the steps in the process.</p>	<p>Exhibit G, pages 177-178 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the application and provided new information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES AND DISCIPLINE POLICY

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>School enrollment policies and procedures</u></p> <p>The narrative states: “The GREAT Academy accepts all students that come to the school in “good standing” with all proper records and shots</p>	<p>page 119 <i>[The applicant’s written</i></p>

<p>if space is available.” “Good standing” is not defined.</p>	<p><i>response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><u>Description of lottery process</u></p> <p>The description of the lottery process contains conflicting numbers: “In SY (1), if the numbers do exceed the <u>120</u>, then the members are selected by a lottery process. The interested members are assigned a number and a random number generator will determine the <u>150</u> that are selected to attend that school year.”</p> <p>The use of a random number generator for selection of students raises concern in regard to transparency of the lottery process. A charter school is expected to be able to assure a random and unbiased result.</p> <p>The narrative describing the lottery process does not include a procedure for additional lotteries to be held should seats still be open.</p>	<p>page 120 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfied the concern.]</i></p> <p>page 120</p> <p>page 120 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfied the concern.]</i></p>
<p><u>Description of proposed student discipline policy</u></p>	
<p><u>Proposed student discipline procedures (appendix)</u></p> <p>A Proposed Student Policy Handbook is included as Exhibit F, pages 135-170. The handbook uses language found in 6.11.2 NMAC including references to the Board of Education, local school board or administrative authority. The school’s Board of Directors is the policy-making authority for student discipline procedures in alignment with 611.2, not the “Board of Education, local school board or administrative authority.”</p>	<p>Exhibit F pages 135 and 141</p>

ANALYSIS: FACILITIES – IF “NO”

<p>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions</p>	<p>Reference</p>
<p><u>Explanation of needs of a facility that will support educational plan</u></p> <p>The school is to be located in Albuquerque. No information is provided to indicate a specific area, quadrant or location based on student or community needs other than that it will be leased space from a strip mall, mall or business complex.</p> <p>An explanation of the school’s needs for a facility that will support the implementation of the school’s education plan is not provided in this section, but referenced briefly in the “Description of the Curriculum” section on page 33 as follows:</p>	<p>page 121 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 33 <i>[The applicant’s written response repeated information that is already stated in the</i></p>

<p>“Because the GREAT Academy will be using a hybrid curricular model (a combination of virtual curriculum, traditional classroom instruction, small group and one-on-one instruction), the facility layout will accommodate computer labs, traditional classrooms, and a resource lab.”</p> <p>The narrative for this section and the statement above lack meaningful detail necessary to understand the layout of space required to fully support the school’s educational plan.</p>	<p><i>application.]</i></p>
<p><u>Reasonable plan to identify and secure an adequate facility</u></p> <p>The required plan is not provided.</p>	
<p><u>Proposed capital outlay needs</u></p> <p>Capital outlay needs are not addressed.</p>	

ANALYSIS: OTHER STUDENT SERVICES

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Transportation</u></p>	
<p><u>Food Services</u></p>	
<p><u>Student access to other services</u></p> <p>The following statement provided as a rationale for hiring a second counselor in the fourth year of operation does not make sense: “The GREAT Academy will hire a second counselor in the fourth year to maintain recommended ASCA ratios of 350:1” The school’s full enrollment is set at 180 students; the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) recommends a 250-to-1 ratio of students to school counselors. Based on the ASCA recommendation, the school is sufficiently staffed with one counselor.</p>	<p>page 122 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>