

Name of Proposed School     *Health Sciences Academy*

Team Members:

*Rachel Stofocik* (Team Lead)

*Doug Wine*

*Gilbert Mondragon*

APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM ANALYSIS SCORE SUMMARY

SECT. NO.	APPLICATION RUBRIC SECTION	POINTS RECEIVED	APPLICANT SCHOOL'S POSSIBLE POINTS
I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4	4
II.	EDUCATION PLAN/ ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK	74	114
III.	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE/ ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK	50.5	70
IV.	BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	12	18
V.	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	9	10
VI.	REQUIRED APPENDICES	1.5	2
	<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>218</b>

## CHARTER APPLICATION EVALUATION RUBRIC 2012: 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	Adequate information provided.
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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.	Adequate information provided.
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments <b>Overall, the review team determined the Executive Summary to be cohesive as it addressed the elements requested in the application. However, the review team would like to make a comment that this summary could better serve the entire application if it better incorporated the rationale behind the Health Science focus and fully explained the entity, Health Futures Inc. since it is mentioned multiple times throughout the application and seems to be sometimes used interchangeably with the Health Science Academy (HSA).</b>			

**Score: 4 out of 4 possible points**

## II. EDUCATION PLAN

A. SCHOOL SIZE

B. VISION

C. MISSION

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.A. School Size	The applicant provides all of the required information.		The applicant does not provide all of the required information.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
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.	<i>The review team found that the mission statement was not incorporated in the proper section; instead it was found in Appendix E at the top of page 3. The review team determined that the mission statement is clear, although not entirely "measurable."</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
	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 review team agreed that the vision stated what the student will look like but not the school "the vision is to assure that all students who enroll in..."(10).</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b>				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<p><i>As written, the review team agrees that the vision and mission statements are adequate. Nonetheless, the review team would note that all of the elements emphasized in the vision and mission — "technology-rich health science curriculum, a school culture of academic excellence, engaging the family"—are not fully developed in the application's entirety. Finally, the mission and vision statement do not reflect the community-school or holistic model of engaging not only school-age students but adults as well.</i></p>			

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance	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.	<p><i>The review team determined that this goal is not "clearly stated" as written. The review team cannot determine if the applicant means "10%" of the population or an increase of 10 percentage points.</i></p> <p><i>As written, this goal is dependent on the performance of the Gadsden School District; the review team decided that as a result of that dependency, the goal did not "reflect high expectations." If the Gadsden school district went down in performance, then HSA, according to their goal, could also go down in performance to a level that is not rigorous, especially not rigorous enough to ensure that students graduate and are prepared for "challenging healthcare careers and college entrance"(10)</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the school's mission or vision.	The goals do not tie to the school's mission or vision.	<i>The review team determined that nothing in this goal reflected the uniqueness of the school's focus on a health science curriculum.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" 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>As written, the review team decided that this goal was not specific and would not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress (11).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0

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 review team agreed that this goal contained no outlet for measuring academic growth. Eleventh and twelfth grade students merely participating in job shadowing experiences or internships does not lend to measuring students' performance growth (11).</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>As written, the review team determined that this goal reflects the unique health science mission of the school because it does emphasize the importance of implementing practices which will familiarize and prepare HSA graduates for "challenging healthcare careers and college entrance"(10).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0
	The goals are specific and measurable, attainable and time-bound.	The goals will not lead to a sufficient plan to monitor progress toward meeting them.	The goals are too broad or vague and do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.	<i>The review team agreed that this goal did not delineate any tool for measuring growth.</i>
II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gaps	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	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>Like the first goal this goal is not "clearly stated" as written. The review team cannot determine if the applicant means "10%" of the population or an increase in 10 percentage points.</i>  <i>In addition, the review team decided that the applicant does not fully understand "student subgroups" as the application only specifically addresses "students with IEPs"(11).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1

	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the school's mission or vision.	The goals do not tie to the school's mission or vision.	<i>The review team determined that this goal did not reflect the high expectations that are integral to the school's vision and mission.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" 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 review team agreed that due to the lack of clarity mentioned above, this goal is not measureable or specific.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.D.(4) Attendance	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address attendance and meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school has goals that are measureable, but only partially address student attendance or are insufficiently rigorous. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address student attendance or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team has determined that this goal is not "rigorous" as it is below the state goal of 92%.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5

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 measureable, but only partially address recurrent enrollment or are insufficiently rigorous. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals to address recurrent enrollment issues; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team decided that this goal may be realistic though less ambitious. The applicant's goal is to be a game changer for the population in this community, thus 75% is not rigorous enough to fill that role.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>



	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0
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 measureable, 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>As written the review team agreed that this goal is not rigorous or measurable. If the applicant further explained the contents within the “portfolio of their health sciences experiences” or better specified the criteria regarding how the “National Health Standards and Accountability Criteria” would be used to assess access to, and success in, college or careers then it may have met the requirement (12).</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.D. (7) Graduation Rate	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>As written the review team agreed that this goal is not rigorous or measurable.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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 measureable, 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>Once again, the review team is not sure if the applicant means 10 percentage points higher or 10% more than the actual amount.</i>  <i>The review team also determined that these goals did not reflect “high expectations” as there is no plan in place for continuous improvement as the school evolves. In fact, as written, the school could actually regress and they still might be meeting their goals (12).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1

	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the mission or vision of the school.	The goals do not tie to the mission or vision of the school.	<i>The review team agreed that this goal is not rigorous and therefore does not align with the school's vision of preparing HSA students for "challenging healthcare careers and college entrance"(10).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" 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 review team decided that this goal was not specific. The applicant mentions the NM average and then the Gadsden average and then writes HSA's goal so that it is dependent on one of these averages.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
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 measureable, but only partially address the growth of the lowest 25% of students in reading and math, or are insufficiently rigorous and do not reflect high expectations. Goals meet most of the stated Evaluation Criteria.	The school does not have measurable goals that address the growth of the lowest 25% of students in reading and math; or the goals do not meet the stated Evaluation Criteria.	<i>The review team decided that this goal is manageable and considers growth over time "by 2016" however it is not rigorous—"20% proficiency in math" and "25% proficiency" (12) in reading nor does it demonstrate continuous improvement as the school evolves (12).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	The stated goals are clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.	The goals do not clearly tie to the mission or vision of the school.	The goals do not tie to the mission or vision of the school.	<i>The review team agreed that this goal "20% proficiency" in math and "25% proficiency" in reading by "2016"(12) does not reflect the mission or vision of ensuring that "all students" are prepared for "challenging healthcare careers and college entrance"(10).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" 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 review team agreed that there is no sufficient plan to monitor the progress of the growth for the lowest 25%.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <i>The review team agreed that while there are components within the goals that meet the stated criteria, overall, the goals lacked "cohesion," some of the goals include the uniqueness of the health science focus, while others do not. Secondly, while the performance of the Gadsden School District needs to be considered when creating a unique charter school in the same area, the review team does not think several goals, as written, are "ambitious," as they are dependent on the Gadsden School District's performance. The application often emphasizes the poor performance of the Gadsden school district, so the review team is unsure as to why this charter applicant is aspiring to do only slightly better than a system that the applicants themselves portray as sub-par. Additionally, if the Gadsden school district fails to keep improving than the way that the goals are written now, the Health Science Academy would not have to be concerned with continuous improvement.</i>			

**Score: 28 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 checked="" 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.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 0</b> <i>The applicant did not put this goal in the correct place. It was found under 11.J.(3), which is about using "valid and reliable assessments"(35). The review team decided that this organizational goal is not clear as it leaves several questions unanswered—how can the applicant "measure" "efficient management of school resources" by simply "allocating 50% of the school's operational funds on direct instruction"? The team also agreed that it was neither manageable nor rigorous—"school's focus on student acquisition of the basic skills in the core content areas"—as far as the information provided (35).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>TEAM SCORE: 1</b>
	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.	<i>The review team decided that if this goal "clearly aligned" to their health science model then the two tools for measurement as suggested would have something to do with maximizing student exposure to "health science" models or curriculum and the "direct instruction" would be centered on health sciences.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>TEAM SCORE: 0</b>
	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.	<i>See comment one in this section.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				

Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>Overall, the team decided that the organizational goal failed to delineate a clear plan for the comprehensive and complex work suggested in the entire application.</i></p>
------------	--

**Score: 1 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.F.(1) Philosophy	The philosophical approach and curriculum framework are clearly presented and clearly aligns with the school's stated mission and goals.	The philosophical approach and curriculum framework are partially defined and/or the alignment with the school's stated mission and goals is unclear.	The philosophical approach and curriculum framework are not clearly presented and do not align with the school's stated mission and goals.	<i>The review team determined that the philosophy and approach suggested, aligns with the day school's mission, but is not clear or inclusive of the philosophy behind the adult evening classes (13-21). Particularly, there is no mention of adults in these eight pages of curriculum explanation.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
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.	<i>The review team decided that the instructional practices provided on page 21 are evidence-based; however, the applicant fails to connect that research directly to citations in this section.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<i>The review team decided this "description" only "partially aligned" with the school's mission; the elaboration of educating and engaging adults, which is emphasized in the school's motto: "Inscribiendo al estudiante-incluyendo a la familia, or enroll the student, engage the family" is missing.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2

II.F.(4) Curriculum Research	Clear research-based evidence of the success of the chosen curriculum when used with the target population is included.	Research-based evidence provided on the chosen curriculum is partially relevant, limited, unreliable, or not valid.	Research to support the chosen curriculum is not provided.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
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 scope and sequence found in Appendix A appears incomplete. In the chart on the first page there are seven classes per grade level listed. However, in the description component, the applicant fails to describe all seven. Specifically, the applicant does not describe several of the classes which make their charter school unique such as "intro to health careers" etc. in this section. It is found instead on pages 22-23. Again, adult classes are under-addressed.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.F.(6)(7) Development Timeline / Instructional Program	A clear plan is in place to develop the school's instructional program; responsible staff and deadlines are identified.	A limited plan is in place to develop the school's instructional program; responsible staff may be identified.	No plan is in place to develop the school instructional program; no responsible staff is identified.	<i>On page 26 the applicant offers a beginning date "October 2012" and an end date "June 2013" however no timeline with "deadlines" is provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>

	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	Waivers, if applicable, state what the waiver is and why school is seeking it.		Waivers, if applicable, are included but without explanation.	<i>The waivers are found in III.k.(2) Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team decided that there are many parts of this curriculum section that are adequate, thoughtful, and needed in the proposed community, however the applicant often does not integrate all the components into this explanation. Specifically, the curriculum does not fully explain the role of online tools or “virtual health environments” nor does it explain the particularities of the curriculum for the adult night classes.</i>			

**Score: 14 out of 18 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 checked="" 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.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b> <i>Adequate information provided.</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.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 1</b> <i>The review team determined that this section does not clearly connect evidence to the effectiveness of their strategies (28).</i>
II.H.(3) Differentiated Instruction	The school describes how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student needs, and examples are provided.	The school describes how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs, but there are no examples.	The school does not sufficiently describe how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs, and there are no examples.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b> <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b>				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
<b>Evaluation</b>	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>Overall, the team decided that this section describes many varied and multiple instructional strategies and supports, but is not clear on how they all fit into a comprehensive plan.</i>			

**Score: 5 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: 1.5 <i>The review team determined that the applicant does not fully address capacity because there are no ancillary services presented in the budget.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	The school has a plan in place to meet all legal requirements to regularly evaluate and monitor progress of special education students to ensure attainment of IEP goals.	The school has a partial plan in place to meet the needs of students with IEPs; but details are not provided.	The school has no stated process in place to monitor students with IEPs.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	The school provides a complete plan for graduating students with special education needs (if applicable) that is in compliance with Federal and State regulations.	There is an incomplete plan for graduating students with special education needs (if applicable).	The plan for graduating students with special education needs (if applicable) is not provided; or the plan provided is not in compliance with Federal and State regulations.	<i>The review team noted that the school does not include transition plans. Also, while the application commits to providing support to this population of students, it did not elaborate on how that helps students graduate (30).</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	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.	<i>The review team noted that the applicant school has only budgeted for a .2 Special Education Teacher (30-31) which is most likely not enough considering the targeted population described.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0
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 review team noted that there appears to be a lack of understanding in the applicant school's plan—the Special Education Teacher can sit on the student assistant team, but cannot run the 504 plan—all special education is 504 but not all 504 is special education. In this section, the applicant discusses special education placement not particularly 504 placement (31).</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>

	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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>Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <b><i>Overall, the review team found the ELL plan to be very strong. Despite the sound ELL plan, the special education services are not sufficiently budgeted. Also, the applicant appears to not clearly understand 504 plans.</i></b>			

**Score: 13.5 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 checked="" 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.	<i>The review team decided that the tools proposed to measure the effectiveness of the organizational goals are not adequate (35).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<i>The review team agreed that the list does not provide the specifics regarding these measurement tools—this list is provided under II J.(3) instead where specific short cycle assessments are addressed (35). There are also some questions regarding the tools suggested—when examining a portfolio, how does the school measure a student’s proficiency?</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2

II.J.1(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.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	<b>Remediation/At-Risk Students</b> 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.	<b>Remediation/At-Risk Students</b> 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.	<b>Remediation/At-Risk Students</b> 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.	<i>The review team noted that while the three tiers are described, they are located in the 504 plan section, which suggests a lack of understanding of the difference between a remediation plan and a 504 plan (36).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5

	<i>School-Wide Practices</i> The school has provided a comprehensive plan to analyze data, indentify school-wide practices that need to be changed, and implement the necessary adjustments in order to improve student outcomes.	<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.	<i>School-Wide Practices</i> The school does not provide a plan.	<i>The review team agreed that while something general is in place, the details necessary to understand how these major community and holistic efforts will be orchestrated is not provided; thus the plan is not “comprehensive” and the “structures for processes for implementation” are limited (36).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.J.(5)Reporting on Progress	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.	The school provides a plan, but it does not include communication of student assessment and progress to all identified parties.	There is no plan provided to communicate assessment results or student progress.	<i>The review team noted that while tools are in place— “PowerSchool reporting features” and the “Internet website” considering the applicant school’s own data “100% of the community is economically disadvantaged”(8) the usability and accessibility of this tool is limited and questionable as many of the parents, community members etc. may not be able to easily access to a computer (37).</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The review team agreed that while there are some logical and innovative ideas in place, the plans are not specific enough regarding time, and the interrelationship of teachers and community to actually implement such interventions. There is also a disconnect in what is asked and the answers; for instance, organizational goal appears on page 35 and is supposed to be under II.E.</i>			

**Score: 7.5 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 checked="" 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.	<i>The review team noted that while topics for the GB are provided, there is no specific outline or descriptions and roles provided in this section (37).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5



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.	<i>The group and individual biographies show individuals who seem highly qualified, but the review team does not get the impression that most of them are physically in the Anthony/Gadsden area. Some appear to reside in Albuquerque and others—"Dr. Kharkongor is a "Professor" in "Shillong, India," "Dr. Nevins has an appointment as a reader at the University College London, UK"(38-39). As a result, the review team questions whether or not these founders can implement the plan for "enrolling the student and engaging the family."</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
II.J.(3) Description of Prospective Governance Expertise	GB members are listed with qualifications. Membership reflects (or will reflect) diverse experiences and skills necessary to oversee all aspects of the school.	GB membership reflects (or will reflect) some diversity of experience and skills.	GB membership reflects a lack of diverse experiences and skills, or no list is provided.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
III.A.(4) GB Selection of Members	The process described for selecting new GB members is focused on selecting leaders who have the skills necessary to govern the proposed school.	The process described for selecting GB members attends to the method of selection, but only vaguely addresses the qualifications for membership.	A plan to recruit GB with identified skill sets is not provided; or no specific needs or qualifications for GB members are listed.	<i>See summary.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				

Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>While the descriptions of the founders as well as the GB members is impressive, the fact that most of them do not appear to reside in the Gadsden Community seems to violate the entire premise of the school, which is based on a community-school model and even has the motto “Enroll the student, engage the family.” The review team agreed that it was difficult to articulate this concern under the rubric element for the “expertise” of “Governance.” It appears that many of the proposed GB members also do not reside in the Gadsden area—MD, KS, Santa Fe, NM etc. (39-40). This group has a myriad of relevant qualifications and experiences, however, their physical locations raised concerns among the reviewers.</i></p>
------------	---

**Score: 5.5 out of 8 possible points**

**B. GOVERNING BODY TRAINING AND EVALUATION**

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
III.B.(1) Governance Training	There is a plan for GB training that complies with state requirements and is supported by the budget.		There is no plan for GB training, or the training does not comply with state requirements, or the plan is not supported by the budget.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
III.B.(2) Governance Evaluation	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>Adequate information provided.</i>

**Evaluator Comments and Questions**

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

Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team agrees that this is an adequate plan.</i></p>
------------	--

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
III.C.(2)(3) Head Administrator Selection/ Evaluation	The administrator's qualifications are clearly described. Evidence of a plan to hire and evaluate a highly qualified administrator is provided.	The administrator's qualifications are described; however, there is no description of a process for hiring and evaluating the administrator.	The administrator's qualifications are not described, and there is no description of a process for hiring and evaluating the administrator.	<i>The review team decided that the applicant did clearly describe the administrator's qualifications; however, the comment "The HSA Governing Board, parent and student selection committee, guided by the Health Futures team, will interview finalists for the position of Head Administrator"(42) is a plan for "evaluating" the head administrator which the review team finds concerning. The Healthy Futures Foundation should not be involved in the hiring of the head administrator."</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				

Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team agreed that the applicant school does have adequate knowledge about the roles of the Governing Board and the administration. At the same time, like many other parts of the application, the review team agreed that the role of Healthy Futures Inc. in the future of the school is uncertain and at times (as suggested), inappropriate.</i></p>
------------	---

**Score: 3 out of 4 possible points**

D. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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 review team agreed that the role of Healthy Futures Inc. is not clear and this uncertainty of their influence is concerning. "Healthy Futures will interface with both the HSA Governing Body and the school Head Administrator to carry out the described tasks...Healthy Futures will continue to guide in the operation of Health Sciences Academy; however, it will have no special authority beyond that of an advisor"(43). There is confusion in much of what is written in this section regarding the head administrator and to whom he or she reports (43-44).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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 review team cannot find descriptions of roles making this school unique—"parent engagement coordinator" or "health instructor." The special education director cannot oversee 504 plans (Appendix D). The instructional assistant is "non-licensed and will "supervise the classroom when the teacher is out"(appendix D" which is not legal. In the description of the teacher it says that he or she will "provide</i>

				<i>counseling” to all students which is also not the job of a certified teacher.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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 review team did not see a process for interventions when a teacher is not performing. Additionally, there is no mention of training assistants on page 46 but there is in the job description. Accordingly, there is no mention of how you evaluate a teacher on his or her training of the assistants.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
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 Special Education plan does not demonstrate “enough support.” Also, the 7.5 health instructor appears to be a misprint, the review team thinks they meant .75 (48).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
	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 review team agreed that the .2FTE special education teacher is not viable, and the ancillary costs are not included or even considered (47).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1

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 review team would like to note that with the plan as it is written, it is difficult to see how a four subject day leads to students meeting their graduation requirements in credits. Also, how can dual credit happen on Friday (49)?</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
III.D.(6) Professional Development Plan	A plan for Professional Development is provided that supports the implementation of the school's educational plan, mission, and goals, and meets state requirements.	A partial plan for Professional Development is provided that partially supports the implementation of the school's educational plan, mission, and goals; or the development plan does not meet state requirements.	No Professional Development Plan is provided.	<i>The review team agreed that this explanation is often an explanation of assessing teachers' capabilities—"we also will require that each prospective teacher demonstrate personal competency on proprietary subject matter examinations, meet minimum achievement scores..."(49)—and responsibilities rather than simply a supportive PD plan.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <b><i>Overall, the review team agrees that the applicant school has many proposed entities and positions to carry out the mission of the school—Healthy Futures Inc., the GB, the administration, the teachers and instructional assistants, and the role of the special education teacher and the two “full-time ESL teachers”(30). However, the applicant often presents a confusing and potentially problematic relationship between these various entities and positions.</i></b>			

**Score: 8 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 checked="" 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.	Adequate information provided.  <b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b>
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.	Adequate information provided.  <b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b>
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.	Adequate information provided.  <b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b>
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.	The review team agreed that the applicant did provide the "employee grievance process" however, the proposal that an employee "discuss the complaint or grievance with the other party"(Appendix E pg: 6) in a hostile work environment is not an appropriate guideline.  <b>TEAM SCORE: 1</b>



Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><b><i>The review team agreed that there is not enough listed in this section. There is no mention of grievance forms or documentation, etc.</i></b></p>

**Score: 7 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 checked="" 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.	Adequate information provided.
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
III.F.(2) Complaint Resolution	The applicant provides a plan to receive and process concerns and complaints from the community and parents that assures a timely and meaningful response from the school administration and/or the GB.	A plan to receive and process concerns is provided, but it does not address how the concerns will be resolved by the school administration and/or the GB.	No plan to address community and/or parent complaints is provided.	The review team agreed that the plan provided does not address how the concerns will be resolved by the school administration or GB (52-53).

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
----------------------------------	--

The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team agreed that the applicant school does not fully respond to the entirety of the prompts. In this section the review team was not sure where the “resolution process” was in the response provided (53).</i></p>

**Score: 3 out of 4 possible points**

G. STUDENT POLICIES

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	There is a description of the Student Discipline Policies that complies with the Student Rights and Responsibilities set forth in the Public Education Department rules and regulations. An explanation is provided of how the school will take into account the rights of students with disabilities.	There is a partial description of Student Discipline Policies that complies with the Student Rights and Responsibilities set forth in the Public Education Department rules and regulations. A partial explanation is provided of how the school will take into account the rights of students with disabilities.	There is no description of the Student Policies or the policies provided; or the description does not comply with the Public Education rules and regulations.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b>  <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b>  <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b>				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The review team agreed that this section offers a reasonable response but fails to directly mention or cite laws that mandate their procedural process.</i>			

**Score: 4 out of 4 possible points**

## H. STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	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 aligns to the targeted population.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 2</b>  <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
III.H.(2) Lottery Process	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>TEAM SCORE: 1</b>  <i>The review team noted that the application says the first lottery date will be "early spring" which would not work. Also there is wording in this section that leaves for a lot of interpretation ("reasonable time") (56) etc.</i>
III.H.(3) Enrollment Process	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>TEAM SCORE: 1</b>  <i>The review team agreed that the process is not clearly delineated in order. Home language surveys cannot be part of the application process because of the appearance of racial profiling (56).</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>TEAM SCORE: 0</b>

	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>This was not included.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <i>The review team agreed that the applicant school does not yet fully understand how to write clear lottery and enrollment policies that are fair and equitable. Also, the applicant school appears to have left out disenrollment processes.</i>			

**Score: 4 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 checked="" 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.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 0</b> <i>The review team noted that this conflict of interest policy is not written for the Health Science Academy but for the Healthy Futures Inc. There is no mention of an Open Meetings Act. This is also written for a 501c3 not for a school (Appendix G page 2).</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.	<b>TEAM SCORE: 0</b> <i>The review team noted that this is not included and that the mention of several remote GB members could possibly violate the "Open Meetings Act."</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b>				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
<b>Evaluation</b>	Summary/Comments:			
	<b>Overall, the review team agreed that this section demonstrates potential conflicts between the Healthy Futures Inc. and the Health Sciences Academy.</b>			

**Score: 0 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 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.	N/A
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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.	N/A
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			

Score: 0 out of 0 possible points

K. WAIVERS.

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

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



**Score: 4 out of 4 possible points**

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

**Evaluator Comments and Questions**  
 The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.

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

**Score: 2 out of 2 possible points**

M. FACILITIES

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.M.(1) Projected Facility Needs	The applicant has attached appropriate documentation from the Public School Facilities Authority (PSFA) director that demonstrates the applicant's proposed capital outlay needs are in alignment with New Mexico public school facility requirements.		The applicant did not attach appropriate documentation from the PSFA director that demonstrates the applicant's proposed capital outlay needs are in alignment with New Mexico public school facility requirements.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2

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.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <i>Adequate information provided.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
IVA(1)910B5 Worksheet	The applicant has provided a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet using appropriate values and computations for each year of the 5-year budget plan.	The applicant has provided a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet for each year of the 5-year budget plan; however, there are minor mistakes in the computations.	The applicant did not provide a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet for each year of the 5-year budget plan, or the worksheet provided contains substantial errors, demonstrating a lack of understanding about New Mexico public school funding.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>Adequate information provided.</i>
IVA(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>The review team noted that there are no funds dedicated to food services, for ancillary services costs, for the adult education classes, or for the internal controls procedures or business policies in place.</i>
	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.	

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
IVA(3) Budget Narrative	The budget narrative is provided that explains basic assumptions, how those were determined based on reliable sources, and identifies priorities that are consistent with the school's mission, educational program, staffing and facility.	A limited budget narrative explanation is provided. Budgetary assumptions are flawed, or there is minimal connection to the school's mission, educational program, staffing or facility.	Little or no detail is provided in the budget narrative, OR there is no connection to the school's mission, educational program, staffing or facility.	<i>The review team would note that the salary schedule the applicant school provides is fine but the actual budget does not reflect this schedule.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
IVA(4) Strategies for Budget Control	The school provides a description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges. The adjustments are viable and realistic.	The school provides a description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges; however, the adjustments may not be viable or realistic.	The school does not provide a description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges, or the description of the adjustments is not viable or realistic.	<i>The review team agreed that as the applicant school names Adele Tutors and Health Futures as benefactors in the case that they do not receive enough money; letters of verification that these organizations are ready to support the school would strengthen the viability of this plan to meet financial and cash-flow challenges.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
IVA(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	A proposed salary schedule is provided for key staff, including teachers and administrators and 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>Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b>				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team noted that the description for the business manager is not detailed; also, the salaries for teachers appear low considering the high expectations of HSA's teachers—understanding and implementing a Health Science curriculum, utilizing virtual environments, and training instructional assistants—, school program and student performance. Also, the Physical Education teacher needs to make at least 30,000 and is budgeted at 12,000 (62).</i></p>			

## Score: 7 out of 10 possible points

### B. FINANCIAL POLICIES AND OVERSIGHT, COMPLIANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
VB(1)(2) Financial Policies and Internal Controls	Financial policies and internal controls are included, are sufficient, and comply with requirements and financial best practices. The policies demonstrate the financial capacity to support the school program.	The financial policies and internal controls are provided, but are deficient or do not comply with generally accepted accounting principles and financial best practices. The information provided does not demonstrate that the applicant understands New Mexico public school finance laws.	The school does not describe or address the financial policies.	<i>The review team noted that while some financial policies are included, the internal controls procedures and business policies are not provided (64).</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	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>The review team noted that while the applicant school provides a plan for finance and audit committees of the GB (64) there is no description of the details regarding these committees nor is there a demonstration of their work in preparation for external auditor.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
IV.B.(5) School Sustainability	The school has provided clear evidence that it has considered the sustainability of the school by describing long-range goals and strategies that will help build the school's capacity in areas such as governance, finance/budget, facilities, community relationships, student enrollment, charter compliance, 501(c)3, mission and vision, and performance objectives.	The school has provided some evidence that it has considered the sustainability of the school by describing long-range goals and strategies that will help build the school's capacity in areas such as governance, finance/budget, facilities, community relationships, student enrollment, charter compliance, 501(c)3, mission and vision, and performance objectives.	The school has provided no evidence that it has considered the sustainability of the school by describing long-range goals and strategies that will help build the school's capacity; or the evidence provided calls into question the long-term sustainability of the school.	<i>The review team is concerned by the assertion that: "Contract services for both Andele Tutors and Health Futures may be deferred and/or modified as necessary"(66). The application prior to this section listed Health Futures as playing merely an advisory role; in general, the role of Healthy Futures is so nebulous that the review team agrees that it's influence could be problematic.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <i>The review team noted that while the applicant school displays some knowledge of acceptable financial policies and procedures, they do not appear knowledgeable about all items necessary to run an efficient school.</i>			

**Score: 5 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<i>On page 67 the review team decided that there is limited evidence of support. There are "108 elementary, 35 middle, and 56 high school." This is not a proposal for an elementary school, so the support listed seems to coincide very little with the proposed school also, there is no evidence for "adult" interest for their evening classes.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2

V.C. Community Ties	The application provides a description of ties to the community and evidence of an understanding of the community and student needs that the school intends to serve.		The application does not demonstrate ties to the local community and/or any evidence that it is familiar with the community and student needs that the school intends to serve.	<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 is provided.			<i>Adequate information provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input checked="" 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>Adequate information provided.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:  <i>The review team agreed that the applicant school has shown sufficient evidence of community support.</i>			

**Score: 9 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: 1.5
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 review team would like to note that I and J were turned in late.</i>
<b>Evaluator Comments and Questions</b> The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			

**Score: 1.5 out of 2 possible points**

## Score Summary

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

	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 1	2	1.5
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 2	2	1
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 3	2	1
	<b>Section Total</b>	<b>48 – OR – 36</b>	<b>28</b>
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 1 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	0
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 2 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	1
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 3 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	0
	<b>Section Total</b>	<b>6 – OR – 0</b>	<b>1</b>
	II.F.(1) Curriculum Philosophy	2	1
	II.F.(2) Curriculum Philosophy/Approach Research/Data	2	1.5
	II.F.(3) Curriculum Description	2	1
	II.F.(4) Curriculum Research	2	2
	II.F.(5) Curriculum Overview	2	1.5
	II.F.(6) & (7) Curriculum Development Timeline & Instructional Program	2	1
	II.F.(8) Curriculum Alignment Timeline	2	2
	II.G.(1) & (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver, Element 1	2 – OR – 0	2
	II.G.(1) & (2) Graduation Requirements / Graduation Waiver, Element 2	2 – OR – 0	2
	<b>Section Total</b>	<b>18, 16 OR 14</b>	<b>14</b>
	II.H.(1) Instructional Strategies	2	2
	II.H.(2) Instructional Effectiveness	2	1
	II.H.(3) Differentiated Instruction	2	2
	<b>Section Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
	II.I(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 1	2	1.5
	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
	II.I(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 4	2	1
	II.I.(2) Students with 504 Plans	2	0
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 1	2	2
	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	2
	II.I.(3)(a) – (e) Special Populations: English Language Learners, Element 4	2	2
	<b>Section Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13.5</b>
	II.J.(1) Measuring Organizational Goals, If Applicable	2	1
	II.J.(2) Assessments to Measure Academic Goals	2	1
	II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Self Monitoring	2	2

		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Remediation & At-Risk Students	2	1
		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / School-Wide Practices	2	1.5
		II.J.(5) Reporting on Progress	2	1
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>12 – OR – 10</b>	<b>7.5</b>
III	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE	III.A.(1) Governance Description	2	1
		III.A.(2) Description of Founders' Expertise	2	1.5
		III.A.(3) Description of Prospective Governance Expertise	2	2
		III.A.(4) GB Selection of Members	2	1
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.5</b>
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Training	2	2
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Evaluation	2	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
		III.C.(1) Leadership & Management: Monitoring	2	2
		III.C.(2)(3) Leadership & Management: Administrator Selection/Evaluation	2	1
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
		III.D.(1) Organizational Structure	2	1
		III.D.(2) Job Descriptions	2	1
		III.D.(3) Staff Evaluation	2	1
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 1	2	1.5
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 2	2	1
		III.D.(5) School Day / Year	2	1
		III.D.(6) Professional Development Plan	2	1.5
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>
		III.E.(1) Employer/Employee Relationship	2	2
		III.E.(2) Personnel Policies	2	2
		III.E.(3) Staff Discipline Process	2	2
		III.E.(4) Grievance Process	2	1
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
		III.F.(1) Community Involvement	2	2
		III.F.(2) Complaint Resolution	2	1
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
		III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	2	2
		III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	2	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

		III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	2	2
		III.H.(2) Lottery Process	2	1
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 1	2	1
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 2	2	0
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>
		III.I.(1) Legal Compliance: Conflict of Interest	2	0
		III.I.(2) Legal Compliance: Transparency	2	0
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
		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
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4 – OR – 0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 1	2 – OR – 0	2
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 2 -- DISTRICT AUTHORIZATION ONLY)	N/A	N/A
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 3	2 – OR – 0	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4 – OR – 0</b>	<b>4 out of 4</b>
		III.L.(1) Transportation (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	N/A
		III.L.(1) Food Service (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>4 – 2 – OR – 0</b>	<b>2 out of 2</b>
		III.M.(1) Projected Facility Needs	2	2
		III.M.(2) Facility Plans	2	2
		III.M.(3) Projected Facility Costs	2	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV</b>	<b>BUSINESS PLAN</b>	IV.A.(1) 910B5 Worksheets	2	2
		IV.A.(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	2	1
		IV.A.(3) Budget Narrative	2	1
		IV.A.(4) Strategies for Budget Control	2	1
		IV.A.(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	2	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
		IV.B.(1)(2) Financial Policies and Internal Controls	2	1
		IV.B.(3) Financial Personnel	2	2
		IV.B.(4) Financial Oversight	2	1
		IV.B.(3) School Sustainability	2	1
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V</b>	<b>EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT</b>			
		V.A. Outreach Activities	2	2



		V.B. Evidence of Support	2	1
		V.C. Community Ties	2	2
		V.D. & F. Community Relationships (Optional Evidence of Support)	2	2
		V.E. Uniqueness of Proposed School	2	2
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>VI</b>	REQUIRED APPENDICES			
		VI. Appendices	2	1.5
		<b>Section Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.5</b>