



**2010 CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION ANALYSIS**

**School Name: Kids’ College Academy**

**Review Date: 8/27/10**

**I. CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED**

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

**ANALYSIS: CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<p><b><u>Mission Statement</u></b></p> <p>The mission statement is broad and lacks a focus that defines the essence of the school.</p>	<p>page 14  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information. Only clarifications that were requested in the preliminary analysis are permissible.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Achievement of Mission/Goals</u></b></p> <p>The two “Organizational Framework” goals do not meet SMART Goal criteria. The first goal is unclear as to what “school-wide systems” will be measured and what metric defines being “in alignment and working as an integrated system”. The second goal lacks a specific metric to define “consistently”.</p> <p>Two of the three Student Achievement organizational goals lack a specific measurable target. “More” is not a clearly defined level of achievement.</p>	<p>page 18  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 18  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Explanation of Need</u></b></p>	

## II. EDUCATIONAL PLAN

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

### ANALYSIS: CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><b><u>Philosophy and Approach to Instruction</u></b></p> <p>“Rigor, relevancy and relationship” (W.R. Daggett Ed. D.) is described as the focus for delivery of instruction through a collection of differentiated research-based programs. However, the application lacks meaningful detail in describing the essence of “rigor, relevancy and relationships” and how, as a philosophy, it will provide the required focus for delivery of the many approaches to instruction. Numerous programs and strategies are identified, including Multiple Intelligences, differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, small groups, hands-on inquiry based learning, workshop model teaching, learning in all content areas within heterogeneous, homogeneous flexible grouping, best practices for English Language Learners (ELL) instruction, Guided Language Acquisition Design (G.L.A.D.), extended learning time, an alternative calendar, and a K-8 seamless configuration. A clear description, however, of how all of these educational approaches will combine to support the educational plan is not provided.</p>	<p>pages 25-26  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Description of the Curriculum</u></b></p> <p>Some programs have tentatively been identified for instruction in Language Arts, Math and Science, but not at all grade levels. Programs or curriculum needed to complete a vertical K-8 alignment have been neither selected nor developed.</p> <p>The description of the curriculum for Social Studies, Technology, Visual and Performing Arts, and Physical Education lacks sufficient information and detail to determine whether or not it has been developed or will be selected/purchased. No plan is provided for development and/or selection/purchase of the curriculum for these areas.</p> <p>The applicants indicate that the full scope and sequence is to be developed by members of the Governing Council by December 1, 2010;</p>	<p>pages 26-28  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>pages 26-28  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 28  <i>[The applicant’s written</i></p>

<p>however, details such as the process to be used, which content areas will be addressed, and resources to be utilized in the development are not provided.</p> <p>The Mission Statement and supporting core values presented on pages 14-17 include references to career goals, career paths and a career development component; however, the description of the curriculum fails to provide a clear plan or enough details to understand how career development will be a curricular focus in alignment with the mission.</p>	<p><i>response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>pages 14-17 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Alignment with NM Standards</u></b></p> <p>Although an assurance is provided that KCAC will implement a curriculum aligned to New Mexico Standards, the alignment process and specific timeline to be used is not provided.</p>	<p>pages 28-29 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Strategies and Methods</u></b></p> <p>The application lists seven topics for professional development. The topics include Marzano strategies which have been unmentioned to this point in the application. No explanation or rationale is provided as to why these topics were selected from among the many strategies and methods listed for possible implementation. Insufficient information is provided to ensure that all teachers will be trained for implementation of all the methods and programs outlined in the application.</p> <p>The Mission Statement includes reference to students becoming bilingual. The 910B5 projects that all students will be counted for bilingual funding and receive 3 hours of bilingual instruction. This funding is dependent on approval of an application. However, the educational plan does not clearly provide information in regard to a specific Bilingual Model as identified by the NM Public Education Department and required for the application process.</p>	<p>pages 31 and 25-26 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>910B5 Provided in Appendix <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>

**ANALYSIS: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<p><b><u>Length of School Day and School Year</u></b></p> <p>Because the application does not identify what is incorporated in the school day (i.e., whether lunch is included in the 7.5 hours Monday through Thursday and the 3.5 hours on Friday) it is not possible to correctly calculate the total number of instructional hours.</p>	<p>page 32 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Grade Levels, Class Size and Projected Enrollment</u></b></p> <p>The total projected full enrollment stated on page 33 does not agree with the full enrollment stated on the Application Cover Sheet, page 5. On page 33, Maximum enrollment is stated as <b>320</b> K-8 students with an</p>	<p>pages 5 and 33 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new</i></p>

indication that there will be an additional 30 preschool students. On the Application Cover Sheet, page 5, full enrollment is stated as <b>360</b> plus 30 preschool students.	<i>information.]</i>
<b><u>Graduation Requirements (if applicable)</u></b>	
N/A	

### ANALYSIS: STUDENT PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b><u>Student-centered SMART Goals</u></b> <p>The three annual student-centered performance goals (Reading, Math and Written Language) lack a specific measurable target. “Better than average” is not a clearly defined level of achievement.</p>	<p>page 34  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<b><u>Alignment</u></b>	

### ANALYSIS: PLAN FOR EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b><u>Types of Assessments</u></b> <p>The listing of the assessments to be used fails to provide the proposed school’s overall assessment plan specific to grade levels, what is being measured, and when. For example, the DIBELS is not available through the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level; the NM Standards-Based Assessment is not administered until the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade level. DBAs are defined in this application’s Acronyms List (Appendix F) as Data Based Assessments, but referred to in the narrative as District Benchmark Assessments. A specific comprehensible description of the assessment plan is lacking.</p>	<p>pages 35-36  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<b><u>Timeline for Achievement</u></b>	
<b><u>Corrective Action</u></b> <p>Based on the definitions provided in the Application glossary, “corrective action” is not addressed and is confused with “Remediation for students not achieving standards”.</p>	<p>pages 36-37  <i>The applicant’s written response provided new information.</i></p>

<p><b><u>Remediation</u></b> Remediation is addressed under “corrective action” indicating confusion.</p>	<p>pages 36-37 <i>The applicant’s written response acknowledges the concern.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Additional Assessments</u></b></p>	
<p><b><u>Documentation and Reporting</u></b></p>	

**ANALYSIS: SPECIAL POPULATIONS**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<p><b><u>Modifications to meet Individual Student Needs</u></b></p>	
<p><b><u>Outline of Special Education Plan</u></b>  A brief outline of a special education plan is included; however it is written primarily in the form of assurances and includes insufficient detail to provide a clear picture of how special education will be managed in the proposed school. The plan does not address specifics or examples of the continuum of services to be offered, examples of modifications and accommodations, documentation, professional development for staff, or other similar details.</p>	<p>pages 40-41 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Access to Ancillary Services</u></b></p>	

**III. FINANCIAL PLAN**

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

**ANALYSIS: BUDGET**

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions			Reference																																												
<p><b><u>Revenue Projection Form 910B5</u></b></p> <p>The Form 910B5 SEG Revenue Projection figures and the proposed phase-in plan provided in the application <u>do not match</u>.</p> <p>The first year SEG Revenue is based on 200 K-4 students; the first year phase-in plan indicates 160 K-3 students. This inconsistency continues throughout the 5-year plan.</p> <p>The inconsistencies in the application phase-in plan (page 6 and 32-33) and the SEG Revenue Plan (Form 910B5) are shown below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">PHASE IN PLAN</th> <th colspan="3">SEG REVENUE PLAN</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Grade Levels</th> <th>Projected enrollment</th> <th>Year</th> <th>Grade Levels</th> <th>Projected enrollment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>K-3</td> <td>160</td> <td>1</td> <td>K-4</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>K-4</td> <td>200</td> <td>2</td> <td>K-5</td> <td>240</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>K-5</td> <td>240</td> <td>3</td> <td>K-6</td> <td>280</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>K-6</td> <td>280</td> <td>4</td> <td>K-7</td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>K-8</td> <td>320</td> <td>5</td> <td>K-8</td> <td>360</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			PHASE IN PLAN			SEG REVENUE PLAN			Year	Grade Levels	Projected enrollment	Year	Grade Levels	Projected enrollment	1	K-3	160	1	K-4	200	2	K-4	200	2	K-5	240	3	K-5	240	3	K-6	280	4	K-6	280	4	K-7	320	5	K-8	320	5	K-8	360	<p>pages 6 and 32-33, Form 910B5</p> <p><i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>		
PHASE IN PLAN			SEG REVENUE PLAN																																												
Year	Grade Levels	Projected enrollment	Year	Grade Levels	Projected enrollment																																										
1	K-3	160	1	K-4	200																																										
2	K-4	200	2	K-5	240																																										
3	K-5	240	3	K-6	280																																										
4	K-6	280	4	K-7	320																																										
5	K-8	320	5	K-8	360																																										
<p><b><u>5-Year Budget Plan</u></b></p> <p>Inconsistencies continue between the application narrative and the 5-Year Budget Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, on page 41 the application uses the \$1,247,250.24 SEG figure which is based on 200 projected students and indicates that 10 certified teachers will be hired. In the same paragraph, the proposed plan is based on 160 projected students and the illustration addresses 8 teachers to be hired.</li> <li>On page 47 under “Instructional Assistants”: The application states that there will be 2.0 FTE Instructional Assistants in year one, increasing to 3.0 FTE in Years four and five. The budget plan for year one includes 2.5 FTE instructional assistants then drops to 2.0 FTE for years two and three, then increases to 3.0 FTE in years four and five.</li> </ul>			<p><i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>(page 41 under VI.A. BUDGET)</p> <p>page 47</p>																																												

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On page 69-70 under Projected Staffing: The 8 classroom teachers at a 20:1 ratio would be based on the proposed 160 students in year one. The 5-year budget plan indicates 10 classroom teachers, which would be correct based on the 200 students reflected in the Form 910B5 SEG revenue projection.</li> <li>• The Instructional Coach Position cited on page 56 as a member of the Academic Leadership Team and described on page 68 as responsible for the duties of Curriculum Specialist, Professional Development Coordinator and Assessment coordinator is not included in the SEG budget plan and no other source of funding is indicated.</li> <li>• The Designated Nurse or trained Nurse Assistant position(s) described on page 69 as a member of the school’s crisis team is not included in the SEG budget plan and no other source of funding is indicated.</li> <li>• The Technology Teacher is not included in the SEG budget plan and no other source of funding is indicated.</li> <li>• The Special Education Teacher is not included in the SEG budget plan and no other source of funding is indicated.</li> <li>• The Internal Control Procedures refer to responsibilities of the bookkeeper, pages 52-53. A bookkeeper is not identified in the SEG budget, no other source of funding is indicated, and there is no indication that this duty will be assigned to a position that is included in the budget.</li> </ul>	<p>pages 69-70</p> <p>pages 56 and 68</p> <p>page 69</p> <p>page 69</p> <p>page 69</p> <p>pages 52-53</p>
<p>The following statement on page 42 implies that the staffing for this charter school, if approved, has already been determined: “The professional development we have outlined will be provided by our own staff that are certified in ESL, GLAD strategies, Baldrige (or other continuous improvement model). In addition, we have three staff members who are national Baldrige presenters on data driven instruction, school-wide systems and classroom systems. All staff development training will be provided in-house with no cost to the charter.” This statement identifies a lack of understanding of the hiring authority provided in law for charter schools. A charter school’s head administrator is hired by the governing body of a charter school and that administrator is responsible for hiring all other staff. It is not possible for the governing body to have entered into any employee/employer relationship at the time of submission of the application.</p>	<p>page 42  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions</u></b></p> <p>The salary of the Vice Principal increases approximately 37% over the 5-year period, the Director’s salary increases approximately 13%, and classified staff salaries increase from 20-30% over the 5-year period. Over the same time period, teacher salaries remain constant and demonstrate a 0% increase throughout the 5-year period. A rationale for the variances in salary increases is not provided.</p> <p>Required salary schedules for all staff are also not provided.</p>	<p>5-Year Budget Plan  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant’s written</i></p>

<p>The narrative description of the revenue and expenditure assumptions does not provide sufficient detailed information to fully understand how budgetary figures were determined. Some examples from pages 46-49 follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No rationale is provided to understand why 18 teachers will be hired for years 4 and 5 when based on the 910B5 student projections of 320 for year 4 and 360 for year 5, 18 teachers would not be required until year 5 when grade 8 would be phased in.</li> <li>• No rationale is provided to understand why legal services for the first and second year of operation are budgeted at \$2,000 and significantly increases to \$20,000 in years three and four.</li> <li>• No rationale is provided to understand why the amount budgeted for Natural Gas/Propane drops from \$10,000 in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of operation to \$8,000 in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year of operation when the additional classrooms will be phased in.</li> <li>• Communication Services lacks detailed information to comprehend why year 3 is budgeted at \$40,000 when years 1 and 2 are at \$5,000 and years 4 and 5 are at \$8,000.</li> <li>• No rationale is provided to understand why “Other Contact Services” is budgeted at \$2,000 in year one, \$40,000 in year 2, \$35,400 in year 3, \$37,567.96 in year 4 and \$5,000 in year 5.</li> <li>• No rationale is provided to understand why food for student nutrition purposes is budgeted at \$0 for year 1, \$10,000 for years 2 and 3, \$8,108.01 for year 4 and \$0 for year 5.</li> </ul>	<p><i>response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>pages 46-49  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Revenue Sources Other Than SEG Funds</u></b></p> <p>Revenue sources other than SEG funding are listed (e.g., Lease Assistance, Instructional Materials, IDEA A and B, Title I, E-rate grants, federal start-up funding, private sector grant opportunities); however, projected amounts are not provided.</p>	<p>page 50, top  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Expenditure Assumptions for Other Than SEG Funds</u></b></p> <p>The narrative for expenditure assumptions for other than SEG funds lacks significant detail by merely mentioning the types of revenues that may be applied for and requested and not what these funds will be used for.</p>	<p>page 50  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>



**ANALYSIS: FISCAL MANAGEMENT**

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><b><u>Fiscal Management Plan</u></b></p> <p>The Fiscal Management Plan contains a reference and blank spaces that indicate it was not for KCAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 44 indicates that <b>the district</b> will estimate anticipated special education enrollment for the charter school based on the <b>district's</b> special education average enrollment and fund the charter school based on that number is incorrect. As a state-chartered school, Special Education funding is received directly from the state. The district is not involved in allocating the special education funding.</li> <li>• Several blank spaces exist on pages 43, 47 and 52 in the Fiscal Management Plan narrative that were not filled in with the school's name (or other information).</li> </ul>	<p>page 44 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>pages 43, 47, 52 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Internal Control Procedures</u></b></p>	
<p><b><u>Annual Audit of Financial Operations</u></b></p> <p>The descriptions provided regarding the annual audit are inconsistent. On page 43 under Financial Plan and on page 61 under Audit, the application states that KCAC agrees to contract with an independent, outside auditor, pay for it and provide the audit results to PED. On page 55 under Annual Audits, the application correctly states that the school will be audited as a component unit of the Public Education Department and will be responsible for paying its proportionate share.</p>	<p>pages 43, 61 and 55 <i>[The applicant's written response provided new information.]</i></p>

**IV. GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT PLAN**

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

**ANALYSIS: GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b><u>Governance and site-based management structure</u></b>	
<b><u>Organizational chart and narrative description</u></b>  In the narrative addressing how the school will be governed, the Academic Leadership Team is identified as consisting of the Director, Vice Principal and the Instructional Coach. The Instructional Coach position is not included in the organizational chart, not included in the SEG operating budget, and no information is provided in regard to sources of funding other than SEG for the position.	pages 57-58 and 68 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>

**ANALYSIS: DESCRIPTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b><u>Governing Body policies and procedures</u></b>  On page 61 the application states that “The Governing Council’s major duties, responsibilities will include: . . . Approving all major educational and operational policies. . . . Approving all major contracts.” The Governing Council should approve <b>all</b> educational and operational policies and all contracts.	page 61, bottom <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
<b><u>List of governing body members and qualifications</u></b>	
<b><u>Staff, families, and community involvement in governance</u></b>	

**ANALYSIS: SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b><u>Job descriptions for all organizational chart positions</u></b>  A job description is provided for the Instructional Coach position; however it is not included on the organizational chart, is not included in the SEG operating budget, and no information is provided in regard to other sources of funding for this key position of the Academic Leadership Team.	pages 57-58 and 68 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>

<p><b><u>Years 1-5 staffing plan with pupil-teacher ratio supporting educational plan</u></b></p> <p>The staffing plan for each year of the first charter term presented on page 69 does not match the 5-year budget plan. (See notes in Budget section above.)</p>	<p>page 69 and Budget  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
---	--

**ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS**

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><b><u>School’s personnel policies and procedures</u></b></p> <p>The Reference to the Nepotism Policy in Charter Schools Act [22-8B-10] is outdated; Statute has been updated to include “brother, brother-in-law, sister or sister-in-law”.</p> <p>Certified teachers and Educational Assistants will operate under a 182-day contract; in addition, they will have an additional 20 professional development days. No information is provided in the narrative or the budget to indicate how the 20 additional days will be funded.</p> <p>“The Director will be a member of the Governing Council without voting privileges. The Governing Council may choose to vote the authorized agent (which may be NMPED as an ex-officio member of the Governing council with no voting privileges).” Section 22-21-1 NMSA 1978 prohibits such individuals from serving on the board as ex-officio members.</p> <p>The following sentence under “Proposed Employee Contracts” on page 74 is incomplete and does not sufficiently explain how a contract with employees will be executed: “Written employment contracts between KCAC and the governing council.”</p> <p>Insufficient information is provided to clearly understand the meaning of the following paragraph: “The Governing council will be consistent with the best practices of the Non-Profit Corporation Act, 1995, in developing the responsibility of running the charter school to the charter school Administrator.” No documentation or citation is provided for the Non-Profit Corporation Act, 1995. Additionally, the statement: “. . . developing the responsibility of running the charter school to the charter school Administrator” is not understandable.</p> <p>The following provisions included in the Employee Relations subsection incorrectly identify the Governing Council as having ultimate firing authority for the school:</p>	<p>page 73 top  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 74  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 73  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 74  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 75</p> <p>page 75  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 75  <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On page 75 under “Contracted Staff”: “Dismissals from the school faculty and/or staff must be reviewed and approved by the Governing Council.”</li> <li>“The Governing council will not be involved in the day to day details of running the school, dealing with specific personnel issues (unless a conflict arises with the Director’s hiring, or addressing individual student needs).”</li> </ul>	<i>response provided new information.]</i>
<p><b><u>Proposed salary schedules for all employees</u></b></p> <p>Proposed salary schedules are not provided.</p>	<p><i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Evaluation process for staff</u></b></p> <p>The following provision in the “Proposed Formal Staff Evaluation Process” presented on pages 79-80 incorrectly identify the Governing Council as having ultimate firing authority for the school:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“In the event of an evaluation rebuttal, the teacher reserves the right to address the Governing Council. The Governing Council will than make a decision based on information presented in a closed-session which the director will not attend. The decision made by the Governing council will follow with an open meeting with said employee.”</p>	<p>pages 79-80 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p>
<p><b><u>Staff discipline process</u></b></p> <p>The proposed staff discipline process presented on pages 81-82 incorrectly provides the Governing Council with a role in disciplining the employees. Discipline is entirely under the control of the administrator. For example, on page 81 under Step 2, the employee does not have the right to a hearing as stated:</p> <p>“The employee may make a written request within ten days of presentation of the complaint/grievance to the Director for a hearing. If a written request is not timely submitted, the grievance shall be considered resolved. If submitted in a timely fashion, the Governing Council President/designee will schedule a closed hearing within ten days of the request, before a committee composed of staff, parent and community representatives.”</p>	<p>pages 81-82 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i></p> <p>page 81</p>

**ANALYSIS: STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES AND DISCIPLINE POLICY**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<p><b><u>School enrollment policies and procedures</u></b></p> <p>The following statement is with information provided for the first year projected enrollment and grade-level phase-in plan presented in the</p>	<p>page 83 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new</i></p>

application: “KCAC will open its doors to students in Kindergarten through 6 <sup>th</sup> grades in July, 2011.” The phase-in plan indicates that in July, 2011, KCAC will open with K-3. The budget, however, indicates K-4. This statement indicates that KCAC will open with K-6.	<i>information.]</i>
<b><u>Description of lottery process</u></b>	
On page 84, the application states: “Special consideration for enrollment acceptance will be given if a sibling is already enrolled in KCAC.” This is permitted only after the first year of operation.	page 84 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>
<b><u>Description of proposed student discipline policy</u></b>	
<b><u>Proposed student discipline procedures (appendix)</u></b>	

**ANALYSIS: FACILITIES – IF “NO”**

<b>Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns &amp; Additional Questions</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b><u>Explanation of needs of a facility that will support educational plan</u></b>	
<b><u>Reasonable plan to identify and secure an adequate facility</u></b>	
<b><u>Proposed capital outlay needs</u></b>	
Projected requests for capital outlay assistance for the school are not provided.	page 90 <i>[The applicant’s written response provided new information.]</i>