

2010 CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION RECOMMENDATION & EVALUATION

| Name: Kids' College Academy Charter School | Projected Grades: K-8 | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Projected Enrollment: 360 Proposed location: Albuquerque | | | | |
| Founders: Cecilia Martinez-Sanchez and Fred Sedillo | | | | |
| Recommendation: I recommend that the Public Education Commission Deny the | | | | |
| application because it is inadequate and incomplete. | | | | |
| | | | | |

Kids' College Academy Charter School fails to demonstrate that the educational plan is focused to the proposed mission of the school. The application is filled with a list of instructional strategies with little if any connection to the total plan for the school. The application lacks substance and specificity in so many areas that it would require the founders to completely rewrite all areas of their application. The mission and the educational plan are incomplete and difficult to connect how the proposed school would measure the school and student outcomes.

The reasons for recommending denial of this application are based on the evaluation of each of the sections of the application:

The mission that is presented for the Kids' College Academy Charter School is inadequate. The mission statement lacks a specific, compelling focus that defines the essence of the proposed charter school. In addition, four of the six goals presented to measure the success of the school's mission do not meet the requirements of the SMART Goal format.

The educational plan fails to provide focus, clarity, and consistency of information. The application fails to provide a sufficient plan of development of the curriculum and does not identify what content areas will be addressed by the scope and sequence. Additionally, a description of the process and a specific timeline for alignment of the curriculum with New Mexico Standards are not included. The assessment system presented does not provide a clear academic accountability plan.

The financial plan is inadequate and incomplete. The application's five-year budget failed to provide consistent enrollment projections which led to a budget that did not support the educational and governance plans presented. The application's revenue and expenditure assumptions narratives do not include funding for all staff positions, and the budget provided is not supported by the narrative descriptions.

The application presents a governance structure that creates a conflict of interest for the head administrator. The policies and procedures set forth inappropriately provide mechanisms by

| which the governing body is involved in managerial processes. The staffing plan that is presented is not supported by the budget provided. The relationship between the governing body and the employees is not articulated clearly. |
|--|
| |
| |

Dr. Don Duran, Assistant Secretary of Education **CHARTER SCHOOLS DIVISION**

CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED EVALUATION

| Inadequate | Approaches | Meets | Exceeds |
|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | | | |

The Kids' College Academy Charter School mission statement lacks a specific, compelling focus that defines the essence of the proposed charter school. In addition, four of the six goals presented to measure the success of the school's mission do not meet the requirements of the SMART Goal format. Consequently, the mission statement fails to provide a focal point to guide the development and implementation of the proposed school and the goals fail to provide a clear accountability system to determine the school's success or failure for the proposed term of the charter.

EDUCATIONAL PLAN EVALUATION

| | Inadequate | Approaches | Meets | Exceeds |
|---|-------------|------------|-------|---------|
| ſ | \boxtimes | | | |

Although the proposed Educational Plan demonstrates knowledge of many educational programs, strategies, and assessments, it fails to provide focus, clarity, and consistency of information. A plethora of instructional strategies and methods are described, however, insufficient detail is provided to clearly understand the unifying philosophy aligning these strategies and methods, why the philosophy was selected, and how all of these educational approaches will combine to support the educational plan. Although a list of some topics for professional development is presented, the professional development topics do not align with all of the methods and programs outlined in the application.

The application fails to provide a plan of development for the curriculum for some content areas. It does not identify what content areas will be addressed by the scope and sequence. Additionally, a description of the process and a specific timeline for alignment of the curriculum with New Mexico Standards are not included.

Types of assessments are identified, yet a clear assessment plan for the school does not emerge from the narrative provided. Consequently, the accountability structure to measure the success or failure of the educational plan is inadequate.

Conflicting and inconsistent maximum enrollment information is presented which leads to disconnected plans for providing educational resources for students. Enrollment projections affect proposed revenue and proposed expenditures. Overall, the Educational Plan lacks sufficient detail, clarity and information to provide a clear picture of what students will experience in grades K through 8 in terms of educational climate, structure, materials, assessment and outcomes.

FINANCIAL PLAN EVALUATION

| Inadequate | Approaches | Meets | Exceeds |
|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | | | |

The Financial Plan narrative fails to align with the 5-Year Budget Plan. Information provided in the narrative regarding student projections, the grade-level phase-in plan, and proposed staffing over the 5-year period is inconsistent with and often conflicts with the SEG revenue projections and the Operating Budget. The application's phase-in plan is also described differently in different sections of the application. Funding sources have not been identified for some positions for which job descriptions exist. Required salary schedules for all staff are not provided. The narrative description of the revenue and expenditure assumptions does not provide sufficient detailed information to fully understand how longitudinal budgetary amounts were determined. Funds budgeted for specific line items appear to increase and decrease over the 5-year period with no clear rationale provided. The 5-year budget plan does not align with or clearly support implementation of the educational plan.

The failures of the Financial Plan submitted for this application cannot be remedied without substantial revision to this section and subsequent realignment with the Educational Plan.

GOVERNANCE / MANAGEMENT PLAN EVALUATION

| Inadequate | Approaches | Meets | Exceeds |
|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | | | |

Some question is raised as to the understanding of the role of the Governing Council of a charter school in relation to the legal authority and responsibilities of the school's Head Administrator. The Governing Council is involved in hiring and firing decisions for employees other than the head administrator, the discipline process for staff, and the staff evaluation process. The provisions included in policy and procedural statements for both the involvement of the head administrator on the Governing Council and the involvement of the Governing Council in staff and student management procedures are contrary to state law and regulation. The staffing plan does not match the staffing presented in the 5-year budget plan. The nepotism policy in the application does not reflect current law.

REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION

| Inadequate | Approaches | Meets | Exceeds |
|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | | | |

The application addressed all of the required components in this section, thereby addressing the legal liability and waiver responsibility of the governing body.