

2010 CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION ANALYSIS

School Name: **Sage Charter School**

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

I. CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

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

ANALYSIS: CHARTER SCHOOL MISSION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Mission Statement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mission statement fails to specifically identify “economically disadvantaged students” as the target population; yet, the application cites that it will know it is achieving its mission when “Student data shows the school’s ability to successfully narrow the New Mexico achievement gap for New Mexico’s economically disadvantaged students.” <p><u>Achievement of Mission/Goals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The broad statements generally describing the school’s overarching indicators for success are not written in SMART goal format. This section lacks significant detail and important additional information to be reasonably comprehensive in identifying organizational goals with clearly defined measures that are time-specific with target dates to assess meeting the organizational/school goals during the full 5-year term of the applicant’s proposed charter application. Each of the three organizational goals lacks significant detail, important additional information, definition, and measures to 	<p>Pages 34 and 40 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 34 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Pages 35-36 <i>[The applicant’s written response does not clarify measures for organizational goals #1 and 3.]</i></p> <p>Pages 35-36 <i>[The applicant’s written</i></p>

<p>ensure the applicant's ability to achieve improved outcomes in practice. Specifically, the three individual goals are not written as SMART Goals per the prescribed format found in the <i>2010 New Mexico Charter School Application – GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THE APPLICATION</i>. As stated, all three goals are single topic statements or titles: <u>Goal 1: Staff Professional Development</u>; <u>Goal 2: Governing Body Professional Development</u>; and <u>Goal 3: Diversity & Equity Education for Staff & Students</u>. For all three goals, the applicant then provides a description for each criteria rather than clearly defining that specific criteria within the actual goal itself. Specific expected results, indicators, and measures to clearly define what success will look like are missing. As presented, some of the criteria descriptors add additional goals within the “goal” identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Organizational Goal #1</u> addresses some of the criteria needed to articulate this goal in SMART terms; however, meaningful detail and additional important information to make this goal reasonably cohesive and comprehensive is lacking. The goal appears to identify two additional, different action goals: (1) Professional Development and (2) Data Collection to determine student achievement. Overall, the goal fails to provide metrics to adequately measure how the school will know its professional development (PD) efforts are working and how the school will determine academic success. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The measure suggested for professional development mentions budget entries to purchase PD materials <u>and</u> staff evaluations of the actual workshops. It is unclear how budget entries will provide a metric to measure successful PD efforts. The metrics to be used to measure what data from the staff evaluations will indicate success is missing. ➤ A metric to measure the successful implementation of teacher tools to be used for student recordkeeping and data collection to prove student success in closing the achievement gap is missing. A clear metric to measure student academic accountability is missing. ➤ The target date for PD cites only one training session. ➤ The data collection goal fails to indicate time-specific target dates for when this data collection will occur. • <u>Organizational Goal #2</u> includes additional goals, thus making it incomprehensible, confusing, and inadequate as written. Clear metrics to measure “legal and fiscal responsibility, competent and fair evaluation of the Head Administrator’s performance, and ‘understanding’ of the Montessori school operational progress and philosophy” are missing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The applicant fails to indicate how it will provide adequate “Montessori board training in order to understand Montessori school operational progress and philosophy,” and a clear metric to measure how the 	<p><i>response does not clarify all needed components to make their three organizational goals SMART goals.]</i></p> <p>Page 35 <i>[The applicant’s written response provides new information and does not clarify metrics/measures, what data will be collected, and time-specific target dates.]</i></p> <p>Page 35 <i>[The applicant’s written response does not clarify its measures and the data to be collected.]</i></p>
---	---

<p>school will know the governing body clearly understands these concepts is missing. The data to be collected to indicate success is not clearly identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Time-specific, target dates for completing this training are not clearly articulated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Organizational Goal #3</u> This goal fails to provide clear metrics to adequately measure how the school will know diversity and equity education staff training is effectively being implemented and yielding improved results. The data to be collected is not clearly identified. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Specific timeline target dates for the staff training are not addressed. ➤ The application fails to identify what specific data/information will be gathered from the “Community Data Surveys” and the metric(s) to be used to measure expected change. It is also unclear what measures will be used to “evaluate the benefits of community diversity.” Clear definitions are also not provided. ➤ Substantial concern is raised regarding the timeline and the school’s ability to adequately impact needed change with the 5-year target date timeline identified. The need for annual data review and potential change/revisions raises additional substantial concerns for the applicant to meet their goals in practice. <p><u>Explanation of Need</u> SCS specifically identifies their target population to be “low income,” but this is not reflected in the mission statement.</p>	<p>Page 36 <i>[The applicant’s written response does not clarify the measures for this goal.]</i></p> <p>Page 40 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>
--	---

II. EDUCATIONAL PLAN

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

ANALYSIS: CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Philosophy and Approach to Instruction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application states that the Montessori methodology was 	

<p>chosen based on supportive research data, including research from varied sources and research data confirming the success of “mixed-age” developmental groupings, hands-on learning, cosmic education, and an anecdotal listing of why Montessori was selected. In addition, reference is made to the publication titled <i>Montessori: The Science Behind the Genius</i> 2005, indicating that within the publication is current scientific research that "provides the most compelling data (to) show the Montessori Method to work equally well for children of various ability, ethnic, economic, and social backgrounds. To date, Montessori education is the most researched educational system in the world.” The application lacks significant detail that specifically cites any of these research points to support the stated conclusions. <i>Cosmic Education</i> is not listed as an approach to the instructional methods.</p>	<p>Pages 44-45 <i>[The applicant’s written response does not clarify research points to support the claims made.]</i></p>
<p><u>Description of the Curriculum</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant detail and important additional information describing the contents, instructional delivery, assessment, development, and implementation of curriculum for the "Student Service Learning" elective course are missing. 	<p>Page 95 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant detail and important additional information describing the contents, development, and implementation of curriculum for the "Project" course are missing. 	<p>Page 95 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant detail and important additional information describing the contents, development, and implementation of curriculum for PE and Music are missing. 	<p>Page 95 <i>[The applicant’s written response does not clarify the contents, development and implementation of curriculum for PE and Music.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant detail and important additional information for how and at what grade levels <i>The Six Traits of Writing – Portfolios</i> will be implemented are missing. 	<p>Page 106 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant detail and important additional information for how and at what grade levels the <i>Language from the Roots Up</i> curriculum will be implemented are missing. 	<p>Page 108 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaningful detail and additional important information 	<p>Page 87 <i>[The applicant’s written</i></p>

<p>identifying what set of skills will indicate mastery within the Measurable Outcomes is missing.</p> <p><u>Alignment with NM Standards</u> Significant detail and important additional information specifying how the Project and Student Service Learning courses and PE will be aligned to NM content standards are missing.</p> <p><u>Strategies and Methods</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The example presented, “Fundamental Needs of Man,” does not include the strategies, Cosmic Curriculum or Peace Education. These two strategies are not explained or detailed throughout the curriculum. • The concept of competition among students to create artificial motivation lacks meaningful detail and requires important additional information and research-based data to be reasonably comprehensive. An outline of what students are allowed or encouraged to compete for is lacking. It is unclear if students will be competing for grades, seating, recognition, etc. Meaningful explanation to support what the competition concept/framework would look like in a multi-age classroom is lacking. • Meaningful detail and important additional information about how the secondary “pod” groupings will be determined and how students in “pods” advance from level to level are missing. • Significant detail and important information to address how the proposed "Student Service Learning" and "Project" elective courses will be delivered are missing. Also missing are strategies and methods for the delivery of Music and required PE courses. 	<p><i>response clarifies outcomes; however, clear measures and metrics for the outcomes are not explained.]</i></p> <p>Page 95 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 79-80 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 84 <i>[The applicant’s written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 86 <i>[The applicant’s written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p>Page 79 <i>[The applicant’s written response does not clarify the strategies and methods to be used for delivering the Service Learning/Project, Music, and PE courses .]</i></p>
---	--

ANALYSIS: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<u>Length of School Day and School Year</u>	
<u>Grade Levels, Class Size and Projected Enrollment</u>	

<p><u>Graduation Requirements</u></p> <p>This section lacks meaningful and important additional information regarding its proposed graduation requirements. Specifically,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The required .5 credit Health course is omitted from the high school's graduation requirements, thus reflecting noncompliance with current graduation and elective requirements of 7 credits. ➤ The application proposes to identify two specific elective courses (of the seven required elective credits) to be <u>required</u> of all graduates -- <i>Student Service Learning</i> and <i>Project</i> -- thus changing the school's required graduation courses. This is not clearly articulated within the graduation requirements. 	<p>Pages 93-95 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant incorrectly cites 7.5 electives for graduation; per current statute, electives = 7 credits.]</i></p>
---	--

ANALYSIS: STUDENT PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Student-centered SMART Goals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section lacks significant detail and important additional information to be reasonably comprehensive in identifying student-centered goals with clearly defined measures that are time-specific with target dates to assess student performance during the full 5-year term of the applicant's proposed charter application. • Each of the three student-centered goals lacks significant detail, important additional information, definition, and measures to ensure the applicant's ability to achieve improved outcomes in practice. Specifically, the three individual goals are not written as SMART Goals per the prescribed format found in the <i>2010 New Mexico Charter School Application – GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THE APPLICATION</i>. As stated, the first goal is a single, topic/title statement: <u>Goal 1: Literacy – The Six traits of Writing – Portfolios</u>, and the second goal is a subject/course title: <u>Goal 2: Geometry/Math</u>. For all three goals, the applicant then provides a description for each criteria rather than clearly defining that specific criteria within the actual goal itself. Specific expected results, indicators, and measures to clearly define what success will look like are missing. As presented, some of the criteria descriptors presented add additional goals within the topic or subject/course goal provided. • Student-centered goals to address the required project-based component identified in this school's proposed educational plan 	<p>Pages 106-108 <i>[The applicant's written response does not define measures for Student Goals.]</i></p> <p>Pages 106-108 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify what the expected results, indicators, and measures to clearly define what success will look like will be and does not clarify measures.]</i></p> <p>Page 106 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>

<p>are missing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal #1 - <i>Literacy</i>: This "goal" is missing a clear definition for what specific literacy indicators it intends to assess, and clear metrics to measure specific literacy indicators/activities and student "improvement" and "success" are missing. The specific indicators of improvement/success and the specific data to be collected that will indicate that progress/achievement has been accomplished are missing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The goal states that SCS "will put forth extra effort, support, and instruction to meet the needs of low achievement and special needs students" yet fails to identify the specific activities that will be implemented to accomplish these strategies/ tasks. Further, the goal fails to address how it will serve the specific needs of <u>all</u> students. ➤ The timeline only identifies reviewing student's performance expectations for one full year and fails to identify clear metrics to measure growth. Plans for assessing students for years 2-5 are missing. Expectations for HS students are missing. ➤ The specific "teacher assessment and feedback" components are missing. The specific data to be gathered and information to be assessed from the formative assessment cumulative writing samples contained in portfolios is not identified. ➤ Identification of when and what the "multiple opportunities for writing and assessment of written work" is missing. Expected outcomes with clear metrics to measure improved results are missing. ➤ Identification of when and how much "additional instructional time" will be expected is missing. Expected outcomes with clear metrics to measure improved results/growth are missing. 	<p>Page 106 <i>[The applicant's written response provides new information.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify the specific activities to be implemented to meet the needs of low achievement and special needs students.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify clear metrics to measure growth or expectations for HS students.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify what data will be gathered and what information will be assessed from the formative writing samples.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify when and what the multiple opportunities for writing and assessment of written work will be, and expected outcomes with clear metrics are also not provided.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify when and how much additional instructional time will be expected, and expected outcomes with clear metrics to measure for improvement/growth are not provided.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written</i></p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identification of clear measures reflecting how much "narrowing the New Mexico Achievement Gap for all students" is expected to be is missing. • Goal #2 <i>Geometry/Math</i>: This "goal" is missing metrics to measure expected improvement of 1st-6th grade students' math and problem solving skills. Further, specific metrics to measure expected improvement/growth of students' formative assessment results of geometry tests and portfolios are missing. ➤ Clear metrics to measure how much students will "meet or exceed" state levels of proficiency in Geometry and NMSBA testing are missing. Expected levels of improvement of student scores in Geometry are missing. ➤ The timeline only identifies reviewing student's performance expectations for one full year and fails to identify clear measures to define growth. Plans for assessing students for years 2-5 are missing, and expectations for HS students are missing. • <i>Vocabulary</i>: This "goal" is not concisely or correctly stated but does appear to address all criteria, though the grade levels to be assessed are not specifically articulated (“for every new student and as a review for Montessori students as well.”). ➤ Specific measures to indicate expected student outcomes for the grades 4-8 "Language from the Roots Up" curriculum are missing. Expected outcomes for years 2-5 are also missing. ➤ Expected outcomes that will indicate improvement/progress for student lessons and weekly tests are missing. Identification of the measure and timeframe for “continue to improve thereafter” for student scores on the NMSBA are missing. Grade 	<p><i>response does not clarify clear measures for narrowing the NM achievement gap.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify metrics to measure expected improvement for grades 1-6 math and problem solving skills, and metrics to measure expected improvement/growth of formative assessment results in geometry and portfolios are also not provided.]</i></p> <p>Page 107 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify clear metrics to measure how much students will meet or exceed state proficiency levels in Geometry and NMSBA testing. Also not clarified are expected levels of improvement of student scores in Geometry.]</i></p> <p>Pages 107-108 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern except for the missing HS expectations.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify specific measures for grades 4-8 "Language from the Roots Up" curriculum.]</i></p> <p><i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify time frame, measures for the English/Language and Latin</i></p>
--	---

<p>levels are also not identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Meaningful detail, important additional information, and measures are lacking to demonstrate how “The Montessori English/Language curriculum timelines exceeds the NM Benchmarks. . .” ➤ Significant detail is missing to clearly define what time span “through the grades over the years. . .” refers to, and a specific measure and metric to indicate improvement starting from the “lower elementary” in the Latin and Greek curriculum implementation is missing. <p><u>Alignment</u></p>	<p><i>and Greek curriculum, and also does not clarify what the time span covered "through the grades over the years."]</i></p>
--	--

ANALYSIS: PLAN FOR EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Types of Assessments</u> Specific short-cycle assessments to be implemented and NMSBA are not identified as required assessments in this section.</p> <p><u>Timeline for Achievement</u> Substantial concern is raised about the applicant's expectations for student achievement, particularly for those students who may be several grade levels below grade level, to meet grade level proficiency in one year as stated in the application. The application fails to provide a description of how the school will adequately support such students to achieve grade level proficiency in one year.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application fails to make a distinction between remediation and corrective action. • This section is underdeveloped; significant detail and important 	<p>Page 109-110 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 115 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify expectations for below grade level students to meet proficiency nor provide a description of how the school will adequately support such students to achieve grade level proficiency in one year.]</i></p> <p>Pages 113 and 115-119 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Pages 115-119 <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies their</i></p>

<p>additional information are lacking to identify the specific adjustments the school will make to improve student performance and/or help the school to meet the NM standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial concerns about the applicant's understanding of being a state chartered school with LEA status are raised regarding the following plan to be implemented for students at SCS. Per the application, "<i>H. A student who does not demonstrate academic proficiency for two successive school years shall be referred to the student assistance team for placement in an alternative program designed by the school district. Alternative program plans shall be filed with the department.</i>" The charter school may not directly transfer students to another district school because the student fails to demonstrate academic proficiency for two successive years. Parent and student choice must determine such decisions. <p><u>Remediation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section lacks significant detail that identifies the specific research-based assessments that will be used. A distinction was not made with elementary and secondary students and the requirement of payment for remediation and extended day programs. This section addresses some of the criteria but lacks meaningful detail about what will be done by teachers in the classroom for remediation. What teachers will do when students lack the skills needed for success in a particular activity is not clearly stated in the plan. <p><u>Additional Assessments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial concern is raised about the applicant's understanding of the difference among "assessment strategies and data" and the evaluative instruments/tools that are used to determine progress. Didactic, discussion, "traditional Montessori assessment philosophy and methods, Montessori approach, consensus building, responsibility, lesson plans . . ." 	<p><i>understanding of corrective action and expected responses per school AYP designations. However, this response does not address activities to meet individual student performance corrective action needs.]</i></p> <p>Page 117 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 109-110 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify the specific research-based assessments to be used.]</i></p> <p>Page 116 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Pages 115-119 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Pages 110-111 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify the understanding of the differences.]</i></p>
--	---

<p>are examples of strategies, tools, and methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mastery levels for grades K-3 and 5-12 are missing. Significant detail and important information are missing that clearly define SCS' expectations and criteria for mastery. A "Checklist of Mastery of Criteria" to be used to track and monitor "the growth and development of each learner" is mentioned but not clearly explained. <p><u>Documentation and Reporting</u> Substantial concern is raised about the applicant's understanding of reporting requirements as a state chartered school (LEA); reporting to the local school district is not required.</p>	<p>Page 111 <i>[The applicant's written response does not address mastery levels and expectations.]</i></p> <p>Page 119 <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies that a typo appears in this item; LEA needs to be replaced with NMPED.]</i></p>
---	--

ANALYSIS: SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Modifications to meet Individual Student Needs</u> Significant detail and additional important information are lacking about what instructional modifications may be implemented for ELL/ESL students.</p> <p><u>Special Education Plan</u></p> <p><u>Access to Ancillary Services</u></p>	<p>Pages 122-125 <i>[The applicant's written response provides new information.]</i></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><u>Revenue Projection Form 910B5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section lacks meaningful detail and requires additional important information to explain why revenue student membership (SEG) projections don't match the application 	<p>Pages 126 and Appendix C <i>[The applicant's written response provides new</i></p>

<p>membership (SEG) projections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For grades K-8 in year 1 are cited to be 292 membership, however, the 910B5 reflects projections for 280 membership (mem). ➤ Year 2 is cited to be 332 mem, but the 910B5 reflects mem projections for 320. ➤ Year 3 mem projections are cited to be 372 mem, but the 910B5 reflects mem projections for 360. ➤ Year 4 is cited to be 412 mem, but the 910B5 reflects mem projections for 400. ➤ Year 5 mem projections are cited to be 452, but the 910B5 reflects mem projections for 440. <p><u>Operating Budget</u> Funding for fine arts, physical education, and Bilingual staff to adequately support the instructional program is missing.</p> <p><u>Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contract services budget fails to include counseling expenditures. • The narrative fails to provide a description for the Related Service personnel expenditure. <p><u>Revenue Sources Other Than SEG Funds</u></p> <p><u>Expenditure Assumptions for Other Than SEG Funds</u></p>	<p><i>information.]</i></p> <p>Appendix C <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify funding for fine arts, PE, and Bilingual staff.]</i></p> <p>Page 128 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies these concerns.]</i></p>
---	--

ANALYSIS: FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Fiscal Management Plan</u></p> <p><u>Internal Control Procedures</u> The description of “Segregation of duties” addresses some of the criteria but lacks meaningful detail and requires important additional information to be reasonably comprehensive. No position has been identified in the application that will be involved in cash and varied transactions relative to supply, equipment, and purchases.</p> <p><u>Annual Audit of Financial Operations</u></p>	<p>Page 131 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concerns.]</i></p>

IV. GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

ANALYSIS: GOVERNANCE /MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Governance and site-based management structure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaningful detail and important information to be reasonably comprehensive is lacking about the community outreach, parents, PTC, students, and Student Council roles and relationships as delineated in the organizational chart. The narrative descriptions cite the volunteer and assistive nature of these components, but the downward arrows between these components suggests a “reporting” structure between and among these components. • The application states that the Head Administrator and Business Manager “shall serve <i>ex-officio</i> on the Governing Body.” This is noncompliant with NM law, which does not allow any employee of the school to be a member <u>on</u> a Governing Body. Section 22-21-1NMSA 1978 prohibits such individuals from serving on the board. <p><u>Organizational chart and narrative description</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational chart addresses some of the criteria but requires important additional information. The following positions, which were identified in other areas of the application, are missing in the organizational chart: Related Services, Secretary, Information Systems, and Custodian. Additionally, there is no narrative description for these positions. • The application states that the “arrows represent two-way communication.” While communication appears to be open and two-way, the organizational chart fails to identify a clear reporting structure or a relationship connection between the governing body and the administration. 	<p>Pages 136 and 140-142 <i>[The applicant's written response does not address the reporting structure concern.]</i></p> <p>Page 138 <i>[The applicant's written response provides new information by stating that the Head Administrator and Business Manager will compliantly be serving only on the audit and finance committees.]</i></p> <p>Page 136 <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies that these positions were purposely omitted from the organizational chart.]</i></p> <p>Page 136 <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies that the narrative that is provided presents a correct interpretation of the organizational chart reporting structure; however, the organizational chart as</i></p>

	<i>depicted is inadequate.]</i>
--	---------------------------------

ANALYSIS: DESCRIPTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Governing Body policies and procedures</u> The Head Administrator requirements fail to identify hiring, firing, evaluation, and disciplinary action of employees as duties.</p> <p><u>List of governing body members and qualifications</u></p>	<p>Page 148 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify the concern for this missing information in this specific section.]</i></p>
<p><u>Staff, families, and community involvement in governance</u> This section addresses some of the criteria but lacks meaningful detail and requires important additional information to identify specifically how families and the community may be actively involved in the governance of the school other than occupying the one seat on the governing body.</p>	<p>Page 153 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern. This was inadvertently cited in error by the reviewer.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Description of site-based management structure and job descriptions for all organizational chart positions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job descriptions for the “Related Services” position, Educational Assistants, Secretary, Information Systems position, and Custodian job descriptions are missing. • A description of the site-based management structure and relationships for these positions is also missing from this section. <p><u>Years 1-5 staffing plan with pupil-teacher ratio supporting educational plan</u></p>	<p>Pages 136, 154-159 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify these missing job descriptions.]</i></p> <p>Pages 154-159 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify the missing site-based management structure information.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>School’s personnel policies and procedures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A description of and implementation procedures for the required teacher mentoring program for all first-year teachers is missing from this application. The <i>Personnel Manual</i> cites “the Human Resources Department;” however, the organizational chart fails to identify a Human Resource (HR) position and funding for HR is missing from the application. Information citing who will be responsible for HR activities and compliance is missing. <p><u>Proposed salary schedules for all employees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application directed the reader to “the aligned salary scale table depicted below” for the Head Administrator’s salary information – the table is missing. The minimum annual salary level for Educational Assistants is noncompliant with current NM statute. <p><u>Evaluation process for staff</u></p> <p><u>Staff discipline process</u></p> <p>Due process procedures for all employees are missing from this application and are not specifically addressed in the personnel manual. Meaningful detail and important information to be reasonably comprehensive are missing. The progressive discipline process states that “a number of tools” may be used “to motivate, correct, and/or discipline employees, including but not limited warnings, reprimands, suspension with or without pay, and discharge, as determined to be appropriate in each individual circumstance.” Substantial concern is raised for the applicant’s understanding of required due process procedures and levels of correction/appeal and the ability of the applicant to meet personnel requirements in practice.</p>	<p>Appendix A <i>[The applicant's written response concurs with this omission; new information for implementation of the teacher mentoring program was added to Appendix A.]</i></p> <p>Appendix A, page 11 & Appendix C <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies that the Head Administrator will be responsible for all HR matters.]</i></p> <p>Page 160 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify the omission of the Head Administrator's salary table.]</i></p> <p>Page 162 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p> <p>Appendix A, page 15 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES AND DISCIPLINE POLICY

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>School enrollment policies and procedures</u> The applicant fails to adhere to the guidance provided by CSD regarding the enrollment and lottery process. This section fails to indicate that the number of available openings (for each grade level) for each lottery will be publicly published. Applicant does not comprehend that first come first served only applies after total spaces have been noted during the published enrollment periods and there are still spaces available. Student information other than contact and grade level information should not be taken prior to a lottery or the need for a lottery is determined.</p> <p><u>Lottery process</u></p> <p><u>Description of proposed student discipline policy</u></p> <p><u>Proposed student discipline procedures (appendix)</u></p>	<p>Pages 166-167 <i>[The applicant's written response does not clarify its enrollment and lottery processes.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: FACILITIES – IF “NO”

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Explanation of school’s facility needs to support educational plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Site 1 property does not meet the school’s plans to have at least 5 acres; this Wyoming Blvd location site is 2.5 acres. • The application indicates that “SCS is providing descriptions of two proposed sites it is interested in that meet the requirements of 22-8b-80 NMSA 2006.” Only “Site 1” information is provided; information for a second site is missing. <p><u>Reasonable plan for identifying and securing adequate facility</u></p> <p><u>Proposed capital outlay needs</u></p>	<p>Page 173 <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies this concern by clarifying that "ideally" the site would have 10 acres and the school is actually looking for land to be donated.]</i></p> <p>Page 173 <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies that the reference to two sites is a typo.]</i></p>

ANALYSIS: OTHER STUDENT SERVICES

Criteria Not Sufficiently Addressed, Concerns & Additional Questions	Reference
<p><u>Transportation</u></p> <p><u>Food Service</u></p> <p><u>Student access to other services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section lacks significant detail and clear definition for the specific counseling, health, or additional services that it will contract out for on an as need basis. <p>Meaningful detail and important additional information are missing for funding health, counseling, and other additional contract services. Per the budget narrative, funding to provide additional services is only identified for “instruction and administrative needs.”</p>	<p>Pages 175 and 128 & Appendix C <i>[The applicant's written response clarifies that SCS will not provide counseling, health or additional services, unless a qualified student enrolls in the school.]</i></p> <p>Page 175 and Appendix C <i>[The applicant's written response satisfies the concern.]</i></p>