

Name of Proposed School: StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School

Date of Application Team Analysis: July 18, 2012

Team Members:

Brad Richardson (Team Lead)

Mary Scofield

Greta Roskom

APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM ANALYSIS SCORE SUMMARY

SECT. NO.	APPLICATION RUBRIC SECTION	POINTS RECEIVED	APPLICANT SCHOOL'S POSSIBLE POINTS
I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3.33	4
II.	EDUCATION PLAN/ ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK	85.21	112
III.	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE/ ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK	39.26	68
IV.	BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	10.5	18
V.	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	9.32	10
VI.	REQUIRED APPENDICES	1	2
	OVERALL SCORE	148.62	214

StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School, Application 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 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.	<i>The team agreed that the summary focused too little attention on the proposed school's model, its components, how they combine to support the needs of the identified community and assures high outcomes. As a result, the team did not have a clear picture of the StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School model.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 2
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments <i>The Team agreed that the Executive Summary did not provide a cohesive and comprehensive plan. First, the summary did not provide an adequate description of the "StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School" model. Instead, the summary captured the neighborhood's identified needs and interests, as well as the deficiencies of the Santa Fe Public Schools in addressing those needs. Further, the summary failed to capture various components of the StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School model that appear in the full application, such as the proposed school's STEM component.</i>			

Score: **3.33** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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 team agreed that the mission statement appears to be less the mission of the proposed school and more the mission of the StarShine Academy company: "...grow the world's best schools..." "At StarShine Academy ...it's our mission"). The subsequent endorsement of StarShine Academy by the United Nations arguably belongs later in the application, as it has to do with evidence that this model works.</i> <i>The team noted that this section does provide a glimpse into the various components that make up the model of the proposed school.</i> <i>This section fails to include mention and discussion of STEM as part of its model (compare with the text in the academic growth goal # 2, p.12; and Appendix "I").</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>The vision is ambitious and laudable, but the goals are too generalized to understand how the school will know if it is being successful. The team notes that the vision statement includes long-term success indicators: "StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School will consider an individual student's post high school job preparation, college completion and career path as an indication of StarShine's academic performance indicators..."</i> <i>The team expressed concern that these indicators will not allow the proposed school to make needed adjustments until years after students actually experience the</i>

				<p>program.</p> <p>Finally, the team noted the prominence "Peace" is given to the proposed school, appearing in the school's name. The team expected greater weight to be given to the significance of peace (peace education, peace building, etc.) to both the mission and vision and the model of the school. Peace building, however, features as only a passing reference in the school's vision and is not discussed in the Executive Summary as an identified need.</p>
<p>Evaluator Comments and Questions</p> <p>The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.</p>				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p>The team agreed that this section needed a focused and clear mission and vision of the proposed school rather than that of the corporation developing the school. The team would like to have seen success indicators of the vision that provided school governance and administration with more immediate measures of success. Greater emphasis on peace and peace building as a key component to the school's model was expected.</p>			

Score: **4 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance				TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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.	<i>The team expressed concern that this goal is linked to AYP, given that the state has moved away from AYP and towards state grading, as part of its waiver agreement with the US Department of Education.</i> <i>The team was not certain what is meant by a "passing" score ("proficient"?).</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 team agreed that due to the ambiguity of the wording of the goals, it was difficult to conclude with certainty that the goals aligned with the school's mission and vision.</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 team agreed that the AYP goal drove down the score of this element.</i>
II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth				TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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 goals tend to employ terms that are too vague to be measurable and do not reference reliable measuring instruments. In addition, the goals introduce elements that appear unrelated to the mission and vision (e.g., STEM program, p.12). The goals listed here appear not to measure academic growth:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal II measures student satisfaction. • Goal III measures attendance. • Goal IV was listed under Academic Performance. • Goal V measures student participation in service learning projects.

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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 goals as written do appear to align with the school's mission and vision; however, the goals are not all appropriate for this category.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input 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 team agreed that the goals as written meet the descriptor under "Partially Meets".</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gaps	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>The team agreed that the goal does not address student subgroups, rather it appears to address the achievement of students who are working below their expected grade levels.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 team had to assume that the goal aligns with the school's mission and vision to help all students with "pre-collegiate readiness."</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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>No reliable measuring instrument is referenced, and the goal is not clearly time bound.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>

II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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 was slightly concerned that the goal itself does not consider the transient population it is serving, although the narrative after the goal describes measures the school will take to mitigate against family relocations due to employment.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</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.(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 measurable, 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>The goal does not define “success” in a “rigorous high school curriculum” or “on at least one AP examination.” The team assumes that success must be related to the students’ GPA, and a score of 3 or better on AP examinations. Hence, it is difficult to know if all the identified indicators are sufficiently rigorous.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
	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>Terms, such as “success” and “knowledge”, etc. render these goal statements difficult to measure precisely.</i>
II.D.(7) Graduation Rate	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	The school has appropriate and manageable goals that address graduation rates that are rigorous and reflect high expectations.	The school has goals that are measurable, 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.66
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 measurable, 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>There appears to be no goal statement in the text provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.66
	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>There appears to be no goal statement in the text provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.66
	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>There appears to be no goal statement in the text provided.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The team determined that many of the goals lack the precision necessary for the school to build a data collection / monitoring system to determine if it is achieving its goals (Student Academic Performance, Student Academic Growth, Addressing Achievement Gaps, High School College Readiness). In one instance the goal statement appears to be missing (Achievement Growth of Lowest Scoring 25%).</i>			

Score: 37.43 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 type="checkbox"/>	
II.E Organizational Goals				TEAM SCORE: 1
	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.	<i>The team agreed that the goals as written will not allow the school to manage all of them successfully.</i> <i>The first goal is not time bound; the second goal is not precise. The goals listed under "Other Goals" are not clear or measurable. In addition, these goals appear to be replaced by a different set of "Other Goals" on pages 42 – 43 ("Measuring Organizational Goals").</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 1.5
	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>Organizational goals 1 through 3 appear to align with the school's mission and vision, although they all lack the clarity and precision needed. The Other Goals, 1 through 3, are not clearly written (p. 14).</i>
				TEAM SCORE: 0.66
	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>With the exception of Goal 3, the organizational goals as written do not lend themselves to monitoring progress.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The team found the organizational goals lacking clarity and precision. The team also noted that goal number three was "borrowed" form the McCurdy Charter School Application (2011). The Other Goals appear to have suffered from lack of proof reading. The team further noted that the Other Goals are replaced on pages 42 – 43 ("Measuring Organizational Goals"), hence the team was left unclear as to which goals it needed to evaluate.</i>			

Score: **3.16** 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.66 <i>The team noted that the text relied heavily on the McCurdy Charter School application (2011).</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>No curriculum development timeline is provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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>The plan partially addresses grade levels K – 8, but there appears to be no mention of grade levels 9 – 12. The team noted that StarShine Academy company states that it has an already developed or partially developed curriculum.</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.(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>Assurance is provided that Core Knowledge aligns to New Mexico Standards and Benchmarks. No such assurance appears to be provided for the curriculum related to grade levels 9 – 12. No timeline is provided.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: N/A
	Waivers, if applicable, state what the waiver is and why school is seeking it.		Waivers, if applicable, are included but without explanation.	<i>No waivers are being sought.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The team was concerned about the lack of clarity about the curriculum for grade levels 9 – 12. It noted that the StarShine Academy company may already have developed curriculum, but no mention is made about adapting that curriculum to meet the needs and interests of the local, identified student population. The application suggests that teachers will be hired towards the end of the school's planning year, so the team concluded that little to no adapting of the curriculum will be made prior to the school's opening.</i></p>

Score: **14.32** out of **16** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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.	<i>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<i>Minimal explanation is given on how the instructional strategies effectively support different student needs.</i> <i>There is no clear description how the physical space of the K – 12 school will be configured.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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.	<i>The application provided a list of strategies that a teacher might employ, but no examples were provided (p. 28).</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments:			
	<i>The team agreed that the instructional strategies were drawn from a fairly standard repertoire with no compelling explanation as to how the StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School model is supported by the strategies. The team was also concerned about how the instructional strategies are supported by the physical layout of the school.</i>			

Score: **4.66** 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: 1.33 <i>Assurance is provided that the school will comply with all federal and state laws and rules related to special education services. This assurance is supplemented with lists. No indication, however, is given how this will happen at the proposed school. Nor is there any distinction made between students with learning and physical disabilities, and gifted students.</i>
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.33 <i>No plan appears to be provided detailing how the school will regularly monitor progress of Special Education students (p. 35).</i>
	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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>Alternate assessment is stated only for grades 3 – 5. There does not appear to be a description of the school's plan for assisting special education students through graduation.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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>Assurance and brief descriptions are provided for all of the ancillary services that are indicated in students' IEP's and 504 Plans. No explanation is provided, however, for how the services will be adequately budgeted.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
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 application provides only a checklist of what goes into a 504 Plan.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
II.I (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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	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>The budget supports only one (1) teacher of ESL, a number that appears insufficient given the target population as described in the Executive Summary.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The school provides appropriate levels of assurance that federal and state statutes and rules will be complied with. However, the team observed that the narration tends to rely on standard text about the laws, rules, and guidance, rather than on how the StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School will implement those within the context of its model.</i>			

Score: 13.82 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>There is a different set of organizational goals than the ones provided under II.E. (Compare the text on pp. 42 – 43 and pp 14 – 15).</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.33 <i>StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School has identified the following assessments: Core Knowledge Assessments, Galileo and Stanford 10 will be offered each year; Robert Marzano Institute will provide research-based assessments, progress monitoring and screening tools, to be used at all grade levels. Questar provides end of year assessments for Core knowledge. There appears to be no described assessment plan and schedule.</i>
II.J.(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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.66 <i>This section is well-researched and suggests that the developers will use assessment results. The team agreed, however, that the discussion remained mostly at the theoretical level and did not clearly show how the proposed school will actually make use of assessment results.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
	<p><i>Remediation/At-Risk Students</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>Remediation/At-Risk Students</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>Remediation/At-Risk Students</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>The school has described some strategies for teacher interventions in the classroom for students whose test results suggest that they have not mastered the material.</i></p> <p><i>The text in this section shifts unexpectedly from a description of corrective action (RtI) to the school's accreditation plan (pp. 44 – 46). Presumably this was missed in proofreading.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
II.J.(5) Reporting on Progress	<p><i>School-Wide Practices</i></p> <p>The school has provided a comprehensive plan to analyze data, identify school-wide practices that need to be changed, and implement the necessary adjustments in order to improve student outcomes.</p>	<p><i>School-Wide Practices</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>School-Wide Practices</i></p> <p>The school does not provide a plan.</p>	<p><i>There appears to be no plan to monitor and adjust school-wide practices as necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Evidence of how data will be used in Professional Development appears to be missing.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The school provides a plan, but it does not include communication of student assessment and progress to all identified parties.</p>	<p>There is no plan provided to communicate assessment results or student progress.</p>	<p><i>The application provides a general communication plan, but the team was concerned about the intention of broadcasting student results to the community. The school did not describe what would be broadcast, hence the review team could not determine if FERPA would be violated.</i></p>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The team agreed that this section contained varying degrees of adequate and incomplete responses to the prompts, with the response to one prompt contradicting information that was provided elsewhere in the application (Organizational Goals), and the response to another prompt shifting unexpectedly to a description of the school's accreditation plans. With other responses, the text provides only partial information.</i></p>

Score: **7.82** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<p><i>The team was concerned that the governing body is being tasked with hiring the top administrative staff, as distinct from hiring the school’s head administrator only. This is contradicted, however, in the Appendix “B”, under “Powers of the Governance Board”, bullet 2). Here the governance board hires only the school’s director.</i></p> <p><i>The above suggests that the applicants may be blurring the lines between governance and administration. The governance responsibilities (accountability) list is missing its role in ensuring high student performance, and ensuring the provisions of the charter contract are complied with.</i></p> <p><i>The team expressed some concern about the Audit and Finance Committee of the governance board developing Budget Adjustment Requests, as distinct from reviewing and recommending them to the governance board (Appendix “B” under “Standing Committees of the Governance Board”).</i></p> <p><i>The team also expressed concern about having the business manager sign checks (Appendix “B”, under “Miscellaneous”; Checks, Drafts, Etc.).</i></p> <p><i>The Audit and Finance Committees need to be separate (Appendix “B”, “Standing Committees of the Governance Board”).</i></p>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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>The response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The team had several concerns regarding the roles and responsibilities of the governance board, as described in this section. See the notes above.</i>			

Score: 7 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 1</p> <p><i>The application does suggest requiring and providing additional hours of training, beyond state requirements. However, the state requires that 5 hours of mandated training must be at state-approved venues.</i></p> <p><i>There is concern that the budget does not allocate sufficient funds to meet the expenses associated with the stated annual training expectation.</i></p>
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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 1.33</p> <p><i>There is reference to a governing board evaluation, but there is no apparent plan. (Qualities are listed, but no plan is present.)</i></p>
<p align="center">Evaluator Comments and Questions</p> <p align="center">The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.</p>				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The review team appreciated the proposal that additional hours of governance training will be required; however, the application is not clear that a minimum of 5 hours of training must be conducted at state-approved training (pp. 49 – 50).</i></p>			

Score: **2.33** 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	<p><i>The team agreed that this section provides a list of the qualities of an effective board, and a list suggesting that an annual board evaluation will take place. These lists, however, do not provide a complete description of the evaluation of the school's governance board.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, these lists do not include among the indicators the ability of the governance board to demonstrably further the mission and vision of the school (p. 51).</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
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.	<p><i>Starshine Academy company's "qualities" rubrics / descriptors are provided, presumably used in evaluating administrators, but there does not appear to be a narration describing the evaluation process (pp. 52 – 59).</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
<p align="center">Evaluator Comments and Questions</p> <p align="center">The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.</p>				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The team agreed that the responses in this section were incomplete.</i></p>			

Score: 2.99 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 type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	<p><i>The review team agreed that the text describes shared qualities of high performing schools with middle grades, but does not describe organizational structures and relationships between and among administrative, teaching, and support staff.</i></p> <p><i>The text also appears to be relevant only for district schools, as it references districts, district staffs, and feeder schools (p. 59).</i></p> <p><i>There appears to be no organization chart in the application.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0
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.	<p><i>The job descriptions are inconsistent in stating licensure / certification requirements (Appendix "D").</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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.	<p><i>A rubric for evaluation is provided, but no process or plan is described.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.66
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.	<p><i>The review team was concerned that the text indicates that the governing body hires all certified and administrative positions (p.67). This responsibility is assigned differently throughout the application, suggesting that the school developers do not recognize the appropriate distinctions between governance and management.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.33

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.33
	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.	<p><i>The staffing plan suggests 13.5 teachers in year 1. The application contemplates 400 students with a student: teacher ratio of 12:1, which should suggest the need for 33 teachers in year 1. (A plan for phasing in grades was not provided.)</i></p> <p><i>A staff of 41 is listed in the plan, but the budget accounts for a staff of 40.</i></p> <p><i>There is concern that the school will be able to secure a business manager for \$30,000/year. The staffing plan does not appear to indicate the number of working days expected of this position.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.33
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.	<p><i>The summer professional development plan does not appear to be supported with sufficient funding. These include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>School site visits</i> <i>CORE Knowledge & Paideia Conferences</i> <i>Starshine Boot Camp</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The review team was concerned about this section of the application. Without an organizational chart and a narrative that provides greater insight into how this school will be organized, the team had difficulty evaluating the sufficiency of the plans.</i>			

Score: 6.31 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 0.66 <i>This team noted that this section of the application relies heavily on the McCurdy Charter School (2011) application, with dates left unchanged (p. 71). The team was concerned that in borrowing the text, the school founders had not given this part of the application considered thought.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<i>The team noted again that the school developers relied heavily on the McCurdy Charter School Application (2011) to complete this section of the application (pp. 71 – 72). Without carefully reviewing these policies and how they might apply to this school, the developers did not recognize that some of the policies may not in accordance with NMPSIA, ERB, and 218A. The Personnel Policies appear to lack Reduction In Force, and Furloughs.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
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.	<i>The team expressed some concern about the discipline process described, which is briefly and broadly written and lacking clarity. The role, if any, of the Governance Board in the process, including appeals, is unstated (p. 73). This text seems at odds with what appears in the employee handbook. There is no text covering staff discipline; instead there are offenses that are grounds for the termination of employment (Appendix "E").</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.16
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.	<i>Response days for the aggrieved differ from the application section III.E.(4) – 10 days; and the Appendix E – 7 days.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The team agreed that in relying too heavily on the responses from another charter school's application, StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School developers did not demonstrate that they had given this part of the application considered thought. The application did not reflect how these elements aligned with StarShine Academy Lisa Law Peace School's own mission and vision. The team was also concerned about the absence of the school's discipline policy in the employee handbook.</i>			

Score: 3.82 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 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.	<p><i>The application indicates that all interested parties' voices will be included in governance, leadership, advisory bodies (p. 74).</i></p> <p><i>It is not clear why the student service learning component is included in this section. The service learning component described in this section (p. 74) does not appear to be covered in the Education Plan.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input 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.	<p><i>The complaint resolution process does not provide a timeframe.</i></p> <p><i>The complaint process implicates the involvement of the "State Superintendent of Public Instruction". The team noted that New Mexico does not have a State Superintendent.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1
<p>Evaluator Comments and Questions</p> <p>The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.</p>				
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>See the notes above.</i></p>			

Score: 2 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 type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input 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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.33 <i>The student discipline policy, appearing as Appendix F, is difficult to understand.</i>
III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	The application and/or student discipline policy describes how the school will address alternative educational settings for eligible students who are long term suspended or expelled that is consistent with the Students' Rights and Responsibilities.	The application and/or student discipline policy describes how the school will address alternative educational settings for eligible students, but fails to demonstrate an understanding of the school's legal obligations.	The application does not address alternative educational settings for eligible students.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>The alternative placement addresses primarily the excluded student's homework. The review team did not see a complete policy that spoke to any identified alternative opportunities for excluded students to continue their education.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>See notes, above.</i>			

Score: **2.33** 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 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 markets to the targeted population.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 1.66</p> <p><i>This section includes a wide range of activities, geared for students at all levels. The review team agreed that the activities would work best after the school is in full operation.</i></p> <p><i>The team would like to have seen outreach and student recruitment activities that will lead up to the 1st operational year.</i></p> <p><i>The team did note that the text in this section was repeated several times.</i></p>
III.H.(2) Lottery Process	The lottery procedures are clearly explained and comply with state statutes. Tentative dates are provided.	The lottery procedures are partially explained. Tentative dates may or may not be provided.	The lottery procedures are not explained or do not comply with state statutes. Tentative dates are not provided.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 2</p> <p><i>The response is adequate.</i></p>
III.H.(3) Enrollment Process	The school has a clear description of the enrollment process that is in full compliance with state statutes.	The school has an enrollment process that is in partial compliance with statutes.	No description of the enrollment process is provided; or the enrollment process is not in compliance with statutes.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 2</p> <p><i>The response is adequate.</i></p>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0.33
	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.	<p><i>No conditions for dis-enrollment appear to be provided. Instead there is only an assurance that the school will comply with statute.</i></p>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The team found that the responses in this section to be generally adequate, with the exception of the conditions for dis-enrollments.</i></p>

Score: 5.99 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.83 <i>The conflict of interest policy needs to include the state's expanded definition of "family".</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 0
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.	<i>There is no reference to complying with the Open Meetings Act and the Public Records Act in this section. The team noted, however, that within Appendix "B" (Governing Documents), governing board members are expected to familiarize themselves with several New Mexico rules, including the Open Meetings Act.</i> <i>That said, there is no explanation of how the school will comply with these statutes.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The team agreed that the explanation about complying with the Open Meetings and Inspection of Public Records Acts are missing from the application.</i>			

Score: 1.83 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 does not sufficiently 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.	TEAM SCORE: N/A <i>Not Applicable</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: N/A <i>Not Applicable</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Not Applicable</i>			

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 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.	TEAM SCORE: N/A <i>Not Applicable</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: N/A
	(This is to be completed only by schools seeking local district authorization.) 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.		(This is to be completed only by schools seeking local district authorization.) The school has provided a list of authorizer policies for which a waiver is requested; however, the rationale for the waiver not included.	<i>Not Applicable</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: N/A
	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>Not Applicable</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Not Applicable</i>			

Score: 0 out of 0 possible points

L. TRANSPORTATION AND FOOD

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
III.L.(1)Transportation	The school states whether or not it plans to offer transportation to its students. If yes, the school has provided a clear description of how transportation will be provided that is supported by the proposed budget.	The school has stated whether or not it plans to offer transportation to its students. If yes, the school has provided only a partial description of how student transportation will be provided. The plan is supported by the budget.	The school has not stated whether or not it plans to offer transportation to its students. Or, if stated, the school does not provide a description of how student transportation needs will be met; or the plan is not supported by the budget.	TEAM SCORE: 1.33 <i>The team agreed that the response provided is not a plan.</i>
III.L.(2)Food Services	The school states whether or not it plans to offer food services to its students. If yes, the school has provided a clear description of how food services will be provided that is supported by the budget.	The school states whether or not it plans to offer food services to its students. If yes, The school has provided a partial description of how student food services will be provided. The plan is supported by the budget.	The school has not stated whether or not it plans to offer food services to its students. Or, if stated, the school does not provide a description of how the food services will be met; or the plan is not supported by the budget.	TEAM SCORE: 1.33 <i>The team agreed that the response provided is not a description of how student food services will be provided.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>No clear plans are provided in the responses above.</i>			

Score: 2.66 out of 4 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 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.	TEAM SCORE: 0 <i>While the Facility Master Plan was included as appendix "I", no letter from PSFA was attached.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 2 <i>The response is adequate.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 0 <i>The description of the proposed school's projected capital outlay needs was not included.</i>

Evaluator Comments and Questions	
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.	
Evaluation	<p>Summary/Comments:</p> <p><i>The team noted that significant elements from this section were missing from the application.</i></p>

Score: **2** 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 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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 0.5</p> <p><i>The review team agreed that the T&E factor used may not be sustainable.</i></p> <p><i>The team expressed concern that the average salary appears to be \$37.5K.</i></p>
IVA(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	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.	<p>TEAM SCORE: 1</p> <p><i>The 5-Year budget is provided but is only partially aligned with the staffing, as the staffing plan calls for 41 staff, but the budget accounts for 40.</i></p> <p><i>The student:teacher ratio is meant to be 12:1, but the budget supports only a student:teacher ratio of 33:1.</i></p>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input 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 team noted that the school's budget narrative does not appear to acknowledge that Federal stimulus funds are not available.</i> <i>Further, a full-day Kindergarten is required and paid for by SEG.</i>
IVA(4) Strategies for Budget Control	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.5
	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 expressed some concern that unidentified dollars will be used for advertisements. The applicants need to be reminded that state funds (SEG) may not be used for recruiting students.</i>
IVA(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
	A proposed salary schedule is provided for key staff, including teachers and administrators that 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>The response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions				
The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The budget and budget narrative contain assumptions that raise concerns, noted above.</i>			

Score: **6** out of **10** possible points

B. FINANCIAL POLICIES AND OVERSIGHT, COMPLIANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

Topic	Ranking			Comments & References
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input 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.	TEAM SCORE: 1.5 <i>The team noted that many of the required policies and internal controls appear to be in place, with assurance provided that others will be developed and approved before operations commence. The team was concerned that these need to be in place prior to the governing board being made a public board of finance.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 0 <i>The review team is concerned that the proposed school has allocated insufficient funds to ensure adequate personnel to provide an appropriate separation of duties. The school's Director is not assigned finance activities.</i>
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.	TEAM SCORE: 1 <i>The review team noted that the text referred readers to Appendix "B" to find the description of how the governing body will provide proper legal and fiscal oversight. Assurances are given that this body will exercise control and oversight, but no clear plan how this will happen is provided.</i>

	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 2
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 response is adequate.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>The review team was concerned about two elements: what appears to be inadequate staffing for appropriate separation of duties, and the lack of clarity (plan) how the governing body will exercise its fiscal oversight. The lack of clear and compelling responses in these two critical areas may set the stage for a lax fiscal accountability environment.</i>			

Score: 4.5 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 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>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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>The team could not ascertain if the numbers represented a limited polling (only those within walking distance from the proposed site), or limited interest. Nevertheless, the evidence (numbers) provided is anecdotal.</i>
	Meets—2 <input type="checkbox"/>	Partially meets—1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not meet—0 <input type="checkbox"/>	TEAM SCORE: 1.66
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>The ties to the community is represented by the time founders and proposed board members have spent within the community and various conversations held with community members.</i> <i>The team would have appreciated neighborhood or local community leaders taking an active role in developing the school.</i>

	Meets—2 <input 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 are provided.			<i>The response is adequate.</i>
	Meets—2 <input 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>The response is adequate.</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 has some concerns about the level of actual interest in the school as well as the apparent lack of involvement of community members in the development of the school.</i></p>

Score: 9.32 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
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>PSFA documentation in Appendix "I" is missing. E-mail sent to the school developers on 7/23/12 providing them with an opportunity to submit a the missing Appendix I. Appendix I was received on 7/24/12.</i>
Evaluator Comments and Questions The application reviewer has opportunity to take notes on the application.				
Evaluation	Summary/Comments: <i>Concerns noted above.</i>			

Score: **1** out of **2** possible points

Score Summary

Section Number	Description	Elements	Possible	Score
I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			
		Element 1	2	1.33
		Element 2	2	2
		Section Total	4	3.33
II.	EDUCATION PLAN			
		II.A. School Size	2	2
		II. C. Mission	2	1
		II. B. Vision	2	1
		Section Total	6	4
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 1	2	1.33
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 2	2	1.66
		II.D.(1) Student Academic Performance Goals, Element 3	2	1.66
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 1	2	1.33
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 2	2	1.33
		II.D.(2) Student Academic Growth Goals, Element 3	2	1
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 1	2	1
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 2	2	1.66
		II.D.(3) Addressing Achievement Gap, Element 3	2	1.66
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 1	2	2
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 2	2	2
		II.D.(4) Attendance, Element 3	2	2
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 1	2	2
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 2	2	1.66
		II.D.(5) Recurrent Enrollment, Element 3	2	2
		II.D.(6) College Readiness, Element 1 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1.5
		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	1.66
		II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 1 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 2 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		II.D.(7) Graduation Rate, Element 3 (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	2
		II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 1	2	0.66

	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 2	2	0.66
	II.D.(8) Growth for Lowest 25%, Element 3	2	0.66
	Section Total	48 – OR – 36	37.63 / 48
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 1 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	1
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 2 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	1.5
	II.E. Organizational Goals, Element 3 (Optional)	2 – OR – 0	.66
	Section Total	6 – OR – 0	3.16 / 6
	II.F.(1) Curriculum Philosophy	2	2
	II.F.(2) Curriculum Philosophy/Approach Research/Data	2	2
	II.F.(3) Curriculum Description	2	2
	II.F.(4) Curriculum Research	2	1.66
	II.F.(5) Curriculum Overview	2	1.5
	II.F.(6) & (7) Curriculum Development Timeline & Instructional Program	2	1.66
	II.F.(8) Curriculum Alignment Timeline	2	1.5
	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	N/A
	Section Total	18, 16 OR 14	14.32 / 16
	II.H.(1) Instructional Strategies	2	2
	II.H.(2) Instructional Effectiveness	2	1
	II.H.(3) Differentiated Instruction	2	1.66
	Section Total	6	4.66
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 1	2	1.33
	II.I.(1)(a) – (d) Special Populations: Special Education, Element 2	2	1.33
	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	1.33
	II.I.(2) Students with 504 Plans	2	1.5
	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	1.33
	Section Total	18	13.82
	II.J.(1) Measuring Organizational Goals, If Applicable	2	1
	II.J.(2) Assessments to Measure Academic Goals	2	1.33
	II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Self Monitoring	2	1.66
	II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / Remediation & At-Risk Students	2	1.33

		II.J.(1)(3)(4) Use of Assessments / School-Wide Practices	2	1
		II.J.(5) Reporting on Progress	2	1.5
		Section Total	12 – OR – 10	7.82
III	ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & GOVERNANCE	III.A.(1) Governance Description	2	1
		III.A.(2) Description of Founders' Expertise	2	2
		III.A.(3) Description of Prospective Governance Expertise	2	2
		III.A.(4) GB Selection of Members	2	2
		Section Total	8	7
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Training	2	1
		III.B.(1) Governing Body Training & Evaluation: Evaluation	2	1.33
		Section Total	4	2.33
		III.C.(1) Leadership & Management: Monitoring	2	1.33
		III.C.(2)(3) Leadership & Management: Administrator Selection/Evaluation	2	1.66
		Section Total	4	2.99
		III.D.(1) Organizational Structure	2	0
		III.D.(2) Job Descriptions	2	1.66
		III.D.(3) Staff Evaluation	2	.66
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 1	2	.33
		III.D.(4) Staffing Plan, Element 2	2	.33
		III.D.(5) School Day / Year	2	2
		III.D.(6) Professional Development Plan	2	1.33
		Section Total	14	6.31
		III.E.(1) Employer/Employee Relationship	2	.66
		III.E.(2) Personnel Policies	2	1
		III.E.(3) Staff Discipline Process	2	1
		III.E.(4) Grievance Process	2	1.16
		Section Total	8	3.82
		III.F.(1) Community Involvement	2	1
		III.F.(2) Complaint Resolution	2	1
		Section Total	4	2
		III.G.(1) Student Discipline Policy	2	1.33
		III.G.(2) Alternative Placements	2	1
		Section Total	4	2.33
		III.H.(1) Student Recruitment	2	1.66

		III.H.(2) Lottery Process	2	2
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 1	2	2
		III.H.(3) Enrollment Process, Element 2	2	.33
		Section Total	8	5.99
		III.I.(1) Legal Compliance: Conflict of Interest	2	1.83
		III.I.(2) Legal Compliance: Transparency	2	0
		Section Total	4	1.83
		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
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	0 / 0
		III.K.(1)(2)(3) Waivers, Element 1	2 – OR – 0	N/A
		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	N/A
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	0 / 0
		III.L.(1) Transportation (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1.33
		III.L.(1) Food Service (If Applicable)	2 – OR – 0	1.33
		Section Total	4 – OR – 0	2.66 / 4
		III.M.(1) Projected Facility Needs	2	0
		III.M.(2) Facility Plans	2	2
		III.M.(3) Projected Facility Costs	2	0
		Section Total	6	2
IV	BUSINESS PLAN	IV.A.(1) 910B5 Worksheets	2	0.5
		IV.A.(2) 5-Year Budget Plan	2	1
		IV.A.(3) Budget Narrative	2	1
		IV.A.(4) Strategies for Budget Control	2	1.5
		IV.A.(5) Salary Schedule (Appendix)	2	2
		Section Total	10	6
		IV.B.(1)(2) Financial Policies and Internal Controls	2	1.5
		IV.B.(3) Financial Personnel	2	0
		IV.B.(4) Financial Oversight	2	1
		IV.B.(3) School Sustainability	2	2
		Section Total	8	4.5
V	EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT			
		V.A. Outreach Activities	2	2
		V.B. Evidence of Support	2	1.66

		V.C. Community Ties	2	1.66
		V.D. & F. Community Relationships (Optional Evidence of Support)	2	2
		V.E. Uniqueness of Proposed School	2	2
		Section Total	10	9.32
VI	REQUIRED APPENDICES			
		VI. Appendices	2	1
		Section Total	2	1