

## I. Recommendation

APPROVE

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) demonstrated a clear capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application. Nothing was identified that would indicate the applicant(s) do not have the experience, knowledge, and competence to successfully open and operate a charter school.

APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) demonstrated a general capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application. However, the CSD has identified some specific concerns that would need to be addressed during the planning year. The CSD has listed the noted concerns and conditions to address the concerns below. If the PEC determines that there are any additional conditions that need to be addressed, those should be noted during the public hearing and all approved conditions negotiated in the final contract.

### PROPOSED CONDITIONS

None

FOR ALL APPROVALS: The Applicant will negotiate a contract with the Public Education Commission pursuant to 22-8B-9.1:

1. Obtain standing as an approved Board of Finance
2. Secure a facility that meets PSFA Approval
3. Complete the planning-year checklist

DENY

Overall the application is either incomplete or inadequate; or during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) did not sufficiently demonstrate the experience, knowledge, and competence to successfully open and operate a charter school.

The Charter Schools Act, in paragraph 1 of Subsection L of Section 22-8B-6 NMSA 1978, states that a chartering authority may approve, approve with conditions or deny an application. A chartering authority may deny an application if:

- (1) the application is incomplete or inadequate;
- (2) the application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter Schools Act;
- (3) the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was involved with another charter school whose charter was denied or revoked for fiscal management or the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was discharged from a public school for fiscal mismanagement;
- (4) 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; or
- (5) 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.

## II. Overall Score Sheet

Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points	Percent
Application	269	307	87.6
• Education Plan / Academic Framework	96	104	92.3
• Organizational Plan & Governance/Organizational Framework	119	135	88.1
• Business Plan / Financial Framework	30	44	68.2
• Evidence of Support	24	24	100
Capacity Interview	84	92	91.3
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>88.47%</b>

**SCHOOL NAME: ACES Technical Charter School**

Section #				Score
<b>I</b>	<b>ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK</b>			
A	Mission	16	16	Meets
B	Mission Specific Indicators	12	6	Approaches
C1	Bilingual Multicultural, Indian Education, and Hispanic Education	12	12	Meets
D	Curriculum/Ed Program/Student Standards	12	12	Meets
E1	Graduation Requirements	4	4	Meets
F1	Ed Philosophy/Instructional Methods	4	4	Meets
F2	Yearly/Daily Calendar	4	4	Meets
F3	Programs impact for population	4	4	Meets
G1 a	SPED Identification	4	4	Meets
G1 b	SPED Progress	4	4	Meets
G2 a	ELL Identification	4	4	Meets
G2 b	ELL Progress	4	4	Meets
G3	Plan to address the needs of students as outlined in the Indian Education Act, Hispanic Education Act, and the Bilingual Multicultural Education Act	4	2	Approaches
H1	Assessment Plan	6	6	Meets
H2	Assessment Data	4	4	Meets
H3	Assessment Communications	6	6	Meets
<b>II</b>	<b>ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK</b>			
A1	Governing Board Outline	8	8	Meets
A2	Board Qualifications & Profiles	4	4	Meets
A3	New Member Process	8	8	Meets
B1	Board Training	4	4	Meets
B2	Board Evaluation	8	4	Approaches
C1	Board Oversight	12	6	Approaches
C2	Hiring Head Admin	12	6	Approaches
C3	Principal Job Description (Appendix B)	4	4	Meets
C4	Principal Evaluation	8	4	Approaches
D1	Org Chart & Relationship	8	8	Meets
D2	Staff Job Descriptions (Appendix C)	4	4	Meets
D3	Staffing Plan	8	8	Meets
D4	PD/Novice Membership	8	8	Meets
E	Employment Terms	4	4	Meets
F1	PTA	4	4	Meets
F2	Grievance Process: Families	8	8	Meets
G1	Recruitment Plan	4	2	Approaches
G2	Lottery	4	4	Meets
H	Conflict of Interest	4	4	Meets
I1	3rd Party Relationships	Eight		NA
I2	3rd Party Contracts (Appendix D)	Four		NA
J	Waivers	3	3	Meets
K1	Transportation	Four	4	
K2	Food Service	Four	2	
L1	PSFA Checklist (Appendix E)	4	4	Meets
L2	Facility Identification	4	4	Meets

<b>III</b>	<b>FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK</b>			
A	School Size	4	4	Meets
B1	SEG Worksheets (Appendix F in Excel)	8	8	Meets
B2	5 Year Budget (Appendix G in Excel)	12	6	Approaches
B3	Budget Narrative	4	4	Meets
B4	Budget Adjustments	4	2	Approaches
C1	Financial Oversight (Appendix H)	4	2	Approaches
C2	Financial Staff	4	2	Approaches
C3	Governance Finance	4	2	Approaches
<b>IV</b>	<b>EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT</b>			
A	Outreach Activities	4	4	Meets
B	Community Support	8	8	Meets
C	Networking Relationships	4	4	Meets
D	Innovation	8	8	Meets
	<b>PART C RATING</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>87.62%</b>
	<b>CAPACITY INTERVIEW</b>			
1	Mission	4	4	Meets
2	Innovation	4	4	Meets
3	Mission Implementation	4	4	Meets
4	Leadership & Governance (GB selection & success of school)	4	2	Approaches
5	Leadership & Governance (HA selection & success of school)	4	4	Meets
6	Leadership & Governance (GB and school evaluations & success)	4	4	Meets
7	Leadership & Governance (Relationship of founders, GB, and admin & success)	4	2	Approaches
8	Leadership & Governance (bylaws, implementation, & success)	4	4	Meets
9	Leadership & Governance (establish, implement, change policies and procedures)	4	4	Meets
10	Facility (plan for facility and educational occupancy; responsible party)	4	4	Meets
11	Facility (next step plan if building does not get PSFA approval)	4	4	Meets
12	Finance (planning year budget without federal start-up funds)	4	4	Meets
13	Finance (enrollment projections)	4	4	Meets
14	Finance (plan if actual enrollment is below projections)	4	4	Meets
15	Planning Year (organizational steps during planning year)	4	4	Meets
	<b>School Specific Questions</b>			
16	academic plan for EL students with IEPs	4	2	Approaches
17	accommodations if not successful in regular classroom; not ready for Algebra	4	4	Meets
18	special events for families and how it will be inclusive for all	4	2	Approaches
19	contract days for teachers? Leadership? Others?	4	4	Meets
20	lottery process timeline	4	4	Meets
21	grievance process - staff and families; evaluation of Head Administrator	4	4	Meets
22	marketing efforts to ensure equal access for all	4	4	Meets
23	internal controls during the first year of operation	4	4	Meets
	<b>Part C and D RATING</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>88.47%</b>

### **III. Explanation Regarding Use of the Score Sheet**

In the Recommendation and Final Analysis, the CSD has considered the overall score on the written application and the ratings on the responses during the Capacity Interview, feedback from the Community Input Hearing, and letters of support or opposition. Those components are summarized on the following pages.

The written application evaluation and capacity interview scoring were provided by an external team of four peer reviewers:

- A licensed NM School Administrator
- A licensed NM Teacher
- A licensed NM School Business Official
- A Team Leader with administration experience

Also please note two additional considerations:

- First, the community input hearing is not scored but is referenced in this Recommendation and Final Analysis to summarize and to document any pertinent information offered. The transcripts provide further details.
- Second, if the applicant school did not answer any prompt (question) because that prompt did not apply to the applicant school (e.g., the applicant school will be an elementary school and so did not provide responses to graduation-related prompts), then the CSD adjusted the total possible points in the application section where the non-applicable item(s) is found, as well as in the final score. For this reason, you may see varying total possible points from application to application.

## IV. Final Analysis

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
<b>EDUCATION PLAN/ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK</b>	96	104

**Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:**

The applicant scored “Meets Criteria” in 14 indicators and “Approaches the Criteria” two (2) indicators.

According to the peer reviewers, with respect to the application, the areas that did not meet the criteria were found to be inadequate for the reasons described:

**B. Mission Specific Goals**

The applicant appears to have approached the criteria. More could have been stated about the program and how it challenges students rather than reiterating the measurability. The mission specific goal proposed by the school is solely based on proficiency in ELA and math. While this goal is a good academic goal, mission specific goals should reflect the mission described in Indicator A.

**G3. Plan to address the Acts regarding Native American Students, Hispanic Students, and Bilingual and Multicultural Education**

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to identify specific responsibilities for school staff and classroom teachers, including professional development for teachers. While professional development was discussed, specific roles and responsibilities were not discussed beyond “ACES Tech teachers will be expected to create classroom environments where students are all challenged and have the opportunity to learn and grow”
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to describe how the proposed school will ensure that the best practices are used in teaching, mentoring, counseling and administration are culturally and linguistically responsive to students. While there was discussion of best practices and observations & feedback, more should have been said as to how they will be culturally and linguistically responsive to students.
- The Applicant does not appear to have met the criteria to describe how school policies will be culturally and linguistically responsive. They themselves state that “the Governing Board will need to determine how it will ensure that policies are culturally and linguistically responsive.” Though this shows awareness, it does not address it.

**Overall, in this section of the application, 92.3% of the possible points were earned for Education Plan/Academic Framework.**

**NOTE: The peer review team determined that the responses by the school during the capacity interview adequately addressed the majority of the concerns in this section of the written application.**

The school’s mission was more clearly understood during the presentation and discussion than from what was presented in the written application. The Commissioners made the following comments during the hearing, which match those made by the peer review team after the capacity interview:

CHAIRWOMAN GIPSON: "The uniqueness and the qualities that have been represented here, to me, weren't -- I have two different stories [one] that I've read and [one that] I've heard ..... I think there's that greater story that isn't reflected here."

COMMISSIONER VOIGT: "Because when I did read this -- and I was reading your mission -- it didn't sound very unique or innovative. But with this experience that you're all holding and bringing forward, to open this dynamic, justice-related school is very exciting. So I know that's going to come through with your programs and your curriculum."

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND GOVERNANCE / ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK</b>	119	135

**Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:**

The applicant scored "Meets Criteria" in 18 indicators and "Approaches the Criteria" in 5 indicators. (The food service response was also rated as "Approaches the Criteria".) ***Please note that the applicant received 6 bonus points in this section for school lunch and transportation responses.***

According to the peer reviewers, with respect to the application, the areas that did not meet the criteria were found to be inadequate for the reasons described:

**B2. Board Evaluation**

- The evaluation does not appear to include any area for reflection on how the governing body has addressed grievances. Also, while they intend to include sections addressing these other areas, this seems to be more a restatement of the expectations rather than a development of criteria.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to describe how the identified plan will focus on and support continuous improvement. While there is mention of improvement throughout the discussion, the fact that a Self-Evaluation Plan is not in place makes it difficult to find how it can be effectively utilized.

**C1. Board Oversight**

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to identify a plan for how the governing body will monitor academic performance on an ongoing basis, include action steps, timelines, responsible parties, and identified criteria or standards. While figure 62 outlines some key performance indicators that they will evaluate, more should have been done with respect to actual actions, timelines and responsible parties. Committees and their respective chairs could have played a role.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to identify a plan for how the governing body will monitor organizational performance on an ongoing basis, include action steps, timelines, responsible parties, and identified criteria or standards. While figure 60 outlines some key performance indicators that they will evaluate, more should have been done with respect to actual actions, timelines and responsible parties. Committees and their respective chairs could have played a role.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to identify a plan for how the governing body

will monitor financial performance on an ongoing basis, include action steps, timelines, responsible parties, and identified criteria or standards. While figure 61 outlines some key performance indicators that they will evaluate, more should have been done with respect to actual actions, timelines and responsible parties. Committees and their respective chairs could have played a role. They also should have had some performance indicators relating to timely reporting and quarterly benchmarks, because school finance requires this in order to function.

- The Applicant does not appear to have met the criteria to describe how each of the monitoring plans will focus on ensuring the school is meeting its mission, providing a quality education, and acting as a responsible public entity. The applicant should have taken the opportunity with each area to bring it back to their mission, "ACES Technical Charter School will provide students with a challenging and exciting education and graduate students exceptionally prepared for any college and career of their choice."

#### **C2. Hiring Head Administrator**

The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to identify an ongoing process for hiring a head administrator, both for the initial hiring and for any time the position becomes vacant, include action steps, timelines, responsible parties, and identified criteria or standards. The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to describe how the identified process will ensure the school is able to identify and hire a highly qualified, licensed administrator no later than July 1, 2020. Figure 63 outlines the timeline for hiring future school leadership, but a similar timeline should have been provided for the initial hire; it was simply stated: "The Board Members will collect the applications and review them in the fall of 2019. The Board will have a goal of hiring the School Leader as soon as possible after approval, well ahead of the July 1, 2020 date indicated in the charter application."

#### **C4. Principal Evaluation**

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to include action steps to evaluate the effectiveness of the head administrator in overseeing the stewardship and management of public funds and responsible government accounting.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to include action steps to evaluate the effectiveness of the head administrator in ensuring compliance with legal obligations related to government organizations and public schools.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to include action steps to evaluate the effectiveness of the head administrator in addressing grievances received from staff and parents and families.
- The only mention of the above items in the evaluation process was in figure 65. While they offer some indicators, further elaboration as to what actions would be taken to hold the head administrator accountable in this arena should have been described.

#### **G1. Recruitment Plan**

- The Applicant does not appear to have met the criteria to identify a prospective student outreach and recruitment plan, including action steps, timelines, responsible parties, and associated costs. They speak of several modes of outreach:
  - Everyone is a Recruiter
  - Using Multiple Modes of Media
  - Reaching Underrepresented Groups
  - Open to All

However, as effective as the means may be, the goal of 125 students is very high. In addition they speak of using operational monies for student recruitment which is not allowable. Lastly they did not adequately present a timeline, responsible parties or associated costs.

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to describe how the plan is tailored to ensure equal access to the school. While there is no statement that contradicts the school providing equal

access, the applicant should have had a statement regarding the school ensuring equal access to the school

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to describe why the plan is likely to attract a student body that is demographically reflective of the local community and school district. The plan does speak to outreach in the community and those nearby and ensuring that they reach out to all outgoing 5th graders in the area.
- The Applicant does not appear to have met the criteria to describe how the school will annually evaluate the effectiveness of the outreach and recruitment efforts in ensuring equal access to the school and attracting a student body that is demographically reflective of the local community and school district and how the school will use that information to make adjustments to the outreach and recruitment plan. The applicant notes that ‘Evaluating the effectiveness of our student recruiting campaign can be done in very objective terms.’ However in the response they do not really evaluate what adjustments could be made other than to invest more heavily in marketing.

**Overall, in this section of the application, 88% of the possible points were earned for Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework. However, five (5) responses were rated as “Approaches the Criteria”.**

**NOTE: The peer review team determined that the responses by the school during the capacity interview adequately addressed the majority of the concerns in this section of the written application.**

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School’s Possible Points
<b>BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK</b>	30	44
<p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></p> <p>The applicant scored “Meets Criteria” in three (3) indicators and “Approaches the Criteria” in five (5) indicators.</p> <p>According to the peer reviewers, with respect to the application, the areas that did not meet the criteria were found to be inadequate for the reasons described:</p> <p><b>B2. Five Year Budget</b></p> <p>While they have also accounted for contract services, they did not allocate to specific ones such as diagnosticians and other specific special education contractors and food services. Furthermore they have budgeted for other expenses such as supplies and professional development. Lastly they have accounted for the use of other funds that will be crucial such as the Food Service Program, IDEA B, and the PSFA Lease Reimbursement Award.</p> <p><b>B4. Budget Adjustments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant does not appear to have met the criteria to describe budget control strategies as well as budget adjustments that will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges. The purpose of this section is to address concerns about monitoring the budget throughout the year and how they would handle cash flow issues. For the budget they should have talked about</li> </ul>		

how they would ensure Functions and Funds are not overspent. For the cash flow they should have talked about issues such as if you have \$80,000 in outstanding RFRs, how does the school manage the temporary shortage of funds?

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to include address how special education students will receive services before special education funding is provided, based on accurate 40-day counts. While much of the response is reasonable, it is not feasible to believe that they could successfully “defer payments for special needs services with our vendors when necessary”.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to address how gaps between budgeted students and actual enrollment will be addressed. The applicant appears overly ambitious. The applicant should have provided multiple scenarios of enrollment and the impact. Their most conservative estimate is at 105 of 125 anticipated students. They should have gone as low as 65, as history has shown Charters typically do not reach desired enrollment their first year.

#### **C1 Financial Oversight**

- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to identify all the internal control procedures that have been attached in Appendix H. They have identified that internal control procedures are for Payroll, Cash Receipts, Cash Disbursements/Accounts Payable, and Cash Reconciliation have been included in the Appendix.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to attach in Appendix H internal control procedures the proposed school will utilize to segregate its payroll, as well as cash and check disbursement duties.

The applicant appears to have segregation in place, however it is noted that the policies in place are for a fully staffed school, and so they should alter some of the roles for the early years in the school’s beginning.

#### **C2 Financial Staff**

- The Applicant does not appear to have met the criteria to align completely with the organizational chart from response to D1 in the Organizational Framework. The glaring oversight in this was that the organizational chart does not show any relationship with the service provider.
- The Applicant appears to have approached the criteria to include a plan that will result in the recruitment, identification, the evaluation of candidates, and the hiring of highly qualified staff for each of the identified positions, no later than two weeks prior to the start of the proposed school year. Even if the applicant feels that they have already covered this matter in another section, the applicant should have provided a condensed summary of their strategies to sufficiently answer this question.

**C3 Governance Finance** - There was no mention of Legal Oversight in the response.

**Overall, in this section of the application, 68% of the possible points were earned for Business Plan / Financial Framework and five (5) responses were rated as “Approaches the Criteria”.**

**NOTE: The peer review team determined that the responses by the school during the capacity interview adequately addressed the majority of the concerns in this section of the written application.**

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
<b>EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT</b>	24	24
<p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></p> <p>The applicant scored “Meets Criteria” in all four (4) indicators.</p> <p><b><u>Overall, in this section of the application, 100% of the possible points were earned for Evidence of Support.</u></b></p>		

Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
<b>CAPACITY INTERVIEW</b>	84	92
<p><b>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</b></p> <p>The peer reviewers asked fifteen standard questions (#1-15) and eight school specific questions. The applicant scored “Meets Criteria” on nineteen responses and “Approaches the Criteria” on four responses.</p> <p>The proposed school was represented by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Jeron Titus Campbell, lead founder</li> <li>• Dr. Finnie Coleman, founder, proposed board member, and faculty member at UNM</li> <li>• Ms. Cassandra Sims, proposed board member and an educator</li> <li>• Ms. Stephanie McIver, proposed board member</li> <li>• Mr. Dan Hill, legal counsel for the school</li> <li>• Mr. Michael Vigil, financial expert, licensed Level 2 School Business Manager</li> </ul> <p>According to the peer reviewers, the following responses to the questions in the Capacity Interview were found to be inadequate for the reasons described:</p> <p><u>Question 4:</u> What role does a governing body play in the success of a charter school? Describe your strategic process for identifying and selecting members. How will this process support the success of your proposed school?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was not a strong process to select new members</li> <li>• There were already selected members but not specific to school knowledge and experience. There were a lot of high academia and industry focused board members, but not so many school professionals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Question 7.</u> Please explain the delineated roles and responsibilities of, and the relationships between, the founders, the governing body, and the proposed school's administration during the transitional period between the planning/implementation year and the first year of operations. Describe how those relationships</p>		

evolve to ensure the success of the charter school.

- Talked about the roles but never talked about connecting the different entities
- They did not talk about how the relationships would evolve between board members and the different entities within the school
- It was not explained how they would intertwine and evolve to ensure the success of the school.

Question 16: What is the academic plan if a student is identified as an ELL student with an IEP?

- Talked about ELL needs and then IEP needs separately but did not explain how they would deal with if they were all encompassing
- Quality training explained somewhat, but needs a bit more should be explained about specific students with both ELL and IEP students.

Question 18: Please describe the special events for the students and their families and how those will be inclusive for all students.

- Mentioned ideas for bringing in families as far as student driven events and talent opportunities
- Needs a plan regarding how the school will promote parent involvement

**Overall, in this section, 91.3% of the possible points were earned for the Capacity Interview. However, four (4) responses were rated as “Approaches the Criteria”.**

## COMMUNITY INPUT HEARING

During the July 17, 2019 community input hearing in Albuquerque, NM, attendees expressed support of the school. **No representatives of the school district attended the hearing.**

The proposed school was represented by the following representatives:

- Dr. Jeron Titus Campbell, lead founder
- Dr. Finnie Coleman, founder, proposed board member, and faculty member at UNM
- Ms. Cassandra Sims, proposed board member and an educator
- Mr. Dan Hill, legal counsel for the school
- Mr. Michael Vigil, financial expert, licensed Level 2 School Business Manager

**Ten (10) attendees spoke, with ten (10) in favor and none in opposition.**

Of the thirty-nine (39) individual people that signed in, five (5) were either undecided or did not indicate support or opposition. Of the remaining thirty-four (34), **100% (34 individuals) were in support of the school.**

Please see the transcript of the Community Input Hearing for details regarding all comments made.

## LETTERS OF SUPPORT OR IN OPPOSITION

No correspondence was received by CSD regarding the proposed school.

## SUMMARY

Overall, the application is complete and adequate. During both the capacity interview and the community input hearing, the applicant team demonstrated the capacity to implement the educational, organizational, governance, and financial plans as described in the application. The team is strong and represented by experts in the finance, legal, and education arenas.

The minimum scoring expectations set by the Public Education Commission, from page 3 of the New Charter School application are:

- No scoring area received a score of *"Falls Far Below the Criteria"*.
- No more than 3 responses were evaluated as *"Approaches the Criteria"* in any one section of the application
- The applicant must earn at least 80% of the available points in order for a positive recommendation by independent reviewers

The proposal scored 88.47% and received no *"Falls Far Below"* ratings. On the written application, five responses were scored as *"Approaches the Criteria"* in the Organizational section, five (5) responses were scored as *"Approaches the Criteria"* in the Financial section and four (4) capacity interview questions were rated as *"Approaches the Criteria"*. However, the peer review team determined that the responses by the school during the capacity interview adequately addressed the majority of the concerns identified during the review of the written application.

The peer review team members commented during/after the capacity interview that the applicant team presented a much stronger proposal than what was understood from reading the application. The peer reviewers recommended that the school use the purpose that they described as their mission, which would lead to the development of more appropriate mission-specific goals. The Public Education Commission seemed to arrive at the same conclusion per the comments noted on pages 8 and 9 above.

The applicant team has clearly demonstrated their preparedness to open a high quality charter school.  
**The CSD recommends approval of this application.**

## APPENDIX A

### Letters of Support or in Opposition

No correspondence was received regarding the proposed charter school,  
ACES Technical Charter School.