



STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
300 DON GASPAR  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501-2786  
Telephone (505) 827-5800  
[www.ped.state.nm.us](http://www.ped.state.nm.us)

ARSENIO ROMERO, PHD  
SECRETARY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM  
GOVERNOR

**Charter Schools Division  
Analysis and Recommendation  
Sacramento School of Engineering and Sciences  
New School Application  
August 2, 2024**

Cynthia Stong, Dr. James Klump, Lorrie Black, and Dr. Michelle Perry applied to open a new charter school, Sacramento School of Engineering and Sciences, within the boundaries of Alamogordo Public Schools to serve grades 9-12.

Based on the analysis set forth below, which includes the peer review team's evaluation of the new charter application and capacity interview, as well as a brief summary of the community input hearing and written community input received, the Charter Schools Division (CSD) recommends that the application be:

**Recommended for Approval** – 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.

**Recommended for Approval with conditions** – 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.

**X Recommended for Denial** – 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 in New Mexico.

The Charter Schools Act, in NMSA 22-8B-6 M states that 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 mismanagement 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;
- (5) for a proposed charter school on tribal land, it fails to receive approval from the tribal government; or
- (6) 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.

### **CSD Analysis and Recommendation**

The Sacramento School of Science and Engineering represents an innovative school option for Alamogordo and has some preliminary support, however, the application and capacity of the founding team suggest the school should be denied. The CSD recommends denial for two main reasons:

1) The application is inadequate. Multiple sections were an exact or partial cut and paste from a 2022 charter application on the PEC's web page. Although the applicant recognized the other school for lending their application as "a guide", CSD warned applicants against cut and paste in the new application training, yet most sections in the organizational framework appear to be plagiarized. The founding team has not demonstrated the capacity to develop a thoughtful application nor were they able to demonstrate the clear capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application during the capacity interview and input hearing. The response to the Peer Review noted several sections where the founders would work to make improvements on what was submitted or what is planned, however as submitted the application is inadequate. CSD notes final section ratings below.

2) The school is not in the best interest of the community. The proposal has divided the local community with a majority of individuals—representing multiple sectors of Alamogordo—providing clear and coherent input against the charter, citing a lack of inclusivity in the planning process. Additionally, the application does not provide a viable plan for identifying and meeting the needs of all students, sufficiently staffing the school, engaging families, nor meeting fiduciary responsibilities of a public school.

### Overall Review Evaluation

APPLICATION	Meets the Criteria		Approaches the Criteria		Does Not Meet the Criteria	
	Peers	CSD	Peers	CSD	Peers	CSD
Academic Framework	7	2	9	10	2	6
Organizational Framework	11	5	4	9	8	9
Financial Framework	2	2	4	4	2	2
Evidence of Support	0	0	3	2	0	1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>

CSD ratings that differ from peer review ratings				
Indicator	Description	Peer Rating	CSD Rating	CSD Evaluation
A.(1)	Mission	Meets		
A.(2)	Vision	Completed		
A.(3)	Uniqueness and Innovation	Meets	Approaches	The application lacks compelling demand for the charter in the Alamogordo community.
B.	Mission Specific Goals	Approaches		
C.	Curriculum, Educational Program, Student Performance Standards	Approaches		
D.(1)	Bilingual Multicultural Education, Indian Education, Hispanic Education and Black Education	Approaches	Does not meet	Significant cut and paste from another application.
D.(2)	Equity Plan	Does not meet		

E.	Graduation Requirements	Meets ▾	Approaches ▾	Concern for how the school would support learners needing credit recovery, as described on p.48 and for how the 4th session would be structured and meaningful for all. The 4th session appears to be a “catch-all” and not a meaningful plan to ensure students would be supported in obtaining all credits needed to graduate.
F.(1)	Instruction Philosophy	Meets ▾	Approaches ▾	Inadequately describes how the instructional methods will best support the population the school intends to serve.
F.(2)	Yearly Calendar and Daily Schedule	Approaches ▾	Does not meet ▾	In addition to not setting assessment periods, the daily schedule for shortened days is not provided and it is unclear the school’s plan for moving instruction online.
F.(3)	Schedule Narrative	Does not meet ▾ Note peers rated this as Does Not Meet, in the roll up table it was incorrectly coded.	Does not meet ▾	CSD agrees with Does Not Meet and questions how the school would change the chronic absentee rate in Alamogordo of 46%, which is higher than the state average rate of 39%.
G.(1a)	Special Education: Students with IEPs	Approaches ▾		
G.(1b)	Special Education: Progress Monitoring	Approaches ▾	Does not meet ▾	Completely plagiarized
G.(2a)	English Learners: Curriculum & Instruction	Approaches ▾		
G.(2b)	English Learners: Progress Monitoring	Approaches ▾		
G.(3)	ESSA and Special Population Needs	Approaches ▾	Does not meet ▾	Significant cut and paste.
H.(1)	Assessment Plan	Meets ▾		
H.(2)	Assessment Data Analysis	Meets ▾	Approaches ▾	Significant cut and paste
H.(3)	Achievement Communication Plan	Meets ▾	Approaches ▾	Significant cut and paste
A.(1)	Governance Structure	Meets ▾	Approaches ▾	Significant cut and paste. Audit committee membership describes a preference for accounting or finance experience, on p. 123, whereas statute <u>requires</u> the experience.
A.(2)	Governing Board Qualifications	Meets ▾	Approaches ▾	No description of each proposed initial governing body member’s specific qualifications and skills sets included.
A.(3)	Governing Board Recruitment	Approaches ▾		
B.(1)	Annual Board Training Plan	Meets ▾		
B.(2)	Annual Board Self-Evaluation	Meets ▾		

C.(1)	Board Oversight Monitoring Plan	Does not meet		
C.(2)	Hiring Head Administrator	Meets	Approaches	Similar narrative and exact action steps as another application.
C.(3)	Governing Board Roles & Responsibilities	Approaches		
C.(4)	Annual Head Evaluation	Approaches		
D.(1)	Organizational Chart and Narrative	Does not meet		
D.(2)	Job Descriptions	Does not meet		
D.(3)	Staffing Plan	Does not meet		
D.(4)	Professional Development Plan	Approaches		
E.	Conditions of Employment	Does not meet		
F.(1)	Meaningful Community Involvement in Governance	Does not meet		
F.(2)	Complaint Process	Meets		
G.(1)	Student Outreach & Recruitment	Meets	Does not meet	Cut and paste (p. 171-176 of this application and p. 143-146 of the copied application). Have the founders already acquired lists through US Census data for homes with grade levels within the targeted age ranges and sent direct mailers as stated in the application? The promotional flyer presented on p.223 makes no mention of it being a direct mailer. No other evidence exists that this actually occurred.
G.(2)	Lottery Process	Meets	Approaches	Significant cut and paste, the school plans to give families only 2 weeks to register, which may be unreasonable in a community with little school choice.
H.	Conflict of Interest Policy	Meets		
I.(1)	Third Party Relationship	Not Applicable		
I.(2)	If I.(1) then Appendix D	Not Applicable		
J.(1)	Transportation	Meets	Approaches	The school demonstrated no effort to begin planning to provide transportation by working with the local LEA, as stated in the application.
J.(2)	Food Services	Does not meet		
K.(1)	Facilities Master Plan	Meets		

K.(2)	Evidence of Researched Facility	Does not meet		
A.	Projected Enrollment	Approaches		
B.(1)	910B5 Appendix F	Approaches		
B.(2)	5 Year Budget Plan Appendix G	Does not meet		
B.(3)	Budget Narrative	Approaches		
B.(4)	Budget Adjustments	Approaches		
C.(1)	Internal Control Procedures	Meets		
C.(2)	Appropriate Financial Staff	Does not meet		
C.(3)	Governing Board Fiduciary Oversight	Meets		
A.	Evidence of Support/Outreach Activities	Approaches		
B.	Community Support	Approaches	Does not meet	
C.	Community Relationships	Approaches		

### Summary of Capacity Interview and Community Input Hearing

Capacity interview: 9 AM on June 20th via zoom, representatives from the school in attendance; Cindy Stong, Dr. Michelle Perry, Dr. James Klump, and Lorrie Black. There were 19 questions asked and the applicant team received four (4) Meets , seven (7) Approaches, and eight (8) Does Not Meet. Three of the four (4) school specific questions asked by the peer review team received ratings of Does Not Meet the criteria.

Input Hearing: 9 AM on July 11, 2024 at the Alamogordo Civic Center, 92 in attendance, there were a total of 8 speakers with 6 speakers in favor of the applicant and 2 opposed.

Founders			
Name	Listed on the Application	Attended the Capacity Interview	Attended the Community Input Hearing
Cindy Stong	Yes	Yes	Yes

Dr. Michelle Perry	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dr. James Klump	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lorrie Black	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vickie Marquardt	Yes	No	Yes
Jerrett Perry	Yes	No	Yes

**Summary of Support/Opposition Provided by Email**

There were 182 letters in total received. 68 of those were in support and 55 were opposed to the applicant school, however one contained signatures from 59 individuals –leading to a total of 114 people not in favor of the charter. There was one individual who both signed the letter of 59 opposed and sent in a letter opposed. So the unduplicated number of individuals opposed totaled 113.

**Vista data in the proposed community**

School	NM Vistas		Proficiencies		
	Score	Designation	ELA	Math	Science
Alamogordo High	67.7	Traditional	44.1%	15.8%	54.7%