

New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

August 25, 2023



Mind Your Books Charter School

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed School Name	Mind Your Books Charter School
Proposed EMO/CMO	Not Applicable
Proposed Mission and Vision	<p>Mission: The foundation and mission of the proposed Mind Your Books Charter School is to improve the academic achievement of at-risk students, encourage the use of effective and innovative methods of teaching, and provide an accurate measurement of educational achievement. We pioneer a wrap-around model of high-quality educational best practices, and the development of social-emotional wellness strategies in a holistic and therapeutic approach.</p> <p>Vision: Mind Your Books Charter School will provide families with a public-school option yielding private school results through holistic therapeutic services that support social-emotional competence. Through Psychotherapeutic Board approved best practices, students will develop strategies through therapy sessions. They will develop emotional resources so when faced with adversity and strong emotion they have the power to rewrite the moment. Students will balance emotional wellness with a sound academic foundation received at The Mind Your Books Charter School. Balancing the left and right brain; logic and emotion, thereby creating a stabilizing life-force for the student; which levels the playing field in any arena. Our students will be able to lead future endeavors, gain and create access to possibilities and opportunities for life-long achievement in high school, college, and life in general.</p>
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: K-8 Full Scale: K-8
Proposed Opening	August 2024
Proposed Location	Clark County; 89115
Proposed Zip Codes to be Served	89115

PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2024-25 ¹	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
K	23	23	25	25	25	25
1	23	23	25	25	25	25
2	22	24	26	25	30	30
3	22	25	26	29	32	32
4	22	25	26	29	33	33
5	22	25	28	31	33	33
6	22	25	28	32	34	34
7	22	25	28	32	34	34
8	22	25	28	32	34	34
9						
10						
11						
12						
Total	200	220	240	260	280	280

¹ In response to clarifying questions, the Committee to Form provided corrected enrollment numbers for year one.

CONTENTS

1	Overview and Recommendation	4
2	Meeting the Need	6
3	Academic Plan	9
4	Operations Plan	15
5	Financial Plan	21
6	Application Process Details	23
	Appendix A	25

1 OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The SPCSA conducts a rigorous review of new charter school applications. This process includes the submission to the SPCSA of a written notice of intent to submit a new charter school application 90 days prior to the submission of the new charter school application; the submission to the SPCSA of the actual new charter school application between April 15 and April 30 of each year; the review of the new charter school application by the SPCSA – including the review of the new charter school application by outside reviewers and a capacity interview with the applicant team. The application is rated against the SPCSA’s new charter school application evaluation rubric and, as stated in the evaluation rubric, an applicant must Meet the Standard in all four, or five, if applicable², main sections of the application (Meeting the Need, Academic Plan, Operations Plan, Finance Plan, and Addendum, if applicable) by the end of the application and evaluation process to be recommended for authorization. If an application Meets the Standard in all but one section, and Approaches the Standard in the one remaining section, the application and proposed new charter school may be recommended for authorization if the remaining issues are specific and limited and the outstanding deficiencies can be addressed through conditions. In addition, as part of the review process, the SPCSA seeks input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located. The input provided by the school district is posted along with other relevant materials for this application for consideration by the SPCSA board.

Finally, it is important to note that there is also an opportunity for an unsuccessful new charter school applicant to resubmit its charter school application, as well as an opportunity for an unsuccessful applicant to appeal the denial of its application. For more details regarding the SPCSA’s application process, please see Appendix A.

The review committee and SPCSA staff determined that none of the four main sections of the application Meet the Standard as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard
Academic Plan	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Financial Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard

Details regarding the rating for each component of the application can be found in Section 1.3 of this report. Based on these ratings and the findings summarized within the remainder of this report, the SPCSA staff’s recommendation is to deny the Mind Your Books Charter School charter school application.

1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

Proposed motion: *Deny the Mind Your Books Charter School application as submitted during the 2023 Application Cycle based on a finding that the Applicant has failed to satisfy the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3) in that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate competence in accordance with the criteria for approval prescribed by the SPCSA that will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school. Designate SPCSA Staff to meet and confer with the Applicant.*

² Charter Management Organizations applying for sponsorship directly, as well as Committee to Form applicants that propose to contact with a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Educational Management Organization (EMO) are required to complete the Addendum section of the application and therefore will be rated in five main sections. All other applicants are not required to complete the Addendum section and are only rated on four main sections.

1.3 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION SECTION RATINGS

Rating options for each section are Meets the Standard; Approaches the Standard; Does not Meet the Standard. A detailed description of each rating option can be found in Appendix A.

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Approaches the Standard
Academic Plan³	Approaches the Standard
Transformational Change	Approaches the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Approaches the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Does Not Meet the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Approaches the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Approaches the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Does Not Meet the Standard
Financial Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard

³ The Mind Your Books Charter School proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Dual Credit Partnerships. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

2 MEETING THE NEED

2.1 SECTION RATINGS

Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Approaches the Standard

2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Meeting the Need section was rated as Approaches the Standard. One of the three sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Mission and Vision section was rated overall as Meets the Standard. In proposing a unique charter school that provides both rigorous academics and additional support for students in the form of therapy, the Committee to Form outlines compelling mission and vision statements in the written application, and additionally conveyed a strong passion for their model in the capacity interview. As further detailed within this memorandum, it remains unclear throughout the application whether the Committee to Form has the capacity to implement the mission and vision to meet the needs of the community and target student population. Nevertheless, this section was rated overall as Meets the Standard.

The Targeted Plan section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The application generally aligns with the Demographics and Academic Needs sections of the SPCSA Needs Assessment, as the Committee to Form proposes to serve a large percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) and/or those who are English language learners (ELLs). Additionally, the school proposes to locate in the 89115 zip code, an area with many low-performing schools (1- or 2-star performance on the Nevada School Performance Framework, or NSPF). The Committee to Form further explains that they intend to offset disparities in the community by integrating high-quality academics and mental health support into the proposed model. However, based on the experience of proposed leadership, staffing plans, and budget, it is unclear if the Committee to Form has the demonstrated capacity and/or credible plans to effectively serve the populations outlined in the SPCSA Needs Assessment. Additionally, the narrative does not articulate a comprehensive understanding of the expected student population and their demographic and educational needs. Finally, the application is lacking information, research, and/or data supporting various components of the proposed model.

The Parent and Community Involvement section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form has engaged in community outreach using various strategies, resulting in the collection of numerous enrollment interest forms from prospective families and students, and plans to employ similar strategies if approved to open. Despite this outreach, and although the Committee to Form indicates the 89115 community exhibits overarching needs for mental health, community resources, and school options, specific evidence and examples appear to be lacking as to how the proposal was shaped by the feedback of community members, other than a stated interest by the community in sports programs at the proposed school. As such, it is unclear how the proposed school will build upon community assets. Additionally, regarding opportunities for all parents to contribute to the school community, the proposal only states that activities will be accommodating to disabled persons, and that translators and English as a Second Language classes will be available for families. Considering the large populations of these students the school proposes to serve, this remains a concern. Finally, the application includes few community-based partnerships that support the goals of the proposed school, as several of the listed partners reflect paid vendor relationships (First Nevada, Sysco, Three Square, STEMfinity) while the impetus behind other relationships is unclear.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Meeting the Need section as Approaches the Standard.

2.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

The tables below provide details regarding each rubric criterion and whether it was determined to Meet the Standard. The criterion for which “No” is selected was either rated as Approaches the Standard or Does Not Meet the Standard as described in the new charter school application evaluation rubric and summarized in Appendix A.

2.3.1 Mission and Vision: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clear, measurable, and compelling mission statement which explains the role of the school in meeting the needs of the community and intended student population, and which is reflected throughout the application.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Vision describes success (beyond graduation) for students if the school fulfills its mission.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Committee to Form/CMO aims to achieve outcomes that they demonstrate will improve the long-term quality of life of all students served, including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School’s plan, in alignment with the mission and vision, satisfies at least one statutory purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the academic achievement of pupils. Encouraging the use of effective and innovative methods of teaching. Providing an accurate measurement of the educational achievement of pupils. Establishing accountability and transparency of public schools. Providing a method for public schools to measure achievement based upon the performance of the schools, AND/OR Creating new professional opportunities for teachers. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

2.3.2 Targeted Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the community and students to be served, including the demographics and educational needs of the intended student population, as well as the current school options within the community.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed educational model is clearly described and addresses a need(s) related to student outcomes in the identified community that is either shown to exist with data or is in response to demonstrated demand for a particular school model.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Demonstrates a commitment to meeting at least one of, and preferably multiple, academic, or demographic needs identified in the SPCAS’s Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demographics: Applicants meeting this need will propose a school model that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, and thorough research and analysis in order to intentionally enroll and serve the following student groups, each of which has been identified as historically underperforming based on data provided by the NDE: students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL), English language learners (ELLs), students with disabilities (those with an Individual Education Program, or IEP), students in foster care, and students experiencing homelessness. Successful applicants will demonstrate the capacity to support these student groups in making rapid academic growth and achieving academic performance above the state average. Applicants intending to enroll and serve student groups that have historically underperformed can be most impactful when they alleviate barriers to access, such as by providing meals through the National School Lunch Program, providing student transportation, proactively translating written communication to commonly spoken languages, and offering robust social work and counseling services. Academic Need: Geographies with 1- and 2-star schools that continue to have an index score below 50: Applicants meeting this need will propose a school model that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, and thorough research and analysis to intentionally provide access to 3-, 4- and 5-star schools in zip codes where a significant percentage of students are attending a school that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received a 1- or 2-star NSPF rating for the 2018-19 school year, AND Continues to have an NSPF index score below 50 as of the 2021-22 school year. Successful applicants will demonstrate the capacity to effectively meet the needs of students who will transfer from 1- or 2- star schools that continue to have an index score below 50 in order to drive rapid academic growth and achieve academic performance above the state average. Additionally, applicants meeting this need will provide intentional plans for partnering with the community and building on identified community assets to meet the needs of students within the community. Simply adding a school option in a community with 1- or 2-star schools that continue to have an index score below 50 will not inherently lead to effectively meeting the community needs. Rather, schools must establish trust with the community by working in partnership to intentionally meet the needs of the students and community. Alternative 3-, 4- or 5-star school options in communities where a significant percentage of students are attending a 1- or 2-star school that continues to have an index score below 50 can be most impactful when there are limited or no public charter school options available in the community. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<p>2b. Academic Need: Students at risk of dropping out of school: Applicants meeting this need will propose a public charter school model that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, and thorough research and analysis to enroll and prevent at-risk students from dropping out of school and put them on track for successful high school completion with concrete post-secondary plans that will put them on a trajectory toward economic success. Models may include but are not limited to programs designed for student groups that are most at-risk of dropping out or programs aimed at enabling credit-deficient students to get back on track to graduate. Applicants should demonstrate a strong understanding of grade-level appropriate indicators for successful high school completion, such as early literacy, attendance, and credit sufficiency and plans to enable students to successfully meet these milestones. Public charter schools aimed at enrolling and preventing at-risk students from dropping out of school can be most impactful when they offer a unique academic experience for students and/or are closely aligned to Nevada’s priorities for workforce and economic development.</p> <p><i>Pursuant to NRS 388A.249(2), the SPCSA must consider the degree to which the proposed charter school will address the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment as part of the application review. Additionally, in accordance with NRS 388A.249(3) the SPCSA may only approve an application to form a charter school if, in addition to meeting other requirements, the proposed charter school will address one or more of the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.</i></p>	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

2.3.3 Parent and Community Involvement: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates ties to and/or knowledge of the identified community and explains how the proposed school will build upon community assets.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Intentional and thoughtful strategies for engaging with community members, families, and parents representative of the community to be served. Illustrates, with examples, that parents, neighborhood, and community members representative of the community to be served helped shape the school proposal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines a thoughtful plan to proactively engage parents, community members, and other neighborhood partners from the time that the school is approved and once the school is operating.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes meaningful opportunities for all parents to contribute to the school community and be active partners, including parents of students with disabilities and English language learners.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies key supporters, partners, or resources that are directly tied to the stated outcomes of the school, including community partners that are located in and/or serve the identified zip codes. Partnerships are evidenced by specific letters of commitment outlining the accountabilities of both parties and clear, measurable, time-specific deliverables from the partner which are clearly relevant to the needs of the identified population, and do not reflect a paid vendor relationship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 SECTION RATINGS

Academic Plan ⁴	Approaches the Standard
Transformational Change	Approaches the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Approaches the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Does Not Meet the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Approaches the Standard

3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Academic Plan was rated as Approaches the Standard. The majority of the nine sections were rated as Approaches the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Transformational Change section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form intends to support the SPCSA’s strategic goals and embraces the responsibility of providing a 4- or 5-star school to Nevada families, describing a theory of change based on a combination of social emotional curricula, a clinical component, and the use of data to promote high-quality academic instruction. However, this theory of change does not appear to be paired with a clear education strategy or ambitious yet achievable plan that will result in a 4- or 5-star school and ensure every SPCSA student succeeds. The narrative lacks a robust discussion backed by research that demonstrates key features of this school (1) could be coherently and cohesively implemented to ensure fidelity of the program or (2) are supported by success in other schools implementing similar programs and serving similar populations. Although two other existing school models in the United States are briefly mentioned, their similarities to the proposed model and school-wide performance are not described.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form describes curricular choices for each grade and content area, along with selections for clinical and mental health workbooks, demonstrating both standards and mission alignment. However, the description of the instructional model appears to lack key details such as planned class sizes and structures, and additionally, the narrative does not address culturally responsive strategies to ensure students from a variety of backgrounds will access relevant, engaging, and rigorous content and instruction. Furthermore, the Committee to Form does not adequately describe a plan for delivering arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education, and the provided weekly schedules do not mention these subjects except for fine arts in kindergarten. Finally, clarification was requested in the capacity interview regarding proposed instructional strategies, as these were underdeveloped in the narrative, but the Committee to Form did not outline credible instructional strategies beyond project-based learning.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form aims to set high expectations for all students, stating that grade-level retention would be the exception. While the promotion and retention policy supplied in the narrative outlines strict criteria, written clarification was provided that when making retention decisions, the school would opt for flexibility and consider extenuating circumstances. However,

⁴ The Mind Your Books Charter School proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Dual Credit Partnerships. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

the proposed policy notably only allows for retention in kindergarten, third, fifth, and eighth grade, and the Committee to Form did not provide a clear rationale for this unique approach in the capacity interview.

The Driving for Results section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The proposed school goals discuss academic growth and achievement, as well as mission-specific goals related to social-emotional development. Generally, though, the outlined goals do not appear to meet the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound) goal criteria. For example, in establishing certain performance goals, the Committee to Form utilized district-wide Clark County School District data that may not be specific or relevant to the proposed location. As far as corrective actions that will be taken if the school does not meet these achievement outcomes, the narrative does not consider issues beyond the classroom and school-wide levels, and roles for the board and school leadership remain ambiguous. It also remains unclear how academic progress will be monitored, including disparities in student group performance, when the proposed goals do not include goals and/or subgoals specific to student groups. Additionally, the proposed assessment plan is underdeveloped, as interim and summative assessments seem to be conflated, roles for data analyses are unclear, and substantial responsibility for interim assessments is placed on teachers. Lastly, while the narrative demonstrates alignment of financial goals with the SPCSA Financial Performance Framework, it does not describe whether organizational goals are aligned with the SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations section was rated overall as Does Not Meet the Standard. The application outlines a mission-aligned approach to identify at-risk students, as well as an intent to prioritize social-emotional learning. Overall, however, narratives within this section lack detail. The Committee to Form plans to use student data to provide remediation and interventions for at-risk students, but crucial information does not appear to be provided. The application does not include a clear description of how the school will remediate academically underperforming students. Approaches for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (RTI), and strategies to communicate remediation needs to parents are also lacking. Regarding special populations, the Committee to Form does not provide an explanation of their track record serving students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs). Furthermore, while the proposal conveys an intent to welcome students with disabilities and that applicable teachers will be appropriately licensed, it lacks details regarding identification of students needing Individual Education Programs (IEPs), how IEPs will be developed, and how services will be provided to students with IEPs. Similarly underdeveloped are the ELL narratives, as the Committee to Form does not articulate a full understanding of ELL identification or ELL assessments in Nevada, and the proposal lacks detail with respect to ELL instructional programs and strategies, monitoring, and evaluation of progress.

The Professional Development section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. Annually before school begins, the school plans to provide professional development required under Nevada state law, and after school begins, various professional development will occur on Wednesday afternoons, including mission-aligned professional development. However, the plan does not seem to address whether teachers will receive professional development on the curricula and instructional strategies prior to the beginning of the school year. Additionally, other professional development topics throughout the year lack detail. Similarly incomplete are the descriptions of teacher coaching plans and the support structures ensuring teachers can meet the needs of all students. Additionally, for most professional development, it remains unclear which persons or organizations will be responsible. Finally, concerns persist regarding a possible overload of the designated two-hour Wednesday block, as beyond professional development, the proposal mentions this time block with respect to planning for and execution of many critical areas of the program.

The School Culture section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. In various areas of the application the Committee to Form establishes a capacity to implement a safe and supportive environment via a social emotional curriculum and therapy. However, this section of the proposal is underdeveloped, with the Committee to Form overlooking an opportunity to describe how relevant portions of the proposed model could support school culture and climate. Moreover, neither clear and measurable school culture goals nor detailed plans to norm social/cultural expectations appear to be provided.

The Student Discipline section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. In addressing various discipline-related areas, the Committee to Form outlines their commitment to due process and states they plan to use restorative circles, therapy, and a social emotional curriculum. However, this section of the proposal remains underdeveloped. The Committee to Form does not appear to provide detail regarding goals for student behavior, a plan for tracking discipline, monitoring of discipline goals, and how certain populations will not be disproportionately impacted by discipline policies. Additionally, the number of individuals seemingly responsible for implementing discipline policies is cause for concern; although the Committee to Form provided written clarification that the principal will be responsible for final decision-making regarding discipline policies and implementation, questions remain with respect to various roles and responsibilities outlined in the discipline policy.

The School Calendar and Schedule section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The provided calendar and schedule appear to (1) meet minimum Nevada day/minute requirements and (2) support implementation of the academic program. In this section, however, the proposal does not present detailed goals for attendance, such as goals to address chronic absenteeism, and does not discuss structures in place to decrease truancy and chronic absenteeism. Furthermore, attendance and truancy policies, including a description of due process, do not seem to be provided.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Academic Plan as Approaches the Standard.

3.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

The tables below provide details regarding each rubric criterion and whether it was determined to Meet the Standard. The criterion for which “No” is selected was either rated as Approaches the Standard or Does Not Meet the Standard as described in the new charter school application evaluation rubric and summarized in Appendix A.

3.3.1 Transformational Change: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school’s success.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Ambitious, yet achievable plan to further the SPCSA’s strategic goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide families with 4- or 5-star school. • Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds - including those from historically underserved student groups. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that the key features of the proposed school can be implemented together in a coherent and cohesive manner that will drive towards meeting the proposed mission and vision.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Distinguishing features of the proposed school are supported by compelling evidence of success in schools implementing similar programs while serving similar student populations or a demonstration of rationale for the feature that is supported by a logic model and plans to study effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.2 Curriculum and Instructional Design: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision, academic program, and instructional strategies. Instructional model and learning environment will engage students in ways that are culturally responsive and relevant.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies curricula for all core academic subjects and demonstrates that they align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Includes a logical plan for delivering required courses including arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that instructional strategies are well suited to the identified student population and will enable effective differentiation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Demonstrates how the instructional model and curriculum will enable all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level to build the knowledge base necessary to access rigorous instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If the school intends to include a career and technical education program, the application outlines a logical plan that is aligned with the school's mission, vision, instructional model, and goals for student growth as well as the State's requirements for career and technical education.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

3.3.3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Structures are in place to support students at risk of dropping out, including those who are over age for their grade, those needing to access credit recovery options, and those performing significantly below grade level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If proposing a high school program, clearly articulates high school graduation requirements which align with Nevada Graduation Requirements and will ensure that students graduate college and career ready.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

3.3.4 Driving for Results: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
All academic goals and targets are expressed in SMART terms (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound) and demonstrate a commitment to ensuring the success of all students including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission-specific academic goals explicitly complement or supplement, but do not replace, the SPCSA's performance standards. All such indicators, measures, and metrics are rigorous, valid, reliable, and objectively verifiable. Annual performance and growth goals align to the Nevada School Performance Framework and/or the Authority Performance Framework and will put the school on a trajectory to meet SPCSA performance standards. Quarterly performance targets can be used to develop a plan for monitoring and reporting academic performance gaps and a process for using data to support instruction and inform professional development. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students and monitoring for disparities in academic performance between student groups.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Explanation of corrective actions that will be taken if the school fails to meet achievement outcomes at the classroom, cohort, special population and/or school-wide level (throughout the year or at end of year), including the party responsible for implementing these actions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Internal assessment selections will provide sufficiently rich data for evaluation of the education program, are valid and reliable, and are fully align with state assessments, Nevada Academic Content Standards, and the curriculum as presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The assessment plan is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate collection and analysis of individual student, student cohort, special populations, and school level data (interim, annual, year over year), including a clear process for setting and monitoring ambitious academic goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Logical plan for using assessment data to drive key decisions aimed at improving academic outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA's Performance Frameworks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.5 At-Risk Students and Special Populations: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
At Risk Students	
Provides a clear and research-based process for identifying at-risk students and their needs, including those with academic and behavioral needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the methods according to which the school will remediate academically underperforming students, including the system according to which the school will track progress, facilitate teacher collaboration, and the research supporting the school's remediation strategy.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The school's Response to Intervention system differentiates planning for each student according to the significance of their need, providing a continuum of programs, strategies, and supports that corresponds with the needs identified for each student and is supported by research.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents a reasonable plan and identifies the parties responsible for communicating with parents regarding remediation needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Demonstrates that the school's response to early signs of behavioral and/or social emotional needs will be met with positive interventions and restorative justice practices. The school will utilize differentiated support for each student in collaboration with the students' parents, teachers, and with support, as needed, from other school staff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Special Populations	
Demonstrates the Committee to Form or CMO's track record of success serving a wide range of students with disabilities (mild, moderate, and severe), English language learners, homeless and migrant students, and intellectually gifted students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For students with disabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a logical plan to screen all students and to ensure that struggling students are evaluated for special education services early and accurately. Presents a plan for student evaluation and developing IEPs that contain rigorous goals and instructional plans that are suitable to meet those students' goals. Presents a monitoring plan that will enable relevant staff to track the progress of all students with IEPs towards the goals articulated in their respective plans. Demonstrates that the school will be able to provide all special education and related services needed either by the staff listed on their organization chart or identified external groups with whom they can contract to provide needed services. Specifies full Nevada licensure for all special education teachers/coordinators. Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. Articulates process for monitoring compliance with state and federal laws pertaining to serving students with disabilities. For middle and high schools, presents a logical and thorough plan for developing and implementing transition plans. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For English language learners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes for identifying English language learners are well-defined, including administration of placement assessments and communications to parents and teachers. Indicates full Nevada licensure for all English language learners teachers/coordinators. Describes the specific services that will be provided for students within and outside the classroom, including curriculum and instruction and exposure to co-teaching. Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For intellectually gifted students, demonstrates that the school will extend their learning offerings such that those students have access to unique, tailored opportunities. The proposed staffing structure demonstrates sufficient staffing and teacher support to implement the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For homeless/migrant students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents a logical and systematic method according to which the school will identify homeless and/or migrant students. Clear plan to assess and meet the needs of students and identified as homeless and/or migrant. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.6 Professional Development: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clearly describes professional development that will be offered during the incubation year to effectively support the academic program, including the topics to be covered and any specialized components of the educational model.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a summary of professional development opportunities throughout the school year to effectively support the academic program, including topics and structures.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Explains teacher coaching plans that will effectively support teacher development, including responsible parties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates how professional development will support all teachers in meeting the needs of special populations including students with disabilities and English language learners.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear identification of the persons or organizations responsible for professional development. If professional development is to be provided by contracted third party, the third party has appropriate expertise.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Cost of any third party provided professional development is reflected in the budget.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.7 School Culture: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate that will allow for fulfillment of the school's stated mission and vision, as well as the school's stated academic goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Describes a concrete plan for norming social/cultural expectations at the start of each year as well as for students who enter mid-year.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Provides plans to establish a culture of high expectations with students/families and teachers/staff and promote a positive school culture.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Dress code and/or uniform policy is age-appropriate, and the applicant articulates how the proposed school will ensure that uniform requirements do not create a barrier for economically disadvantaged students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.8 Student Discipline: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Presents sound policies for student discipline, suspension, and expulsion including procedures for due process which align to Nevada statutes and regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
A plan to ensure that certain student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies, including protection of the rights of students with disabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Goals for student behavior are clear and measurable. There is a plan, and designated personnel, for monitoring and reporting related to behavior goals as well as ongoing maintenance of discipline records.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.9 School Calendar and Schedule: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed Calendar and schedule meets or exceeds applicable statutory and regulatory requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 180 (or equivalent) days of instruction. • 43,200 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades k-2. • 54,000 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades 3-6. • 59,400 minutes of classroom instruction /year for grades 7-12. • Minimum of 120 hours of instruction for High School courses. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Calendar and schedule support implementation of the academic program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Alignment between teacher and student schedules.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents sound policies for student attendance and truancy including procedures for due process that comply with state laws and are customized to the charter school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4 OPERATIONS PLAN

4.1 SECTION RATINGS

Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Approaches the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Approaches the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Does Not Meet the Standard

4.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Operations Plan was rated as Approaches the Standard. None of the eight sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Board Governance section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The proposal states the role of the board is oversight, while that of the executive director/principal is in day-to-day operations and implementation of the mission, vision, and goals. The conflict-of-interest policy, ethics policy, and bylaws appear to be reasonable and compliant, and the proposed board members hold a mission-aligned variety of backgrounds and experiences. However, the proposal contains various discrepancies related to proposed board membership as well as plans and funding for board training. While the Applicant attempted to resolve this during the completeness check phase, in response to clarifying questions about how the proposed board members meet the statutory requirements for board membership, the Committee to Form pointed to an individual who is not included in the board roster as meeting certain membership criteria. Concerns remain that the Committee to Form is not clear on the roles of various individuals with the school. Finally, the relationship between the existing Mind Your Books Inc. nonprofit and the proposed charter school is unclear. During the capacity interview the Committee to Form indicated that the existing nonprofit would serve as the fiscal agent for the school, but it remains unclear what that entails and what it would mean for the school.

The Leadership Team section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. While the backgrounds of the proposed school leadership align with accomplishments in the community as a non-profit and the clinical mission, evidence and/or empirical data do not appear to be provided regarding the proposed school leader's experience leading a high-performing and/or high growth school, experience establishing a high-performing culture with students and staff, or responsibility for significant student achievement gains with target demographics. Additionally lacking is a detailed description of how the school leader will be supported and evaluated by the board. Lastly, the Committee to Form does not appear to include an individual(s) with experience in staff recruitment, hiring, and development.

The Staffing Plan section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form has established plans to ensure specific areas of their mission, such as the clinical components, are staffed, with a devoted leadership position as well as interns via a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the University of Nevada Las Vegas. However, various discrepancies exist between the staffing plan and the proposed budget, and these concerns are reinforced by written comments from the Committee to Form that a vendor completed the budget and the staffing table, and that positions and the budget would be adjusted based on enrollment and priorities. It is also unclear if the staffing plan aligns with the needs of anticipated populations; for example, despite proposing to serve a large population of English language learners (ELLs), an ELL teacher is not included in year one. Additionally, although the Committee to Form states the student to teacher ratio will be 22:1 in year one, it is difficult to determine whether ratios will be reasonable in future years, since the number of core classroom teachers remains static while increasing numbers of students are served.

The Human Resources section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form outlines general processes for recruitment and hiring, but overall, this section is underdeveloped. The areas lacking key detail include those related to recruiting and hiring staff reflective of the student population, plans to retain high-performing teachers, human resources processes, and the performance management system.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. Diverse marketing and outreach strategies are outlined by the Committee to Form, including the creation of marketing materials in English and Spanish, various grassroots efforts, community events, and advertising via print, social media, and other methods. The lottery process and timeline appear reasonable, and a general plan is described for engagement with prospective parents. While the Committee to Form provided a list of interested families/students from meeting sign-in sheets that encompasses 200 potentially interested students, only about 40% of those are from the 89115 zip code where the school proposes to locate, with an additional 10% from zip codes directly adjacent to 89115 – indicating a possible lack of demand in the target community. The Committee to Form stated their intent to offer transportation and that many parents outside the proposed zip code feel the model is worth the drive, but it is unclear if these assertions will transpire as detailed transportation plans were not contemplated in the narrative. Additional potential issues related to the school meeting enrollment targets in year one are the following: (1) funds are not budgeted for student recruitment prior to year one and (2) a current lack of cohesive and comprehensive online advertising platforms dedicated to the proposed school, such as a website and social media accounts.

The Incubation Year Development section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form provides an incubation year plan organized by work stream with general considerations and timelines for establishing the school's systems, staff, facilities, and other areas. A major concern in this area of the proposal is the lack of funding budgeted for incubation year activities. The Committee to Form provided written clarification and/or statements during the capacity interview that (1) completion of required tasks would be on a volunteer basis, (2) agreements on contracts/purchases would be contingent/paid upon approval and opening of the proposed school, and (3) additional grant and private funding was being sought. However, because no immediate prospects for incubation year funding were available, the underlying lack of funding may result in potentially significant challenges during the incubation year.

The Services section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard. Basic plans for services are outlined, and the technology section describes how the school will secure mental health data. Overall, however, many narratives in this area are underdeveloped, and the costs of services are not always clear and/or evident in the budget. Additionally, the proposal does not sufficiently address how vendors will be evaluated and held accountable.

The Facilities section was rated overall as Does Not Meet the Standard. As a facility has not yet been identified, the Committee to Form has been working with a commercial real estate broker. Nevertheless, significant concerns exist in this area of the proposal. Firstly, a detailed description of anticipated facility needs and how the facility will support the academic and clinical models is not provided. Secondly, the Committee to Form states that none of their members have experience in facilities acquisition or management, and the application lacks plans for managing the probable relationship with a broker and/or asset management company. Thirdly, timelines are not provided regarding potential renovations and/or construction, and fourth, plans to ensure maintenance and safety lack detail. Finally, no evidence is provided that the facilities costs included in the budget are realistic and data from other SPCSA schools indicate that the projected facility costs appear to be low. Taken together, these concerns represent substantial facilities challenges.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Operations Plan as Approaches the Standard.

4.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

The tables below provide details regarding each rubric criterion and whether it was determined to Meet the Standard. The criterion for which “No” is selected was either rated as Approaches the Standard or Does Not Meet the Standard as described in the new charter school application evaluation rubric and summarized in Appendix A.

4.3.1 Board Governance: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed governance structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear delineation of authority and working relationship between the governing body, school staff and any committees, advisory bodies, and/or councils.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The board puts into place a structure that enables it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the performance of the school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that the membership of the governing body will contribute the wide range of relevant knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to oversee a successful charter school, including but not limited to educational, financial, accounting, legal, and community experience and expertise, as well as special skill sets to reflect school-specific programs, if applicable (e.g., STEM, fine arts, blended learning, alternative programs, etc.). The proposed governing body members demonstrate capacity and expertise to successfully oversee a school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Provides evidence that the governing body fulfills (or describes reasonable and detailed plans to ensure that the governing body will fulfill) statutory requirements for board membership, including at minimum, one teacher or other person licensed pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS; one teacher or other person licensed pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS or a school administrator; one parent or legal guardian of a pupil enrolled in the charter school who is not a teacher or an administrator at the charter school; and two individuals with knowledge and expertise in one or more of the following areas: accounting, financial services, law, or human resources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If the governing body is not fully developed, a clear plan and timeline for expanding capacity prior to the opening of the school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Shows that the governing body is or describes specific strategies to ensure that the governing body will be representative of the identified community and describes plans for engaging with the community in order to ensure that community voice is meaningfully incorporated into the governing body's decision-making.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members, charter holder board members and staff, or charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity nor any supervisory or business relationships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Proposed conflict of interest policy, ethics policy, and bylaws are reasonable and compliant. Bylaws contemplate a mechanism for removal of governing body members if needed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides plans for meaningful, appropriate training for board members on a regular basis. Governance training is provided by experienced, third parties and addresses on-boarding for new members, or when the composition of the board changes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.2 Leadership Team: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO are demonstrable with empirical data related to student performance, including students from diverse backgrounds and experiences, students with disabilities, English language learners, and other special populations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If identified, school leader demonstrates a range of experience serving all students (students with disabilities, English language learners, students in need of remediation, and students above or below grade level) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leadership role at a high-performing and/or high growth school, • experience establishing a high-performing culture with students and staff, and • responsibility for significant student achievement gains with demographics similar to the proposed school. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
If the school leader is not yet identified, explains the timeframe and the method by which the board will recruit and select a candidate who demonstrates qualifications and competencies aligned with the school's mission and program and has experience working with special populations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Structure of the school leadership team will allow for effective management of the school and staff and demonstrates appropriate assignment of management roles and distribution of responsibilities for instructional leadership, curriculum, personnel, budgeting, financial management, special education and EL programming, legal compliance, state reporting, external relations, and any unique, school-specific staffing needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

School leadership team job descriptions or resumes identify qualifications and competencies of the administration that align with the school’s mission and program and demonstrate capacity to successfully manage the school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comprehensive plan for coaching, support, and evaluation of school leadership. The board articulates a clear, ambitious, data-driven set of standards and criteria that the school leader must satisfy to keep the school on track to achieve its vision.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.3 Staffing Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates an understanding of expected student population and aligns to the applicant’s commitment to meet the needs of special populations and the community the school intends to serve.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Ensures sufficient capacity to enable high-quality teacher support/development, student/family support, effective school operations, and compliance with all applicable policies and procedures.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates reasonable student-teacher ratios based on the proposed model and statutory student-teacher ratios for special education are met (22:1 for students with severe disabilities).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.4 Human Resources: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Articulates recruitment and hiring processes and strategies likely to result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Essential recruitment, hiring, and dismissal functions and processes, such as background checks, payroll, benefits, and employee relations, are clearly described and responsible parties are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system is likely to retain and promote talented staff, allows for re-structuring and removal of staff as needed, creates opportunities for leadership development, and sets clear expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system identifies low-performing teacher or leader performance, provides plans, support, and training for improvement, and provides the steps the school leadership will take in instances of persistent low-performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverages proactive, grassroots strategies such as door-to-door visits, open houses, and forums, and community conversations over the internet, social media, or other passive tactics which disproportionately benefit more advantaged populations. Includes specific plans to ensure equal access to interested families including families in poverty, students zoned to attend 1- and 2-star schools, students with disabilities, EL students, and other at-risk students as defined in the SPCSA’s Needs Assessment. Demonstrates an understanding of the identified community. Is likely to allow the school to enroll a representative student population based on surrounding zoned schools or a mission-specific educationally disadvantaged population. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years includes realistic and appropriate targets, timelines, staff capacity, and monitoring plan to provide confidence that the school will meet its minimum enrollment. <i>Note, the enrollment audit for new schools which determines initial per pupil funding is conducted on or before June 15 of each year.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The application and enrollment process adequately addresses and is compliant with Nevada laws and regulations regarding notification to families within a 2-mile radius during the incubation year, application and enrollment timelines, lotteries, weighted lotteries, enrollment preferences, and backfilling vacant seats when students withdraw.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The recruitment and enrollment plan as well as planned enrollment numbers for year 1 and subsequent years are aligned with the staffing plan and budget, including projected recruitment expenses.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrated interest from parents of students in the appropriate grade level to enroll in year 1 and originating in the identified communities or zip codes to be served (approximately 30% of year 1 enrollment). Demand should be demonstrated through	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

meeting sign in sheets or intent to enroll forms that capture, at minimum, parent name, student grade levels, and zip code of residence.	
Proactive and detailed plan for maintaining engagement with parents of prospective students who have already demonstrated interest and converting interest into actual applications for enrollment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.6 Incubation Year Development: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
<p>Provides key milestones for the planning year, as well as concrete actions and accountability, which will ensure that the school is ready for a successful launch. Incubation year plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that any program-specific components will be ready to begin on the first day of school. Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure the school will be operationally ready to open. Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that the SPCSA Pre-Opening Requirements will be met. <i>Note it is not necessary to duplicate every SPCSA pre-opening requirement into your incubation year plan. Instead, focus on the activities that will ensure success and the major milestones that must be met.</i> Clearly identifies the individuals responsible for leading year 0 initiatives and meeting year 0 milestones. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If a third party (including an CMO/EMO) will implement portions of the Year 0 plan, these actions should align to the contract or additional documentation presented later in the application.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the function of any employees in Year 0, as well as the funding source for associated compensation. The staffing outlined for Year 0 will enable the school to reach its Year 0 milestones and goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.7 Services: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific non-academic services, including, but not limited to transportation, food service, facilities management, nursing, and purchasing processes, and school safety.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates a reasonable process and timeline for ensuring school will have information technology infrastructure, equipment, software, and policies to support the school operations and model, including plans for data security and privacy.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Operations plan for services and information technology demonstrates sufficient staff/contactor capacity to implement the plan, including clear lines of authority.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Costs of services are realistic and align with budget.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.8 Facilities: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Facility plans in the short and long-term are reasonable and meet the needs of the projected student population and proposed program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>If a facility (including a temporary facility) has been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. Projected costs associated with the proposed facility, including purchase price, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance, as applicable, are reasonable and supported by evidence. A sound plan for construction, renovations, or tenant improvements including sufficient funds and a realistic timeline for completion. A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. Evidence that the applicant has engaged with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. Assurance that the proposed facility will comply with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school.	
<p>If a facility (or permanent facility) has not yet been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of anticipated facilities needs that will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. • Inclusion of costs associated with the anticipated facilities needs in the budget including renovation, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance. • Evidence to indicate that facilities-related budget assumptions are realistic based on anticipated location, size, etc. • A realistic, timebound plan for selecting and preparing a facility that will meet the programmatic needs and budgetary constraints. • A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. • A clear, time bound plan to engage with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. • Assurance that the proposed location will be in compliance with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Demonstrated capacity to manage facility selection, leasing, acquisition, development, renovation, and management, as applicable. If Committee to Form or CMO has identified a facility development partner, Committee to Form or CMO has thorough plans for managing the partner relationship and ensuring that the partner meets expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

5 FINANCIAL PLAN

5.1 SECTION RATINGS

Financial Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard
----------------	----------------------------

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section was rated overall as Does Not Meet the Standard. Although the Committee to Form plans to contract with a third-party provider that would likely have appropriate financial expertise, the Application exhibits several major shortcomings under this section. First, as mentioned in the Incubation Year Development section, funding is not budgeted for incubation year activities, which may lead to enrollment, staffing, services, and facilities challenges. While the Committee to Form referenced seeking possible additional grant funding for the incubation year during the capacity interview, it is unclear if that will come to fruition, and no immediate funding prospects were described. Additionally, narratives within this section lack key details assuring the school will be fiscally accountable and responsible, concerns further exacerbated by a limited number of individuals with appropriate expertise in financial systems amongst the Committee to Form, proposed board, and proposed staff. Furthermore, as indicated in the Staffing Plan section, various discrepancies exist between the staffing plan and the proposed budget, and as indicated in the Facilities section, facilities may be underbudgeted based on like costs at nearby existing schools. In addition, the timing of revenue within the cashflow statement does not align with the typical state per pupil funding timeline, raising financial viability questions. Overall, it remains unclear whether the Committee to Form has the capacity to implement processes and controls that would result in a fiscally accountable, responsible, and viable school model.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Financial Plan as Does Not Meet the Standard.

5.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

The tables below provide details regarding each rubric criterion and whether it was determined to Meet the Standard. The criterion for which “No” is selected was either rated as Approaches the Standard or Does Not Meet the Standard as described in the new charter school application evaluation rubric and summarized in Appendix A.

5.3.1 Financial Plan: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The school protects mission-critical expenses when faced with budget cuts and commits to maintaining financial viability. The budget does not appropriate for any fund any amount in excess of the budget resources of that fund (in any single year).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities, as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Projections are accurate, conservative, and legally compliant. This includes appropriate allocations for required expenditures such as sponsorship fee, Public Employee Retirement System contributions, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Budget priorities are consistent with the proposed model, including but not limited to educational program, staffing, and facility, and budget priorities are aligned with the proposed enrollment plan, including any enrollment growth.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for all budget line items to allow for the assessment of fiscal viability.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Current ratio based on proposed budget of at least 1.1 on a monthly basis is either 1.1 or better or is between 1.0 and 1.1 and trending positive from the immediately prior year.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
All funds from external sources that are included in the budget are guaranteed with cash in hand or letter of award and grant terms.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
There is no evidence that the school ever will become insolvent or lack access to the necessary amount of liquidity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Assumptions about facilities in all financial statements correspond to a conservative facility plan and account for possible contingencies.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

6 APPLICATION PROCESS DETAILS

6.1 TIMELINE

SPCSA staff offered a five-part training series regarding the New Charter School Application process. Each training was recorded and posted to the SPCSA's website: https://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application_Packet/. Below is a summary of the training that was provided.

- December 5, 2022 – Application Overview and Process
- January 11, 2023 – Application Cover Sheet and Meeting the Need Section
- January 24, 2023 – Academic Plan
- February 9, 2023 – Financial Plan
- February 27, 2023 – Operations Plan and Addendum Section

Below are key dates related to the Mind Your Books Charter School charter school application.

- January 30, 2023 – Mind Your Books Charter School Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2023 – Mind Your Books Charter School Application is received
- May 17, 2023 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input⁵
- June 28, 2023 – Clarifying Questions sent to Applicant; responses received within 3 business days
- July 14, 2023 – Mind Your Books Charter School capacity interview is conducted
- August 2, 2023 – Input provided by CCSD
- August 25, 2023 – Recommendation is presented

6.2 CAPACITY INTERVIEW

Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the review committee conducted a capacity interview of the Applicant to assess the capacity to execute the application's overall plan. The capacity interview for Mind Your Books Charter School was conducted on July 14, 2023, and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form attended the interview, while three of the five proposed board members attended the interview, all of whom are also members of the Committee to Form. Additionally, one representative from Charter Impact, a charter school back-office services provider, attended the capacity interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

- Mission and Vision
- Targeted Plan
- Curriculum and Instructional Design
- Promotion and Graduation Requirements
- Driving for Results
- Professional Development
- School Calendar and Schedule
- Board Governance
- Incubation Year Development
- Facilities
- Financial Plan

⁵ Pursuant to NRS 388A.249, the SPCSA solicited input from the Clark County School District regarding this application. NRS 388A.249(2)(a) requires that "[t]he proposed sponsor of a charter school shall, in reviewing an application to form a charter school...If the proposed sponsor is not the board of trustees of a school district, solicit input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located."

Prior to the capacity interview, the review committee sent the Applicant team a list of clarifying questions to provide an additional opportunity for details and information to be presented. These responses were considered by the review team and were used to better inform the capacity interview.

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that probed the Committee to Form's capacity to respond to a hypothetical situation where the school was experiencing significant under enrollment of students prior to opening.

APPENDIX A

THE CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION “NOTICE OF INTENT”

The charter school application process begins with the submission of a written “notice of intent” to submit a new charter school application. See NAC 388A.260(2). This notice of intent is a brief document, submitted to the SPCSA 90 days prior to the submission of the applicant’s new charter school application, stating, among other things, the name of the proposed charter school, contact information for the applicant, the proposed location of the charter school, and the grade levels and number of students the proposed charter school seeks to serve.

THE SPCSA’S PROPOSED CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION WINDOW

In December 2021, Nevada’s Legislative Commission approved proposed regulation R043-21, which amended Nevada Administrative Code 388A.260(1). With this change, the SPCSA moved from two new charter school application windows each year (previously in January and July of each year), to a single annual application window. As a result, new charter school applications now must be submitted to the SPCSA between April 15 and April 30 of each year.

Part of the intent behind the change to NAC 388A.260(1), and the move from two annual application windows to a single application window in April of each year, was to allow sufficient time to ensure that a newly approved charter school opens successfully. That is, upon receipt of a new charter school application in April, the SPCSA’s review process (as described in greater detail below), typically takes four to eight months – meaning that a new charter school application that is received in April will be approved or denied by the SPCSA in August or December. This timeline allows a newly approved charter school nine to 12 months to successfully execute the charter school’s incubation year plan and ensures a successfully opening of the charter school.

Note that NAC 388A.260(1) still contains a “good cause” provision whereby a new charter school applicant may, for “good cause,” request that the SPCSA accept a new charter school application outside the annual April 15 – April 30 window. However, if the SPCSA approves a “good cause” exemption to submit a new charter school application outside of the annual April application window, a notice of intent to submit a new charter school application must still be submitted to the SPCSA 90 days prior to receipt of the actual application. In practice, this means that upon approval of a good cause exemption by the SPCSA, allowing an applicant to submit a new charter school application outside of the typical April application window, an applicant will submit its new charter school application 90 days after approval of the good cause exemption and receipt of the applicant’s notice of intent.

THE REQUIRED CONTENTS OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

NRS 388A.246 and NAC 388A.135-160 detail the requirements related to a new charter school application. Note that these statutes and regulations related to the required contents of a new charter school applications are extensive.⁶

⁶ Although the following list is not all-inclusive, among the required contents of a new charter school application are the following:

- The name of the proposed charter school;
- The date on which the proposed charter school seeks to open;
- Grade levels and the proposed enrollment that the charter school seeks to serve;
- A summary of the plan for the proposed charter school, including the mission, vision and goals of the proposed charter school;
- Information regarding the indicators, metrics and measures that the proposed charter school will use to evaluate the academic, organizational, and financial performance of the proposed charter school;
- The organization structure of the proposed charter school;
- Information regarding the committee to form and the proposed governance of the charter school;

COMPLETENESS CHECK

After receiving a new charter school application, the SPCSA, pursuant to NRS 388A.249(3)(a)(2) and NAC 388A.260(2) conducts a “completeness check” of the application to ensure that the new charter school application contains all the information required by NRS 388A.246 and NAC 388A.135-160. If a new charter school application does not contain all the information required by Nevada’s charter school statutes and regulations, if practicable, the SPCSA follows up with the applicant to obtain the required information. If not, the applicant is asked to submit a new, complete charter school application during the next application cycle.

WITHDRAWAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

NAC 388A.260(3) allows an applicant to withdraw a new charter school application upon written notice to the SPCSA. An applicant may decide to withdraw its application due to significant concerns regarding the completeness of the application, or because it is evident after a cursory review of the new charter school application that the proposed charter school application is not fully developed.

THE SPCSA’S REVIEW OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

Once a new charter school application is deemed complete in accordance with 388A.249(3)(a)(2) and NAC 388A.260(2), the SPCSA begins its substantive review of the new charter school application.

NRS 388A.249(2)(a) requires the SPCSA to conduct a “thorough review” of the new charter school application. This “thorough review” requires that the SPCSA establish a review team to review and evaluate the new charter school application and include in the review team persons with knowledge and expertise regarding the academic, financial, and organizational facets of charter school that are not employed by the SPCSA – these persons are often referred to as “external reviewers.” NRS 388A.249(2)(a) and NAC 388A.260(4).

As part of this “thorough evaluation” the SPCSA is required to conduct an interview with the applicant to elicit clarifying or additional information about the proposed charter school and determine the ability of the applicant to establish a high-quality charter school – this is the “capacity interview” conducted by the SPCSA. NRS 388A.249(2)(b) and NAC 388A.260(4)(b)(2)

-
- Information regarding the proposed administrative head of the proposed charter school;
 - Information regarding how teachers and staff will be recruited and hired;
 - Course and curriculum information, including any dual-credit programs for high school students (if applicable);
 - Information regarding serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, an at-risk student;
 - The organization structure of the proposed charter school;
 - Information regarding the committee to form and the proposed governance of the charter school;
 - Information regarding the proposed administrative head of the proposed charter school;
 - Information regarding how teachers and staff will be recruited and hired;
 - The proposed charter school’s calendar;
 - Information regarding any proposed facility for the proposed charter school;
 - Equipment, furniture, and fixtures that the proposed charter school will utilize;
 - Transportation, if applicable;
 - Health and safety requirements;
 - Student records;
 - Extracurricular activities and dress code;
 - Discipline policies;
 - Budget;
 - Enrollment and any lottery process and procedures;
 - Information regarding required insurance

In its review of the charter school application, the SPCSA is required to evaluate the new charter school application based on documented evidence collected through the process of reviewing the application and the information gleaned during the capacity interview. See NRS 388A.249(2)(b) and (e).

The determination regarding whether to grant a new charter school application is to be based on the ability of the applicants to establish a high-quality charter school. NRS 388A.249(2)(b). The SPCSA may approve a new charter school application if:

- The application complies with all charter school laws and regulations;
- The application is complete;
- The applicant has demonstrated competence in accordance with the SPCSA's new charter school application rubric demonstrating that approval of the new charter school application will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school;
- The application meets the criteria contained in the SPCSA's academic and demographic needs assessment; and
- Sufficient input has been received the public. NRS 388A.249(3).

The North Star of the review team's evaluation of the new charter school application is the SPCSA's new charter school application rubric. NRS 388A.249(2)(b). The rubric is broken into four major sections, plus an addendum. Rating options for each section are Meets the Standard; Approaches the Standard; Does not Meet the Standard. These are defined as follows:

- **Meets the Standard:** The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school is expected to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the plan effectively and result in a 4- or 5-star school.
- **Approaches the Standard:** The response meets the criteria in many respects but lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas.
- **Does Not Meet the Standard:** The response is undeveloped or incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation and/or raises serious questions about the coherence of the application and whether it is original work; raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant's ability to carry it out.

Detailed descriptions of each rubric item can be found in the full rubric located on the SPCSA Application website:

http://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application_Packet/

Once the review team reviews and scores the new charter school application, the SPCSA's Executive Director, or his or her designee, forwards his or her recommendation to the SPCSA Board for its consideration. NAC 388A.260(6)

THE SPCSA'S APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

The SPCSA Board is required to consider a new charter school application at a public meeting held no more than 120 days (or later if agreed to by the applicant) after receipt of the new charter school application. NRS 388A.255(1).

RESUBMISSION AND APPEAL OF A DENIAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

If a new charter application is denied, an unsuccessful applicant will be provided with a written notice setting out the deficiencies contained in the new charter school application. If the applicant chooses to do so, the applicant may resubmit the applicant's new charter school application within 30 days after receiving the written notice of deficiencies. NRS 388A.255(2). Given the lengthy and rigorous application process utilized by the SPCSA in regard to charter applications, as well as the limited timeframe specified in NRS 388A.255(2) for an unsuccessful applicant to resubmit their charter application, the SPCSA encourages only those unsuccessful applicants that the SPCSA has found limited or specific areas where the application does not meet standards to resubmit their charter application. Unsuccessful

applicants that the SPCSA has found numerous or significant issues within the application that do not meet standard are encouraged to submit a new charter application during the SPCSA's next application window.

If a new charter school application is denied after resubmission, the unsuccessful applicant may then appeal the denial to the district court in which the proposed charter school was to be located. NRS 388A.255(3).