

New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

August 25, 2023



Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy of Nevada

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed School Name	Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy of Nevada
Proposed EMO/CMO	SSS Education Inc (CMO)
Proposed Mission and Vision	<p>Mission: The mission of Pioneer Technology and Arts Academy Nevada (PTAAN) is to empower and engage students, especially underserved and underrepresented populations, to reach their full potential as global leaders who enhance their communities and the world through an inquiry-based STEM/STEAM (terms are used interchangeably throughout this application) curriculum that emphasizes creativity, collaboration, and innovation.</p> <p>Vision: The vision of PTAAN is to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Become a global leader in STEAM education• Prepare all students for success in postsecondary education• Increase the diversity of students earning STEAM degrees and entering STEAM professions• Ensure that all members of our community make positive contributions to the world around them.
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: K-8 Full Scale: K-12
Proposed Opening	August 2024
Proposed Location	Clark County; 89107, 89108, 89030, 89106, 89130, 89084
Proposed Zip Codes to be Served	89107, 89108, 89106, 89032, 89031, 89030, 89084, 89086, 89081, 89128, 89129, 89149, 89130, 89131, 89119, 89118

PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
K	52	72	108	126	126	126
1	22	66	110	110	110	110
2	22	66	110	110	110	110
3	22	66	110	110	110	110
4	25	75	125	125	125	125
5	25	75	100	100	100	100
6	25	75	125	125	125	125
7	32	64	96	128	128	128
8	32	64	96	96	129	128
9		32	96	96	96	128
10			32	96	96	96
11				32	96	96
12					32	96
Total	257	655	1108	1254	1382	1478

CONTENTS

- 1 Overview and Recommendation 4
- 2 Meeting the Need 7
- 3 Academic Plan 10
- 4 Operations Plan 17
- 5 Financial Plan 23
- 6 Addendum 25
- 7 Application Process Details 29
- Appendix A 31

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 applicable¹, 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 five of the five main sections of the application Meet the Standard as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan	Meets the Standard
Operations Plan	Meets the Standard
Financial Plan	Meets the Standard
Addendum ²	Meets 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 approve the Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy charter school application.

1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

Proposed motion: *Approve the Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy application as submitted during the 2023 Application Cycle, with the conditions as permitted by NAC 388A.410 and as outlined below, based on a finding that the Applicant has met the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3) in that the Applicant has demonstrated competence in*

¹ 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.

² In accordance with NRS 388A.249, the SPCSA is required to consider the academic, financial, and organizational performance of any charter schools that currently hold a contract with the proposed CMO or EMO. This information is evaluated through the Addendum section, which is required for applicants that propose to contract with an EMO or CMO.

accordance with the criteria for approval prescribed by the SPCSA that will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school.

- 1. By October 1, 2023 submit written plans for establishing the local board and handing off the charter to the local board.*
- 2. By January 15, 2024 submit a fully executed lease for a facility that will meet the needs of the school for the 2024-25 school year located in one of the following zip codes: 89107, 89108, 89030, 89106, 89130, or 89084.*
- 3. Provide an update regarding the academic, organizational, and financial performance of all other PTAA affiliated schools in September of each year through 2025.*
- 4. By June 30, 2025 provide evidence of partnership with colleges or universities to offer dual credit programs in compliance with NRS 389.310.*
- 5. Complete the SPCSA pre-opening process for new charter schools.*

Pursuant to NAC 388A.410, all conditions set forth above must be met for the school to open for the 2024-25 school year.

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	Meets the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Meets the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan³	Meets the Standard
Transformational Change	Meets the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Meets the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Meets the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Meets the Standard
Professional Development	Meets the Standard
School Culture	Meets the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Meets the Standard
Board Governance	Meets the Standard
Leadership Team	Meets the Standard
Staffing Plan	Meets the Standard
Human Resources	Meets the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Meets the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard
Financial Plan	Meets the Standard
Addendum	Meets the Standard
Past Performance	Approaches the Standard
Scale Strategy	Meets the Standard
Network Capacity	Meets the Standard
School Management Contract	Meets the Standard
Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly	Approaches the Standard

³ The Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy proposal did not contemplate Distance Education. Therefore, the corresponding section of the rubric was not scored.

2 MEETING THE NEED

2.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Mission and Vision section was rated as Meets the Standard. The mission of Pioneer Technology and Arts Academy Nevada includes a description of empowering underserved and underrepresented populations to reach their full potential as global leaders. The Applicant plans to fulfill the school’s mission through an inquiry-based STEM/STEAM curriculum which meets the statutory purpose of encouraging the use of effective and innovative methods of teaching. At the high school level, the school will offer a Pathways in Technology Early College High Schools (PTECH) program, which is not currently available in Nevada. The proposed mission statement emphasizes creativity, collaboration, and innovation which will improve the quality of life for students and meet the needs of the community by responding to the fast, ever-changing global economy and critical shortage of professionals to fill local and national demand for Science Technology Engineering Arts and Math (STEAM) professionals. The Applicant provides a compelling mission statement which both explains the needs of the community and demonstrates a commitment to improving the long-term quality of life for all students.

The Targeted Plan section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant fully describes the community within the city of North Las Vegas as fast growing with numerous development opportunities. The narrative includes a map of possible geographic locations by zip code with schools that were most recently rated as 1-and 2-stars. The Applicant demonstrates that 63% of the schools in the proposed area are rated as 1- or 2-stars. The expected demographics of the students to be served by the proposed school are similar to the population served by other Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy (PTAA) schools located in other states. Performance data from the existing schools in Texas demonstrate the proposed program has been successful in supporting students in achieving academic performance at or above the state average. The proposed educational model is described clearly and addresses demand for a unique academic experience for students. Finally, the plan is in alignment with Nevada’s priorities for workforce and economic development.

The Parent and Community Involvement section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant appears to have extensive experience with school operations and acknowledged the importance of having members of the board consist of committed and engaged citizens who want to improve the community. In the Applicant’s responses to clarifying questions and during the capacity interview, the Applicant demonstrated an understanding of the proposed community and explained how the community voice has been incorporated within the application. The Applicant also plans to maintain engagement through various methods including virtual meeting options as well as school correspondence in Spanish and English. The Applicant has identified several partners and resources that have documented their commitment through Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) and demonstrates the school will adhere to state laws ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.

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 Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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 : <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 SECTION RATINGS

Academic Plan ⁴	Meets the Standard
Transformational Change	Meets the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Meets the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Meets the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Meets the Standard
Professional Development	Meets the Standard
School Culture	Meets the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Approaches the Standard

3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Academic Plan was rated as Meets the Standard. Eight of the ten sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Transformational Change section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant provides a comprehensive and well-defined educational strategy which is well aligned to the school’s mission statement. The Applicant outlines plans to replicate best practices developed by PTAA schools in Texas to ensure the proposed school earns a 4-or 5-star rating on the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). During the capacity interview and in response to clarifying questions, the Applicant team addressed performance at its Texas campuses and explained how the model might be adjusted depending on the needs of anticipated students at the Nevada campus. The application includes a clear rationale and evidence-based research to support their choice of curricula and instructional practices. These practices have proven to be effective with students with various needs and in particular with targeted populations such as students qualifying for free- and reduced-lunch. The proposed school’s instructional methods include blended learning/technology-based instruction, project-based learning, and Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematic (STEAM). All proposed curricula are aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, and offer high-yield, student centered, learning opportunities for students, especially previous low performing students.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant provided information on the backward design of the curriculum to support the instructional model. It appears this was intentional to ensure a strong instructional program. The Applicant included a plan to identify quantitative and qualitative early warning systems to identify and serve students needing additional support. The Applicant plans to use a Multi-Tiered System of Support to Support (MTSS) struggling students through a tiered approach to instruction that allows for increasing levels of intervention. The Applicant plans to integrate the academic Response to Intervention (RTI) process with additional Positive Behavioral Interventions and supports (PBIS) to ensure whole-child support. The Applicant proposes a school with a positive learning environment and small class size ratios. In addition, the Applicant demonstrates a commitment

⁴ The Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy proposal did not contemplate Distance Education. Therefore, the final section of the corresponding rubric were not scored.

to a common vision, mutual respect, and high expectations. The narrative also includes a plan to maintain flexible classrooms which allow for adjustments to be implemented to meet the need of students.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant's educational model offers a variety of high school courses for students to fulfill the credit requirements for the three diploma types offered in Nevada. The sequence adheres to programming designed for each student's specific pathway and are in alignment with Nevada graduation requirements. The Applicant acknowledged that depending on a specific student population, other methods will be utilized to drive student promotion and graduation based on Universal Screeners and other school administered assessments. Flexible and research backed structures including MTSS, project-based learning, and RTI are in place to support students at risk of dropping out, including those who are over age for their grade, and those needing to access credit recovery options.

The Driving for Results section of the application meets all the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant describes two mission-specific academic growth goals and three additional goals centered on ensuring that students, families, and faculty are satisfied with the academic program, improving academic outcomes of underrepresented students studying STEM subjects, and demonstrating an increase in student interest in STEM careers and STEM postsecondary education. The Applicant has set two behavioral goals. The first includes demonstrating that no student group will be disproportionately impacted by discipline policies. The second is to demonstrate an increase in the aggregate score using the Nevada School Climate Data Tool. The Applicant displays a solid plan for measuring and reporting academic and progress performance of students and for monitoring disparities in academic performance between student groups. During the capacity interview the Applicant further explained how they would use a data dashboard to monitor and analyze student data in order to make decisions for academic and behavioral interventions as needed using the research-based MTSS model.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations section of the application meets all the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant demonstrates an understanding of the different student populations and defines an "at-risk" student as "a pupil having an economic or academic disadvantage such that he or she requires special services and assistance to enable him or her to succeed in educational programs". (NRS 388A.045) The Applicant is committed to employing MTSS, a universal screening and assessment system, to quickly identify and support at-risk students. The school will monitor factors associated with increased risk of academic failure or drop out. These include social and economic factors such as qualifying for free- and reduced-lunch, being temporarily displaced, being placed in foster care, the educational attainment of parents, English language proficiency levels, and students within a single parent family. The Applicant presents a reasonable plan for responding to needed academic interventions for students performing below grade level using age-appropriate assessments such as daily observations of student learning, outcomes on performance tasks, and data derived from formalized assessments taking place at set intervals during the school year. The Applicant has integrated a plan to implement grade level interim and summative assessments at every grade level. Several members of the Applicant team have previously worked to achieve high academic outcomes for students with disabilities, English language learners, homeless and migrant students, and intellectually gifted students.

The Professional Development section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The narrative describes their approach to professional development as a custom-fit model because it is flexible and intended to empower and engage staff. Staff training will be targeted to address unique challenges which are anticipated to be specific to the proposed teacher and leader populations within the school. The Applicant has outlined plans to prepare educators to provide high levels rigor, and relevance, as and instructional engagement strategies. Professional development preparations include content-based training within math and reading, data analysis and preparing staff to implement strong levels of differentiation within the classroom. By employing whole group, small group, individualized job-embedded coaching and a professional development skill management system, the Applicant plans to work with school-site instructional leaders to model,

train, and sustain greater levels of academic success by empowering both teachers and leaders at the school. The Applicant has plans to hold a ten-day professional development session as the incubation year ends and prior to the new school year beginning. These sessions will focus on team building, STEM/STEAM, Project-Based Learning, Mindfulness, and PBIS Framework, Math, Science, History, and English language arts curriculum training differentiated by grade level. Other professional development prior to the school year will include Nevada education regulations regarding special populations including students with disabilities, English language learners, and gifted and talented students. The Applicant will implement Professional Learning Communities to review and break down the Nevada Academic Content standards and examine instructional practices in relation to student data and learning. The principal and school-based coaches will be responsible for daily and weekly professional development of teachers and the Charter Management Organization (CMO), and contracted partners will be the driving force of professional development initiatives and practices and will provide daily guidance to the school team.

The School Culture section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant describes a commitment to establishing and maintaining a supportive culture and promoting student agency and educational equity. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, (PBIS), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and Restorative Justice are the three cornerstones of the school culture proposed by the Applicant. The school is committed to reinforcing students' intellectual, social, and emotional development. The Applicant plans to introduce all components to teachers during the hiring process and focus on hiring staff who are ready to nurture the development of both the students and each other. The Applicant plans to measure and monitor these outcomes using a third-party entity and a survey provided to parents, students, and staff once each semester of the school year. The strategies presented within the application are supported by research. During the capacity interview, the proposed board demonstrated a commitment to establishing a strong staff and student culture through a thoughtful and detailed consideration of data presented as part of

The proposed Student Discipline plan is generally aligned to the proposed school model, but concerns remain regarding restorative justice practices, resulting in a rating of Approaches the Standard. In particular, the written procedures for restorative justice practices do not include behavior goals that are clear and measurable. Although the Applicant categorizes the types of discipline offenses, the Applicant does not discuss the procedures that will be used to implement the system in detail. While the Applicant indicates that the school may work with the guidance of the Exceptional Student Education coordinator to ensure there is not disproportionate discipline of students with disabilities, the narrative does not present a clear and comprehensive plan to ensure that student subgroups are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies. In addition, the Applicant states that disciplinary data reports are generated at least three times per year by the principal to measure progress, however these are broad goals and would benefit from additional specificity.

The School Calendar section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant states that the school will have 180 instructional days, and the proposed minutes of the instruction per year for all grades meets or exceeds the statutory and regulatory requirements. The Applicant provided additional details regarding time for professional development, extended learning blocks and expanded learning time for the MTSS tier one and two interventions during the school day. The Applicant identified an attendance goal of 95% average daily attendance and provided additional details about plans to prevent chronic absenteeism and an early warning system at the school. The Applicant has sound policies for school attendance and describes procedures that comply with due process and state laws.

The Dual Credit section of the application was rated Approaches Standard. The Applicant indicates that high school students will have the opportunity to earn college credits. Students may attend and pass Advanced Placement or Project Lead the Way courses or complete courses through partnerships with local community colleges. The Applicant identifies and provides agreements for two partnerships for dual credit, Arizona State University and College of Southern Nevada. However, it is not clear how the school will incorporate both of these dual credit providers and ensure compliance with

Nevada’s dual credit statutes. The proposed program for dual credit is both appropriate for high school students and financially accessible to all students.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Academic Plan as Meets 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: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.2 Curriculum and Instructional Design: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that instructional strategies are well suited to the identified student population and will enable effective differentiation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

3.3.3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

3.3.4 Driving for Results: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
<p>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.</p> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Logical plan for using assessment data to drive key decisions aimed at improving academic outcomes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA’s Performance Frameworks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.5 At-Risk Students and Special Populations: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents a reasonable plan and identifies the parties responsible for communicating with parents regarding remediation needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>For students with disabilities:</p> <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. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
<p>For English language learners</p> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>For homeless/migrant students:</p> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.6 Professional Development: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Explains teacher coaching plans that will effectively support teacher development, including responsible parties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Cost of any third party provided professional development is reflected in the budget.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.7 School Culture: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.10 Dual Credit Partnerships: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Detailed plan for establishing and running a program for dual credit to enable students to enroll in dual credit courses at a college or university.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Evidence of, at minimum, initial engagement with a college or university and clear steps and timelines for further engagement to ensure that the dual credit program will come to fruition.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Specific plans for monitoring students enrolled in the dual credit program to ensure they have sufficient supports and resources to successfully earn college credits.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed program for dual credit is shown to be both appropriate for high school students seeking advanced coursework as well as financially accessible to all students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4 OPERATIONS PLAN

4.1 SECTION RATINGS

Operations Plan	Meets the Standard
Board Governance	Meets the Standard
Leadership Team	Meets the Standard
Staffing Plan	Meets the Standard
Human Resources	Meets the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Meets the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard

4.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Operations Plan was rated as Meets the Standard. Five of the eight sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Board Governance section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The application demonstrates clear delineation of authority and describes the board’s role in governing and the school leadership’s role in implementation and management. In response to clarifying questions, the Applicant provided clarity on the role of the Advisory Board and how it would support the board in such a manner that demonstrates good governance. During the capacity interview, the proposed board answered several questions and took a leadership role, demonstrating a robust understanding of the proposal and a wide range of relevant knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to oversee the school. One board member shared how he has visited some of the other schools in the Charter Management Organization (CMO) network. In response to the scenario-based question, the proposed board and CMO demonstrated a solid understanding of roles with the board initiating the conversation about additional information they would seek and actions they would direct the CMO and school staff to take. In addition, the proposed board has established bylaws, a conflict-of-interest policy, annual disclosure requirements, as well as a Contract Transparency Policy. Per the application, clarifying questions, and the capacity interview, the Applicant provides evidence ensuring statutory requirements for board membership will be met prior to the opening of the school.

The Leadership Team section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant provided additional details in response to clarifying questions that further explained the roles of the leadership team. In particular, the proposed leader brings valuable experience that aligns to the population of students to be served. In discussions at the capacity interview, the leadership team demonstrated an understanding of opening a new school as well as a commitment to student needs. During the capacity interview, the Applicant discussed plans for the school leader to transition from another school within the PTAA network of schools to launch the new school. This plan will allow the proposed leader to focus on a successful opening while ensuring a smooth transition at the existing school. During the capacity interview the proposed board articulated an ambitious, data-driven set of standards for both the school leader and the proposed school.

The Staffing Plan section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant presents a staffing plan that considers the proposed model including implementation of the STEAM and PTECH program. The Applicant proposes reasonable student-teacher ratios and the staffing plan is in alignment to the budget. During the capacity interview, the Applicant demonstrated an understanding of the challenges they will face recruiting teachers. Specifically, the CMO staff shared experience meeting the needs of special populations with sufficient capacity in other Title I schools within the network.

The Human Resources section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. The Applicant shared plans to hire people with various backgrounds including veteran teachers who have significant experience in both direct teaching methods and project-based learning as well as new teachers who have recently completed their teacher training and are open to new kinds of teaching methods. The Applicant demonstrated a commitment to diversity and shared strategies such as partnering with UNLV for recruitment and hiring. Based upon their previous experience, the Applicant believes their commitment to a fair teacher compensation package and work life balance will provide a competitive edge. The Applicant explained a focus on the selection process will ensure a deep commitment to the teaching profession. During the capacity interview the Applicant described processes for regular review of compensation packages to ensure the school remains competitive.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated Meets the Standard. In response to clarifying questions, the Applicant explained specific targets are designed to ensure the school is on track to meet the enrollment goals along with plans to monitor progress towards these targets. During the capacity interview, the proposed board and CMO discussed the school's enrollment projections and while they include substantial growth over time, the Applicant team believes the growth is attainable due to the fact that the school will be unique within the Las Vegas community. The Applicant also explained how the team would approach the budget if they did not meet the enrollment targets. In addition to reducing staff to align to enrollment numbers, facility costs could also be reduced due to the way the facility financing will be structured. The student recruitment and enrollment plan demonstrated proactive grassroots strategies and included specific plans to ensure equal access to interested families including families in poverty and those students zoned to attend 1-and 2-star schools, students with disabilities, English language learners, and other at-risk students as defined in SPCSA's Needs Assessment.

The Incubation Year section of the application is generally aligned to the proposed school model, but concerns remain regarding specific details and goals for the incubation period, resulting in a rating of Approaches the Standard. The incubation year plan is general in nature and says the Applicant will finalize the facility but does not provide detail as to what steps will be taken. Details about when financial policies and procedures will be established and approved is not included in the application. In addition, there is little detail about staff on-boarding and limited discussion on the leadership training and staff development tied to the STEAM, Project Based, or Blended Learning instructional models. Although the narrative states that professional development for staff will take place ten days prior to the school opening, further details about the plan were not included. The Applicant outlined the function of employees in year zero, as well as the funding sources for associated compensation. The staffing outlined for year zero will enable the school to reach its year zero milestones and goals.

The Services section of the application is generally aligned to the proposed school model, but concerns remain regarding timelines for procuring services, and processes for evaluating the effectiveness of the services, resulting in a rating of Approaches the Standard. The application does not include timelines for the technology infrastructure, equipment, software, and policies. There is no discussion on how the Applicant will ensure electronic student data will be secure. While the Applicant identifies who will provide the services and explains in general terms that they have experience with other schools, they do not provide details to demonstrate their success.

The Facilities section of the application was rated as Approaches the Standard. Based upon details provided in response to clarifying questions and the capacity interview, it appears that while a facility has not been identified, the CMO has a solid strategy based upon prior experience to occupy a smaller facility for the first two years and then expand the facility for the third year to include spaces needed for the high school PTECH program. This will provide an opportunity to see where enrollments numbers land as well as determine the overall facility needs of the school. The CMO appears to have extensive experience in obtaining appropriate facilities. The narrative included a lengthy list of potential zip codes to locate the school. However, the Applicant clarified the intention to locate the school within one of six zip codes in North Las Vegas. While the Applicant has demonstrated capacity to manage facility selection, leasing, acquisition,

development, renovation, and management the narrative does not provide a timebound plan for selecting and preparing a facility.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Operations Plan as Meets 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: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.3 Staffing Plan: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.4 Human Resources: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Meets 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. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 meeting sign in sheets or intent to enroll forms that capture, at minimum, parent name, student grade levels, and zip code of residence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.6 Incubation Year Development: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
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: <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Approaches 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

<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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<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
<p>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.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

5 FINANCIAL PLAN

5.1 SECTION RATINGS

Financial Plan	Meets the Standard
----------------	--------------------

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant has included accurate projections which appear conservative and legally compliant. While the Applicant is hopeful that the school will receive the Charter School Program grant, the budget does not include this revenue since it is not guaranteed. However, the CMO has confirmed that it can provide a line of credit for to cover incubation year costs, if needed. In response to clarifying questions, the Applicant was able to resolve question about key expenditures for nursing services and back-office support. In the capacity interview, the Applicant articulated a reasonable approach to handling under enrollment and ensuring viability without diluting the proposed model. In response to clarifying questions, the Applicant clarified the roles and responsibilities of the financial officer and the business manager. Based upon the discussions at the capacity interview, the CMO appears to have strong financial expertise and experience with opening and operating a school.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Financial Plan as Meets 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: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for all budget line items to allow for the assessment of fiscal viability.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
There is no evidence that the school ever will become insolvent or lack access to the necessary amount of liquidity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Assumptions about facilities in all financial statements correspond to a conservative facility plan and account for possible contingencies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6 ADDENDUM

6.1 SECTION RATINGS

Addendum	Meets the Standard
Past Performance	Approaches the Standard
Scale Strategy	Meets the Standard
Network Capacity	Meets the Standard
School Management Contract	Meets the Standard
Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly	Approaches the Standard

6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In accordance with Assembly Bill 419 from the 2021 Session of the Nevada Legislature, the SPCSA is required to consider the academic, financial, and organizational performance of any charter schools that currently hold a contract with the proposed CMO or EMO. Information gathered through the Addendum Section examines the past performance of affiliated charter schools, as well as readiness of the CMO or EMO to expand and the specific services that are to be provided to the proposed school.

Overall, the Addendum section was rated as Meets the Standard. Three of the five sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Past Performance section was rated overall as Approaches the Standard due to outstanding concerns about performance of certain PTAA affiliated schools. The Texas schools, which have the longest track record, have the highest achievement with recent ratings of B's and C's on the State's rating system, but the student population includes fewer at-risk students than the proposed Nevada school. However, the newer schools in Colorado, Arizona, and Nevada have lower student performance but are closer to the student demographics for the proposed school. It is important to note that both the Arizona and Nevada schools are turnaround efforts that were undertaken during the COVID-19 pandemic. The CMO acknowledged that these turnarounds will take three to five years to achieve desired performance levels. While overall performance ratings and student proficiency rates raise some concerns, student growth is stronger. In addition, PTAA has recently partnered with National Academic Educational Partners (NAEP) to bolster the academic program. Initial data indicates that this partnership is driving improvements in school performance. Additionally, the turnaround school in Arizona is operating under consent agreement due to non-compliance during the 2021-22 school year and financial performance ratings by the Arizona authorizer point to some concerns about the school's financial health. However, recent data indicates that the Arizona school has resolved prior compliance issues and according to the CMO, the financial performance concerns stem from efforts to make the school self-sustaining as part of the turnaround effort. Prior to becoming part of the PTAA network of schools, the Arizona school was reliant on supplemental funding from the prior management organization.

The Scale Strategy section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. During the capacity interview and in the application, the CMO leadership explained that they do not plan to grow into any other states. While the CMO has future plans to add additional schools, this will not occur until the proposed school in Nevada has shown academic success for three years. The Applicant has a plan to commit organizational resources to support the proposed school opening and operations. The plan is well defined, thoughtful and includes a strategic vision and five-year growth plan that are consistent throughout the application. The CMO shared lessons learned during previous scale-up endeavors and demonstrated criteria for establishing high expectations for academic, financial, and organizational performance.

The Network Capacity section of the application meets all of the criteria as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric and was rated as Meets the Standard. Based upon the additional information provided in clarifying

questions and the discussions with the Applicant in the capacity interview, it appears that the CMO has created an organization that includes the necessary network capacity to support their growth. The Applicant team has extensive experience with charter schools and appear to understand the Nevada environment. In addition, the narrative describes plans to support teachers with instructional coaches to ensure fidelity to the model, providing evidence that the CMO has been thoughtful about developing network capacity.

The School Management Contract section of the application was rated as Meets the Standard. The application included a draft management agreement that appears to comply with Nevada laws and regulations. A review of the application reveals that costs for CMO services are justified, reasonable, and commensurate with the services provided. In addition, the narrative provided information about the delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school. During the capacity interview, the proposed board demonstrated an understanding of their role and responsibility to hold the CMO and the school leader accountable. There remain some minor concerns about the intersection between the role of the school leader and CMO and what will transpire in the event that the school leader and CMO disagree on a course of action.

The Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly section of the application was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant plans to have a local governing board, made up of a majority of individuals who reside in Nevada hold the charter contract. This local governing board will enter into a management agreement with the CMO to provide services related to the implementation of the school model as well as back office and operational services. While this approach complies with Nevada’s laws and regulations and is likely to ensure that the school is responsive to the needs of the local community, the plan for the establishment of the governing board and handoff from the CMO is not well defined.

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

6.3 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.

6.3.1 Past Performance: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Academic Performance data for schools affiliated with the CMO/EMO demonstrate strong performance equivalent to 4- or 5-star performance on the NSPF.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Financial Performance data for schools affiliated with the CMO/EMO demonstrate strong performance equivalent to a rating of ‘meets standard’ on the SPCSA’s Financial Performance Framework.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Organizational Performance data for schools affiliated with the CMO/EMO demonstrate strong performance equivalent to a rating of ‘meets standard’ on the SPCSA’s Organizational Performance Framework.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The CMO/EMO and affiliated schools have no significant audit findings within the last three years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Any legal issues, including contract terminations, are satisfactorily explained.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Any authorizer interventions, compliance violations, performance deficiencies and/or schools that failed to open or did not open on time are explained and were satisfactorily resolved.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

6.3.2 Scale Strategy: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
----------	---------------------

Well defined, thoughtful, strategic vision and five-year growth plan for developing new schools in Nevada and/or elsewhere, as applicable. Includes number and types of schools, proposed opening years, all currently identified communities and an explanation of how they were selected, and projected numbers of students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Meaningful focus on expansion in Nevada and commitment of organizational resources to support quality school openings and operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
CMO/EMO criteria for evaluating readiness for expansion are comprehensive and demonstrate high expectations for academic, financial, and organizational performance. Evidence is provided that that CMO/EMO is ready to expand according to the articulated criteria for evaluating readiness.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The plan to scale the model to Nevada is thorough, realistic, and adequately resourced at both the CMO/EMO and school levels.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Plans for sourcing and training potential school leaders, including qualifications and competencies, is aligned with the mission and programs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Previous scale-up endeavors are shown to have been successful with student performance data and organizational financial data (if applicable).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Includes plan to infuse Nevada school(s) with the essential elements of CMO/EMO model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6.3.3 Network Capacity: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
CMO/EMO has sufficient infrastructure and staff capacity (or plan to develop same) to support the proposed network of schools, including shared services and the costs associated with them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Organization charts clearly indicate lines of authority between the board, CMO/EMO, and schools.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clearly describes the roles and responsibilities of the CMO/EMO leadership team.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient evidence is provided that the staffing plan for the CMO/EMO can support the proposed scale strategy.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6.3.4 School Management Contract: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
If applicable, clear rationale for selection of the CMO/EMO.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Clear, appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school. The functions table presented in this section should align to the contract.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates capacity and commitment of the governing board to oversee the CMO/EMO effectively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for board to monitor/evaluate the CMO/EMO's performance. Appropriate internal controls guide the relationship. Describes how the governing board will ensure fulfillment of performance expectations. There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives) nor any supervisory or business relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives). Any real or perceived conflict is disclosed and adequately addressed. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clearly outlines the roles/responsibilities of the CMO/EMO in the year prior to the school's opening. Services and supports during year 0 are documentation in the management contract or another agreement to ensure that governing board can hold CMO/EMO accountable for delivery of services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If the administrative head of the charter school or any key personnel of the charter school are directly employed by the CMO/EMO, there are provisions to ensure board approval of the individual(s) selected for this/these roles. Structures are in place to ensure that the governing board can hold the administrative head and any key personnel employed by the CMO/EMO accountable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Clearly defined contract terms including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The duration of the proposed contract, A clear description of the fees to be paid to the proposed CMO/EMO and a clear description of the services that the proposed CMO/EMO will be providing to the proposed charter school, A description of the roles and responsibilities of the proposed governing body of the charter school, the employees of the proposed charter school, and the proposed CMO/EMO, A clear description of the oversight responsibilities of the proposed governing body over the proposed CMO/EMO and how the proposed governing body will evaluate the performance of the proposed CMO/EMO, and Any renewal or termination provisions. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Costs for services are justified, reasonable, and commensurate with the services provided. The management contract does not authorize the payment of fees to the CMO/EMO which are not attributable to the actual services provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Complies with Nevada laws and regulations regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors, including EMOs and CMOs, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with CMO/EMO is subordinate to the charter contract, • Initial contract term is no more than two years, • Contract with CMO/EMO does not give the CMO/EMO direct control of educational services, financial decisions, the appointment of members of the governing body, or the hiring and dismissal of an administrator or financial officer of the charter school or proposed charter school, and • Contract with CMO/EMO does not include any automatic renewal terms. • The contract does not allow for any form of leverage – including but not limited to severance fees and facilities ownership – by which the CMO/EMO can ensure renewal of their contract. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6.3.5 Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The application clearly and logically explains the extent to which the governance model of the Charter Management Organization requires a waiver from the governance provisions of the charter school law pursuant to NRS 388A.243 .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If the Charter Management Organization is from another state, the application provides a comprehensive, actionable plan to ensure that the board will balance fidelity to its mission with appropriate input and oversight from Nevada residents.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
If the non-profit’s current board will govern the charter school, the application outlines clear, logical, and comprehensive steps to transform its board membership to meet statutory requirements in NRS 388A.320 , mission, and bylaws to assume its new duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
If a new board has been formed, the application clearly delineates the new board’s relationship to the existing non-profit board and the governance responsibilities of both entities as it relates to the proposed school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

7 APPLICATION PROCESS DETAILS

7.1 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 Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy charter school application.

- January 12, 2023 – Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2023 – Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy Application is received
- May 17, 2023 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input⁵
- June 27, 2023 – Clarifying Questions sent to Applicant; responses received within 3 business days
- July 13, 2023 – Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy capacity interview is conducted
- August 2, 2023 – Input provided by CCSD
- August 25, 2023 – Recommendation is presented

7.2 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 Pioneer Technology & Arts Academy was conducted on July 13, 2023 and lasted approximately 120-minutes. Four of the five members of the proposed board, the proposed principal, three members of Charter Management Organization, and one representative of a contractor of the CMO (National Academic Educational Partners) attended the interview.

Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

- Targeted Plan
- Parent and Community Involvement
- School Calendar and Schedule
- At-Risk Students and Special Populations
- Driving for Results
- Board Governance
- Leadership Team
- Incubation Year Development
- Human Resources
- Financial Plan
- Past Performance
- Scale Strategy
- School Management Contract

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."

- Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly

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 Applicant’s capacity to respond to various school performance data during the first charter term. Specifically, the scenario provided enrollment, financial, student growth, and teacher and student satisfaction data and asked the Applicant to identify actions that would be taken to ensure the school is in a position to be successfully renewed.

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).