New Charter School Application Report
and Recommendation

August 25, 2023

Nevada State Public Charter School Authority

Thrive Point Academy of Nevada

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed School Name	Thrive Point Academy of Nevada
Proposed EMO/CMO	Learning Matters Education Group (EMO)
Proposed Mission and Vision	**Mission:** Thrive Point Academy of Nevada's mission is to offer a schooling experience, including credit recovery, to at-risk students; who have been suspended from another school, have habitual disciplinary issues, are academically disadvantaged, have been adjudicated, and/or have an Individualized Educational Plan; in underserved communities and prepare all Thrive Point students for their Next Big Step in life, whether postsecondary education, the workforce, and/or military enlistment. **Vision:** To prepare Nevadan students for their next big step in life, supporting them through three pillars of success; Action, Engagement, and Achievement, and to be the preferred choice in personalized learning for at-risk high school students living in underserved communities
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: 9-12 Full Scale: 9-12
Proposed Opening	August 2024
Proposed Location	Clark County; 204 S. Decatur Blvd. #210, Las Vegas, NV 89107
Proposed Zip Codes to be Served	89107

PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
K						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9	100	150	200	250	300	350
10	100	150	200	250	300	350
11	100	150	200	250	300	350
12	100	150	200	250	300	350
Total	400	600	800	1000	1200	1400

CONTENTS

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 applicable[1], main sections of the application (Meeting the Need, Academic Plan, Operations Plan, Finance Plan, and Addendum, if applicable) by the end of the application and evaluation process to be recommended for authorization. If an application Meets the Standard in all but one section, and Approaches the Standard in the one remaining section, the application and proposed new charter school may be recommended for authorization if the remaining issues are specific and limited and the outstanding deficiencies can be addressed through conditions. In addition, as part of the review process, the SPCSA seeks input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located. The input provided by the school district is posted along with other relevant materials for this application for consideration by the SPCSA board.

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

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

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard
Academic Plan	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard
Addendum[2]	Approaches the Standard

Details regarding the rating for each component of the application can be found in Section 1.3 of this report. Based on these ratings and the findings summarized within the remainder of this report, the SPCSA staff's recommendation is to deny the Thrive Point Academy of Nevada charter school application.

---

[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.

1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

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

1.3 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION SECTION RATINGS

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

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	**Approaches the Standard**
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Does Not Meet the Standard
Academic Plan[3]	**Approaches the Standard**
Transformational Change	Approaches the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Does Not Meet the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Meets the Standard
Programs of Distance Education	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	**Approaches the Standard**
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard
Financial Plan	**Approaches the Standard**
Addendum	**Approaches the Standard**
Past Performance	Meets the Standard
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard
Network Capacity	Approaches the Standard
School Management Contract	Approaches the Standard

---

[3] The Thrive Point Academy of Nevada proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Dual Credit Partnerships. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

2 MEETING THE NEED

2.1 SECTION RATINGS

Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Does Not Meet the Standard

2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Mission and Vision was rated as Meets the Standard. The Thrive Point Academy of Nevada vision describes preparing Nevada students for their next big step in life by supporting them through Action, Engagement, and Achievement. The proposed school is focused on a mission of "mastery-based learning in online, remote, and in-person settings, that is transformative, personalized, that fosters meaningful connections, that engages hearts and minds and that intentionally helps students plan for their next big step, whether that be career or college readiness, is the most effective way to help all students succeed." While the Applicant identified a clear Mission and Vision for the school, the remaining sections of Meeting the Need did not provide compelling evidence of a thorough understanding of the community and students to be served, including the demographics and educational needs of the intended student population or intentional and thoughtful strategies for engaging with community members, families, and parents representative of the community to be served.

The Targeted Plan section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form intends to align to several components of the SPCSA's Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment by proposing a school model aimed at supporting students at risk of dropping out of school. However, as previously noted, the application and capacity interview, did not provide the review team with evidence the Applicant had a thorough understanding of the community, specifically the students, demographics, and educational needs of the proposed location. While several members of the Committee to Form have ties to the Las Vegas community, when asked during the capacity interview about how the proposed model meets identified community needs, the Applicant team was able to speak to general information about the community such as the real estate market and businesses but was not able to provide detail regarding the needs of students in the identified areas.

The Parent and Community Involvement section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The Applicant referenced a focus group which was conducted by an outside firm following the submission of the application. However, based on information provided during and after the capacity interview, it appears this focus group centered on gathering very broad feedback and verifying whether there was potential interest in the Thrive Point model. This focus group included only five individuals, and it does not appear that the participants are representative of the parents and students that the school intends to serve. In addition, the Committee to Form was not able to identify any examples of how feedback from the community shaped the proposal. The Applicant also provided several memorandums of understanding for proposed community partnerships with Thrive Point Academy of Nevada. However, the Committee to Form did not demonstrate a thorough understanding of the proposed partnerships during the capacity interview. This led to concerns about how these partnerships were formed and how the proposed board would prioritize partnering with organizations that would further the school's goals. Finally, the Applicant was unable to 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, and provide intentional and thoughtful strategies for engaging with community members, families, and parents who were representative of the community to be served.

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

2.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

2.3.1 Mission and Vision: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clear, measurable, and compelling mission statement which explains the role of the school in meeting the needs of the community and intended student population, and which is reflected throughout the application.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Vision describes success (beyond graduation) for students if the school fulfills its mission.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
School's plan, in alignment with the mission and vision, satisfies at least one statutory purpose: • 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

2.3.2 Targeted Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the community and students to be served, including the demographics and educational needs of the intended student population, as well as the current school options within the community.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.	☐ Yes ☒ 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:
1. **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.
2a. **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
    • 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
	☐ Yes
	☒ No

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.

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.

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.

2.3.3 Parent and Community Involvement: Does Not Meet 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 SECTION RATINGS

Academic Plan[4]	Approaches the Standard
Transformational Change	Approaches the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Does Not Meet the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Meets the Standard
Programs of Distance Education	Approaches the Standard

3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Academic Plan was rated as Approaches the Standard. Three of the eleven sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Transformational Change section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The narrative describes an academic program that has students and staff rethink how they approach education, and which includes nurturing a growth mindset for students and adults. However, the Applicant was not able to provide a specific description of how this proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model. In both the application and capacity interview, the Applicant struggled to demonstrate how key features of the proposed school could be implemented together in a coherent and cohesive manner that will drive towards meeting the proposed mission and vision. For example, it remains unclear how the proposed model will function with some students operating on a hybrid, partially in-person, partially distance education model, with other students learning fully remotely. Additionally, during the capacity interview members of the Committee to Form appeared unaware of the fully remote learning options that would be available to students. Finally, as will be discussed later in this recommendation, the Applicant was unable to connect the proposed school model with the proposed targeted zip codes and was unable to align the model and mission with staffing and operational aspects which are key to transformational change.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design was rated as Approaches the Standard. Similar to the Transformational Change section, the Applicant was able to describe an instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision, but little information was included as to how this model and curriculum would be implemented in this proposed community. Specifically, while the Applicant stated the curriculum and instructional strategies would be effective for students with disabilities and English Learners, there was not an in-depth discussion, or evidence, about how courses are differentiated to meet individual student learning needs. Additionally, during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form had difficulty demonstrating that instructional strategies would be well suited to the identified student population.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements section was rated as Meet the Standard. The Applicant was able to articulate promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served and demonstrated a high expectation of students who would enroll at Thrive Point Academy of Nevada. Due to the uniqueness of the proposed model, the narrative

---

[4] The Thrive Academy of Nevada proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Dual Credit Partnerships. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

includes structures 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.

The Driving for Results section was rated as Approaches the Standard. A key concern for reviewers during the initial application review was a lack of specific detail regarding how the Applicant would track progress towards academic goals and ensure the success of all students including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students. This was a point of focus during the capacity interview, and the Applicant was not able to provide additional detail around academic monitoring that could alleviate the review team's concerns. In the narrative, the Applicant provided a brief description to how teachers would use data to track student growth and support student subgroups, and there was some description on how the school would use this data to inform instruction. During the capacity interview, when asked to elaborate on academic data, and how it would be used, the Committee to Form did not provide concrete examples of certain types of data that school leader and proposed board would use to monitor academic outcomes of students. Explanations of corrective actions that would be taken if the school failed to meet achievement outcomes at the classroom, cohort, special population and/or school-wide level were overly broad and did not provide sufficient clarity that proposed board members had contemplated these questions prior to the submission of the application. The proposed board members appeared to be reliant on the proposed Educational Management Organization (EMO) to guide them on academic outcome data, which was concerning, considering the board's role in oversight of the delivery of the academic model by the proposed EMO.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. As stated previously, the review team had significant concerns regarding how the Applicant would remediate academically underperforming students and meet the needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learner students. The submitted application did not provide sufficient detail for these student populations, and the capacity interview did not provide sufficient additional information. For example, the proposed school's model will most likely have a higher-than-average interest from students with learning disabilities, and students who are English language learners, but the application failed to articulate how it would provide the required services to English language learners and Special Education students and what specific instructional strategies would be used. The narrative provided general statements that show that the Applicant is aware of federal and state requirements but failed to articulate how these requirements will be met through the implementation of the Thrive Point educational model. Overall, while the proposed school's model catered to at-risk students, the lack of detail for certain at-risk populations continues to be a concern for the review team.

The Professional Development section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant proposed a model that would call for both teachers and Student Success Coaches who would work in tandem to both educate and assist students. While the narrative provides a list of professional development topics and the target audience, it remains unclear how the teachers and Student Success Coaches would be trained to implement the unique instructional model and meet the needs of the student population. In addition, while the Applicant states that teachers will be given a scorecard to track areas for professional growth, it is not clear how these coaching plans will be used to support teachers.

The School Culture section was rated as Approaches the Standard. It was clear from the application that the proposed EMO has a vision for the culture that would serve as a model for this proposed school. This vision was evident throughout the application and appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate were described. Notwithstanding the proposed EMO's other operational schools, the narrative lacks a concrete plan for norming social expectations at the start of each year. There was also a lack of clear and measurable goals to monitor the overall culture of the school. Given the unique online/hybrid model the Applicant proposes, clearly defined goals and strategies that account for both in-person and online learners are critical to realize the culture that is envisioned.

The Student Discipline section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application presented a comprehensive list of expectations and rules for students as well as how that infraction would be handled. Again, the proposed EMO has experience implementing discipline plans in its other schools, and it was articulated in the application. However, as

stated previously, there was not a clear throughline with regard to this proposed school. The Applicant identified qualitative goals around student discipline but did not define measurable goals of how it would know that discipline measures were successful, specifically to ensure that certain student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies, including protection of the rights of students with disabilities.

The School Calendar and Schedule section was rated as Meets the Standard. The application described a reasonable calendar and schedule that supported implementation of the academic program that aligned with Nevada statutes and regulations. The Applicant also spoke to flexibility in student schedules and highlighted the need for this flexibility due to the unique circumstances that students who may enroll at the school would have. The Applicant described students who may have to support other family members, or may have children of their own, and was cognizant of the fact that a typical school schedule may not align with other factors in that student's life.

The Dual Credit Partnerships section was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant was able to provide evidence that the school would be able to enter into an agreement with the College of Southern Nevada and offer students the opportunity to earn dual credit. The proposed program for dual credit was shown to be both appropriate for high school students seeking advanced coursework as well as financially accessible to all students.

The Programs of Distance Education section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The narrative outlined a distance education program that includes a comprehensive set of criteria for enrolling students that corresponds with a clear, logical, and accessible enrollment plan. However, during the capacity interview, there was disagreement, or misunderstanding, between the Committee to Form and the proposed EMO regarding whether students would be able to attend online full-time or not, and the Committee to Form did not appear to have a comprehensive understanding of the distance education program as proposed in the charter application. This led the review team to have concerns about the ability for the proposed governing board to monitor the program and ensure academic success for students. Additionally, the review team was concerned with the lack of a detailed, justifiable, approach for interactions between the pupil and teachers that aligns with the proposed instructional minutes and provides adequate support to pupils in line with individual needs. It appeared that Student Success Coaches would be the primary support for students, but the explanation of how those Student Success Coaches would interact with teachers was unclear, which led to concerns about the implementation of the program as described in the charter application.

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

3.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

3.3.1 Transformational Change: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school's success.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Ambitious, yet achievable plan to further the SPCSA's strategic goals: • Provide families with 4- or 5-star school. • Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds - including those from historically underserved student groups.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No

3.3.2   Curriculum and Instructional Design: Approaches the Standard

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

3.3.4   Driving for Results: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
All academic goals and targets are expressed in SMART terms (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound) and demonstrate a commitment to ensuring the success of all students including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level. • **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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students and monitoring for disparities in academic performance between student groups.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Logical plan for using assessment data to drive key decisions aimed at improving academic outcomes.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA's Performance Frameworks.	☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
At Risk Students	
Provides a clear and research-based process for identifying at-risk students and their needs, including those with academic and behavioral needs.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Presents a reasonable plan and identifies the parties responsible for communicating with parents regarding remediation needs.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	☒ Yes ☐ No
For students with disabilities: • Provides a logical plan to screen all students and to ensure that struggling students are evaluated for special education services early and accurately. • Presents a plan for student evaluation and developing IEPs that contain rigorous goals and instructional plans that are suitable to meet those students' goals. • Presents a monitoring plan that will enable relevant staff to track the progress of all students with IEPs towards the goals articulated in their respective plans. • Demonstrates that the school will be able to provide all special education and related services needed either by the staff listed on their organization chart or identified external groups with whom they can contract to provide needed services. Specifies full Nevada licensure for all special education teachers/coordinators. • Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. • Articulates process for monitoring compliance with state and federal laws pertaining to serving students with disabilities. • For middle and high schools, presents a logical and thorough plan for developing and implementing transition plans.	☐ Yes ☒ No
For English language learners • 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
For homeless/migrant students: • 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No

3.3.6 Professional Development: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clearly describes professional development that will be offered during the incubation year to effectively support the academic program, including the topics to be covered and any specialized components of the educational model.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Provides a summary of professional development opportunities throughout the school year to effectively support the academic program, including topics and structures.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Explains teacher coaching plans that will effectively support teacher development, including responsible parties.	☐ Yes

	☒ No
Demonstrates how professional development will support all teachers in meeting the needs of special populations including students with disabilities and English language learners.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Cost of any third party provided professional development is reflected in the budget.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.7   School Culture: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate that will allow for fulfillment of the school's stated mission and vision, as well as the school's stated academic goals.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Provides plans to establish a culture of high expectations with students/families and teachers/staff and promote a positive school culture.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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: • 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Calendar and schedule support implementation of the academic program.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Alignment between teacher and student schedules.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.10   Dual Credit Partnerships: Meets 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.11   Programs of Distance Education: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes plan and timeline to garner necessary approvals from the Nevada Department of Education for the distance education program and courses. For courses that are already approved, documentation is provided.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Detailed, justifiable plan regarding student attendance which meets minimum state requirements.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Explanation of the plan for ensuring students complete coursework. Detailed, justifiable approach for interactions between the pupil and teachers that aligns with the proposed instructional minutes and provides adequate support to pupils in line with individual needs.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Specific plan for where and when the school will administer mandated assessments in a proctored environment outside of the home and an explanation of how the school will ensure student access and participation.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Detailed plan for ongoing communication with parents.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Comprehensive set of criteria for enrolling students that corresponds with a clear, logical, and accessible enrollment plan.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Presents a logical and research-based plan to serve homeless and/or migrant students in a distance education setting.	☐ Yes ☒ No

4 OPERATIONS PLAN

4.1 SECTION RATINGS

Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet 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 Approaches the Standard. None of the eight sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Board Governance section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. Upon completion of the capacity interview, it became evident that proposed members of the Committee to Form who would transition to become board members for the proposed school were not fully prepared for the duties that would come with serving on a charter school board. The board did not have a clear structure to gather data to monitor the school. Though the proposed board includes passionate individuals who bring a range of experience and expertise, members of the proposed board did not appear to be well versed in critical aspects of the proposed model, such as the hybrid and fully remote learning options. While board members do not need to be educational experts, this lack of understanding of the charter application raises questions about whether the board is prepared to govern and oversee the implementation of the proposal. In addition, the narrative articulated a very narrow role for the board focused primarily on hiring and overseeing the principal, which is an important role, but is one of many items a board must oversee in order to ensure successful outcomes for the school. Additional detail and a more expanded explanation of the board oversight role is needed. Questions also remain regarding the board's committees and the relationship to the governing board. Finally, there was not a clear structure that would enable the board to collect the information it needs to evaluate the performance of the school.

The Leadership Team section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant was able to identify a proposed principal that has experience working at a school with a similar model. The proposed school leader demonstrates a range of experience serving various student populations (students with disabilities, English language learners, students in need of remediation, and students above or below grade level). However, the lack of a cohesive explanation of the model, mission, and vision of the school between the proposed leader, proposed board, and proposed EMO left the review team with concerns about the alignment of the Applicant in implementing a successful model.

The Staffing Plan section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. There was a lack of clarity around the overall staffing plan of the proposed school. For example, despite anticipating a large population of English language learners, the staffing plan does not include an English language teacher until the second year of operation. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form appeared unaware of this and indicated that an English language teacher would need to be hired in the first year. Notwithstanding these comments, the staffing plan nor budget account for an English language teacher until year two. Additionally, the role of Student Success Coaches in relation to teachers remained unclear. When asked about making adjustments to the budget in the event of a shortfall during the scenario-based question, the Committee to Form and EMO said they may have to merge the two roles, which appears to contradict the written application regarding the importance of having Student Success Coaches provide a front line for teachers. The application contemplates student to teacher ratios that are well above typical schools in Nevada and much of the

reasoning for this is that there would be Student Success Coaches in addition to the teachers; but in the event financial issue arise, the plan would be to have teachers fulfil both roles. As a result, questions remain about Applicant's commitment to meet the needs of special populations and the community the school intends to serve. During the capacity interview, discussion regarding recruitment and retainment of high-quality teachers was overly broad and did not contemplate specific strategies to recruit teachers to a school with such a unique model.

The Human Resources section was rated as Approaches the Standard. Similar to the Staffing Plan section, the Applicant was not able to articulate recruitment and hiring processes and strategies likely to result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body. This was especially concerning considering ongoing teaching shortages and the need to ensure a high-quality staff who would be equipped to implement the school's unique model. The explanation of the Student Success Coach and how those individuals would be recruited and retained was also a concern for the review team. The Applicant noted that the Student Success Coaches would have a substitute license at minimum, but did not provide clear, and coherent, strategies regarding how the school would recruit these individuals.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The review team had considerable concerns with the recruitment plan that was presented as part of the initial application, and despite ongoing efforts by the proposed school leader, concerns remain. The initial application submission contained little evidence of demand from interested students and families. In response to clarifying questions, the Applicant was able to provide additional evidence of demand, however, much of the student and family demand was gathered from areas outside of the proposed targeted zip code and many of those who responded appeared to have either students who would not qualify for enrollment during the school's first few years, or appeared to not have children at all. While the Applicant has demonstrated ongoing recruitment efforts and increased demand, concerns remain about the alignment between the stated community to be served and the recruitment efforts. In addition, the narrative does not outline lottery and enrollment policies that align with Nevada's statutes and regulations. Finally, the recruitment and enrollment plan as well as planned enrollment numbers for year one and subsequent years came under question during the capacity interview when it became apparent the proposed school had already planned to expand to multiple sites without contemplating required approvals from the SPCSA board for any such expansion. Ultimately, the proposed enrollment plan is reliant on expansion to additional sites as the proposed facility cannot house the proposed full-scale enrollment.

The Incubation Year Development section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant was able to provide key milestones for the planning year and the EMO has shown experience in opening and operating charter schools in other states. However, the comprehensive leadership development plans, that include training aligned with incubation year goals, as well as stated academic goals remained underdeveloped. Hiring plans for key positions continued to be unclear and the review team was concerned that the proposed board would be overly reliant on the EMO to fill gaps during the incubation year without a clear plan for holding the EMO accountable for outcomes.

The Services section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant was able to provide a plan that articulated a reasonable process and timeline for ensuring the school will have information technology infrastructure, equipment, software, and policies to support the school operations and model, including plans for data security and privacy. However, the application and capacity interview did not provide the review team with a sufficient plan that included logical plans for facility maintenance and management.

The Facilities section was rated Approaches the Standard. While the narrative identifies a facility for the proposed charter school, the narrative left the review team with questions around how the proposed facility would be able to accommodate the projected enrollment for the proposed charter school. During the capacity interview, when asked about the facility plans, the Applicant explained that the identified facility could house up to 800 students and there would need to be additional school locations added to accommodate the projected enrollment growth up to 1,400 students. The Committee to Form did not appear to have a plan for operating exclusively out of the identified site, should expansion to additional sites not be approved by the SPCSA Board. The Applicant noted they may be able to expand within the proposed facility, but no concrete plans were provided. The review team also remained concerned

with how the identified site could accommodate up to 800 students even considering the morning, afternoon, and evening schedule the Applicant presented. Questions remained around staffing the facility, accommodating students in the event that one of the timeframes (morning, afternoon, or evening) had more student demand than others, and how adjustments would be made.

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

4.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

4.3.1 Board Governance: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed governance structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Clear delineation of authority and working relationship between the governing body, school staff and any committees, advisory bodies, and/or councils.	☐ Yes ☒ No
The board puts into place a structure that enables it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the performance of the school.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
If the governing body is not fully developed, a clear plan and timeline for expanding capacity prior to the opening of the school.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections.	☐ Yes ☒ No

4.3.2 Leadership Team: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	☐ Yes ☒ 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: • 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No

4.3.3 Staffing Plan: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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).	☐ Yes ☒ No

4.3.4 Human Resources: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Articulates recruitment and hiring processes and strategies likely to result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years • 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No

• Includes specific plans to ensure equal access to interested families including families in poverty, students zoned to attend 1- and 2-star schools, students with disabilities, EL students, and other at-risk students as defined in the SPCSA's Needs Assessment. • Demonstrates an understanding of the identified community. • Is likely to allow the school to enroll a representative student population based on surrounding zoned schools or a mission-specific educationally disadvantaged population.	
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. *Note, the enrollment audit for new schools which determines initial per pupil funding is conducted on or before June 15 of each year.*	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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: • 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. *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.* • Clearly identifies the individuals responsible for leading year 0 initiatives and meeting year 0 milestones.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Operations plan for services and information technology demonstrates sufficient staff/contactor capacity to implement the plan, including clear lines of authority.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Costs of services are realistic and align with budget.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
If a facility (including a temporary facility) has been identified: • 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A
If a facility (or permanent facility) has not yet been identified: • 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
Demonstrated capacity to manage facility selection, leasing, acquisition, development, renovation, and management, as applicable. If Committee to Form or CMO has identified a facility development partner, Committee to Form or CMO has thorough plans for managing the partner relationship and ensuring that the partner meets expectations.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.	☒ Yes ☐ No

5 FINANCIAL PLAN

5.1 SECTION RATINGS

Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant was able to provide a budget that was generally aligned with the mission, vision, and operational aspects of the proposed school. There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities. In addition, projections appear accurate, conservative, and legally compliant. However, there were concerns related to the feasibility of the proposed budget in the event the school was unable to grow at the rate projected in the application. The staffing plan also left reviewers with concern due to the lack of an English language teacher in year one. If the Applicant proposes hiring an English language teacher in year one, the budget would need to be updated to reflect the additional cost. Overall, while the Financial Plan's budgeted priorities are consistent with the proposed model and there was appropriate segregation of financial duties, the review team could only rate this section as Approaches due to uncertainties around enrollment, facilities, and the staffing plan.

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

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	☒ Yes ☐ 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).	☒ Yes ☐ No
There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities, as applicable.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for all budget line items to allow for the assessment of fiscal viability.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
There is no evidence that the school ever will become insolvent or lack access to the necessary amount of liquidity.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Assumptions about facilities in all financial statements correspond to a conservative facility plan and account for possible contingencies.	☐ Yes ☒ No

6 ADDENDUM

6.1 SECTION RATINGS

Addendum	Approaches the Standard
Past Performance	Meets the Standard
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard
Network Capacity	Approaches the Standard
School Management Contract	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 Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Educational Management Organization (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 Approaches the Standard. One of the four sections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Past Performance section was rated as Meets the Standard. Financial Performance data for schools affiliated with the EMO demonstrate strong performance equivalent to a rating of 'meets standard' on the SPCSA's Financial Performance Framework. Organizational Performance data for schools affiliated with the EMO demonstrate strong performance equivalent to a rating of 'meets standard' on the SPCSA's Organizational Performance Framework. While academic data will be released for EMO affiliated schools later this year, the data provided at the time of the initial charter application submission showed the affiliated schools had been performing adequately under the frameworks of states in which they were operating.

The Scale Strategy section was rated as Approaches the Standard. While the proposed EMO has shown it is able to operate charter schools in multiple states, the plan to scale the model to Nevada was not thorough nor was it adequately resourced at both the EMO and school levels. As mentioned in previous sections, the EMO, along with the Committee to Form, has conducted limited outreach to students and families in the proposed location to determine how to adapt the school's model to meet the local needs. As discussed in the Operations Plan, the scale strategy includes rapid growth from 400 students in the 2024-25 school year to 1,400 students in the 2028-29 school year. That growth is contingent on adding additional sites beginning in year two of the charter contract. While the scale strategy includes initial plans for a second location in the 2025-26 school year along with plans to add a third and fourth site by the 2028-29 school year, no information is provided about how the governing board and EMO will demonstrate readiness for this type of rapid expansion in order to garner SPCSA Board approval. The articulated scale strategy relies on this rapid expansion, and it is not clear that the school could be successful if additional school sites were not approved.

The Network Capacity section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application described the roles and responsibilities of the EMO leadership team and organization charts clearly indicate lines of authority between the board, EMO, and school. However, concerns remain about whether there is sufficient capacity and infrastructure to support the expansion to Nevada. While the narrative provides information about plans to add staff at the EMO, the capacity interview illuminated some misalignment between the EMO and Committee to Form regarding the school proposal. Ultimately, the review team had concerns that considerable planning is still needed by both the EMO and Committee to Form in order to implement the model with fidelity.

The School Management Contract section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The proposed contract includes appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school.

Additionally, the review team found the contract complies with Nevada laws and regulations regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors. However, the review team continues to have questions regarding the service fee proposed in the school management contract. The fee is estimated to be 23% of school revenues which is considerably higher than most other EMO's in Nevada. When asked to explain the fee, the Applicant did note that a portion of that fee goes towards equipment for students, but even taking that into account it appears that the EMO would be collecting up to 19% of school revenues. The Committee to Form was not able to provide specific information to justify the fees. Finally, the review team had considerable concern with the proposed board's ability to oversee and hold the EMO accountable. This topic came up during the capacity interview, and proposed members of the board were not able to provide details as to how the board would monitor and evaluate the EMO's performance. The proposed board was also unable to describe in detail how they would ensure fulfillment of performance expectations. The proposed board appeared to be overly reliant on the EMO and while the contract contained language that confirmed the proposed board would oversee and evaluate the EMO, the review team remains concerned with the proposed board's ability to carry out its responsibilities as defined in the management contract.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Addendum section as Approaches 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: Meets 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
The CMO/EMO and affiliated schools have no significant audit findings within the last three years.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Any legal issues, including contract terminations, are satisfactorily explained.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

6.3.2 Scale Strategy: Approaches 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Meaningful focus on expansion in Nevada and commitment of organizational resources to support quality school openings and operations.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
The plan to scale the model to Nevada is thorough, realistic, and adequately resourced at both the CMO/EMO and school levels.	☐ Yes ☒ No

	Meets the Standard?
Plans for sourcing and training potential school leaders, including qualifications and competencies, is aligned with the mission and programs.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Previous scale-up endeavors are shown to have been successful with student performance data and organizational financial data (if applicable).	☒ Yes ☐ No
Includes plan to infuse Nevada school(s) with the essential elements of CMO/EMO model.	☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3.3   Network Capacity: Approaches 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Organization charts clearly indicate lines of authority between the board, CMO/EMO, and schools.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Clearly describes the roles and responsibilities of the CMO/EMO leadership team.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Sufficient evidence is provided that the staffing plan for the CMO/EMO can support the proposed scale strategy.	☐ Yes ☒ No

6.3.4   School Management Contract: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
If applicable, clear rationale for selection of the CMO/EMO.	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Demonstrates capacity and commitment of the governing board to oversee the CMO/EMO effectively: • 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
Clearly defined contract terms including the following: • 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Complies with Nevada laws and regulations regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors, including EMOs and CMOs, including but not limited to: • 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

• 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.	

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 Thrive Point Academy of Nevada charter school application.

- January 27, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada Application is received
- May 17, 2023 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input[5]
- June 27, 2023 – Clarifying Questions sent to applicant; responses received within four business days
- July 7, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada 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 Thrive Point Academy of Nevada was conducted on July 14, 2023 and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form attended the interview, along with the proposed principal. Additionally, three representatives from Learning Matters Education Group, the proposed CMO, one representative from Thrive Point Academy in Arizona, and the school's legal counsel attended the capacity interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

- Targeted Plan
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Transformational Change
- Curriculum and Instructional Design
- Driving for Results
- School Culture
- At-Risk Students and Special Populations
- 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."

- Board Governance
- Leadership Team
- Staffing Plan
- Student Recruitment and Enrollment
- Facilities
- Scale Strategy
- Financial Plan

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

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that probed the Committee to Form's capacity to address a shortfall in enrollment in the spring prior to the school's opening year. The Committee to Form was asked to discuss the steps it would take to: Increase the enrollment numbers, including all strategies that would be used; determine what budget items may need to be cut and why; and determine whether to request to defer the opening of the school by a year.

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).