

Charter School Application Report

Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada

Recommendation from the Summer 2020 Charter Application Cycle

General Information

Proposed Name	Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada
Proposed Mission	Eagle NV’s mission is to build the foundation for a promising future for all students in a rich, robust learning environment that fosters creativity and problem-solving abilities. Eagle emphasizes cognitive, social, and emotional growth by engaging children as active learners in an inclusive learning environment.
Proposed EMO	Eagle Charter Schools, Inc
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: Kindergarten – 5 th grade Full-Scale: Kindergarten – 8 th grade
Proposed Opening	August 2021
Proposed Location	Sahara Ave and McLeod Drive Las Vegas, NV 89104 School anticipates primarily serving 89104, 89106, 89115, 89121, 89122 zip codes.

Process/Key Dates for Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada

- April 13, 2020 – New Charter Application Training
- March 13, 2020 – Notice of Intent is received
- July 15, 2020 – Application is received
- October 1, 2020 - Capacity Interview is conducted¹
- November 6, 2020 – Recommendation is presented

¹ The Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada capacity Interview was conducted virtually as a result of prevailing Emergency Directives which limit capacity of gatherings, along with space limitations within the SPCSA’s offices.

Planned Enrollment Chart

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
K	108	108	108	108	108	108
1	108	108	108	108	108	108
2	108	108	108	108	108	108
3	108	108	108	108	108	108
4	108	108	108	108	108	108
5	108	108	108	108	108	108
6		108	108	108	108	108
7			108	108	108	108
8				108	108	108
9						
10						
11						
Total	648	756	864	972	972	972

Executive Summary and Recommendation

The review committee, which included one member of the SPCSA staff and two external reviewers, identified shortcomings in four of the five components of the submitted application as outlined in the charter application rubric. The review committee and SPCSA staff found the Academic Plan to Meet the Standard and noted many strengths in the charter proposal. The review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Meeting the Need, Operations, Financial plan, along with the Addendum as ‘Approaches the Standard’ with some strengths and weaknesses.

The review committee and SPCSA staff find that the Eagle Academy of Nevada application meets the Geographic component of the of the Academic Needs within the SPCSA Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment but did not identify local community-based partners that will be relevant or supportive of the target population upon operation of the school. Though the proposed charter management organization, Eagle Charter Schools, Inc., has shown success in serving diverse student populations in Washington D.C, the lack of local community engagement and partners remain significant concerns and ultimately led to a rating of ‘Approaches the Standard’ in the Meeting the Need section.

The review committee and SPCSA staff did find many strengths in the proposed Academic plan and those strengths were reinforced during the capacity interview. The proposed CMO has a track record of serving at-risk students in its other schools and the replication of this model in Las Vegas was bolstered by appropriate performance goals for student growth, and curricula that are aligned to NVACS. For these reasons, and those discussed below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Academic plan as Meets Standard.

The review committee and SPCSA staff identified concerns in the Operations plan of the charter application, specifically with regard to organizational structure and oversight of the proposed CMO. These concerns were amplified during the capacity interview when members of the proposed governing board

were not able to clearly articulate a vision of how they would provide oversight of both the Eagle Nevada school and proposed CMO. For this reason and those discussed below, the review committee and SPCSA staff could not rate the Operations plan any higher than Approaches the Standard.

The Financial plan was found to have both strengths and weaknesses by the review committee and the SPCSA staff. The proposed CMO has a history of running financially successful schools. Previous success was evident in both the application and the capacity interview. However, the proposed governing board was unable to describe clear segregation of financial duties, and it remains unclear as to how the proposed board will remain informed about critical financial decisions. For these reasons and others described in later in the memo, the review committee and the SPCSA staff rated the Financial plan as 'Approaches the Standard'.

The Addendum, which is required of all applicants proposing to contract with an Educational Management Organization or Charter Management Operation, was rated as 'Approaches the Standard' by the review committee and SPCSA staff. This section was found to have some strengths, but also weaknesses. As stated above, the proposed CMO is an established operator in Washington D.C. and this was evident in both the application and capacity interview. However, the gaps that were contained in the application regarding the organizational makeup of the CMO and accountability mechanisms of the proposed governing board were not made clearer during the capacity interview. Answers given regarding the organizational structure of the school by the proposed governing board and representatives of the CMO contradicted one another which led the review committee and SPCSA staff to rate the Addendum as 'Approaches the Standard'.

For these reasons, in addition to those described throughout this memo, staff's recommendation is to deny the charter school application for Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada.

Proposed motion: Deny the Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada charter application as submitted during the 2020 Summer Application Cycle based on a finding that the applicant has failed to satisfy the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3).

Summary of Application Section Ratings

The State Public Charter School Authority is required to assemble a team of reviewers and conduct a thorough evaluation of the application, which includes an in-person interview with the applicant designed to elicit any necessary clarification or additional information about the proposed charter school. The SPCSA is required to adhere to its policies and practices, namely the application guidance, training and rubric, regarding evaluating charter applications. Ultimately, the SPCSA must base its determination on the documented evidence collected through the application process.

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 expects to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the plan effectively in a way which will 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; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant's ability to carry it out.

The rubric is broken into four major sections, plus an addendum, as outlined below. 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/

Summary of Application Section Ratings

Rating options for each section are Meets the Standard; Approaches the Standard; Does not Meet the Standard.

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 Plan²	Meets the Standard
Transformational Change	Meets the Standard
Curriculum & Instructional Design	Meets the Standard
Promotion & High School Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Meets the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Approaches the Standard
School Structure: Culture	Meets the Standard
School Structure: Student Discipline	Meets the Standard
School Structure: Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard
Leadership Team	Does Not Meet the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Approaches the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Does Not Meet the Standard
Services	Does Not Meet the Standard
Facilities	Does Not Meet the Standard
Ongoing Operations	Meets the Standard
Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard
Addendum	Approaches the Standard
Leadership For Expansion	Meets the Need
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard
School Management Contracts	Approaches the Standard

² The Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Pre-Kindergarten. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

Meeting the Need Section

The applicant has identified a target community that closely aligns to the Academic and Geographic Needs Assessment. Specifically, the applicant aims to serve a community with a high percentage of students in poverty and where there are a large number of existing 1- and 2-star schools. Additionally, the proposal presents a mission and vision statements that are embedded within performance goals and instructional strategies, and confirm that the Committee to Form is dedicated to serving all students, including those that may be significantly behind their peers.

This section was rated as 'Approaches the Standard' due to outstanding gaps centered on community engagement, proposed partners, and concerns about the demand for the proposed school. Little evidence was provided within the application that demonstrates clear evidence of concrete partnerships, and the capacity interview confirmed as much. Additionally, evidence of demand for the school is limited and the Committee to Form and proposed CMO did not demonstrate a high-degree of capacity to serve English Learner (EL) students, which will constitute a relatively higher percentage of the student population when compared to other schools within the Eagle Charter School network.

Areas of Strength

- The Committee to Form and written application describe a clear and compelling mission statement that ties to performance goals and proposed instructional strategies while aiming to improve students' long-term quality of life. The Committee to Form commits to academic and whole child growth, active learning, and serving all students. The proposed academic goals, focused on reducing the achievement gap by demonstrating 1.5+ years of growth and outperforming the comparative district by 20%, also align to the mission and reiterate a responsibility to assist students even if they enter behind grade level. Key components of the model are described and instructional strategies such as small groups, independent learning activities and creative and imaginative learning opportunities, aim to meet students where they enter the school.
- Within this section and throughout the narrative, the applicant team makes a clear, compelling case that the targeted region has a need for a high-quality school, noting that the majority of residents are low-income. Additionally, zero elementary or middle schools in the targeted zip codes are designated as high-performing according to the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). This appears to be aligned to the Geographic Need of the SPCSA Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.
- Despite some concerns about current levels of parent and family engagement (see below), the application provides a clear plan for engaging parents should the school be approved. These include home visits, establishing a Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO), ongoing surveys, conducting parent focus groups and sponsoring open houses.

Areas of Concern

- The written application identifies four partner organizations, none of which are local, community-based partners that would help to meet the needs of the target population. During the capacity interview, the board and CMO shared that they have made very minimal progress on community partnerships since the submission of the application. The Committee to Form stated they

intended to solidify partnerships in the event the school was approved but had not engaged potential partners in the in between the submission of the application and the capacity interview. While it is understandable that the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic would impact how these partnerships the lack of developed partnerships or evidence of recent progress in this area raise concerns that the neighborhood partners have not been engaged in the development of application.

- CMO representatives and Committee to Form members expressed capacity concern about serving a high number of EL students at the proposed school, especially when compared to current schools operated by Eagle Charter Schools in Washington, D.C. Minimal data and analysis is included in the application regarding EL students, Special Education or at-risk students in the application from districts the proposed school intends to enroll students from. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did not demonstrate capacity and credible plans to intentionally serve the identified student population, and the proposed board was unable to provide significant evidence that they were actively working to address this aspect of the academic plan.
- While the applicant has examined third-party survey data collected in Clark Count in the fall of 2016, the applicant does not provide evidence of the involvement of parents, neighborhood, and/or community members representative of target population in the development of the plan.

Academic Section

The review committee identified many strengths within the written application, which were supplemented during the capacity interview. The proposed academic program, a replication from established Eagle Charter Schools in Washington, DC, includes detailed descriptions, appropriate performance goals for student growth, and curricula that are aligned to NVACS. Additionally, there are students supports described within the application to develop a positive culture at the school. Professional development strategies are outlined, and these are tied directly to the instructional model. While the review committee does have some remaining questions about the adaptability of the program to support some at-risk students, particularly EL students, this section was rated as 'Meets the Standard'.

Areas of Strength

- The proposed academic program has been successfully implemented in Washington, D.C. for pre-kindergarten to 3rd grade students. In 2019, the Washington, D.C. schools were classified as Tier 1, the highest rating possible. Despite some concerns that the projected demographic in Nevada would be different, especially in terms of EL students, this demonstrates that the educational strategies outlined in the application have been successful. Additionally, the key distinguishing features of the current model, such as rigorous and aligned curriculum, extensive professional development, and social and emotional learning opportunities, would not be compromised.
- A list of curricula is provided for several content areas within the application. Proposed core curriculum and resources for ELA (Journeys, Collections, AIMSweb, Fast for Word for Reading Intervention), and math (Eureka math) are aligned with Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS).
- The written application describes clear structures to support students that are at-risk, and promotion standards are clearly defined. A School Success Team (SST) will be established and convened well in advance of any retention decisions, and criteria impacting final promotion decisions are outlined.
- Performance goals outlined within the application are ambitious. Growth goals are established as 1.5 years for students who do not meet or exceed grade-level performance. These set a high-bar and can lead to a 4- or 5-star rating for the school under the NSPF.
- Eagle proposes a multi-faceted approach to establish a culture of high expectations with students, families, teachers, and staff. The school plans to implement Responsive Classroom and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to build social skills and classroom cooperation as well as incorporate a 30-minute SEL lesson on a weekly basis. Initial culture communication will begin through home visits and orientations for students and families. These plans are appropriate, concrete and can lead to a strong student culture among staff, students and parents.
- Professional development is outlined within the application and includes an emphasis on differentiation strategies and the use of student performance data. The application goes on to state the teachers will be observed on an informal basis daily, and classrooms will be videotaped for teacher reflection to help ensure quality teaching practices are implemented. Additionally, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to assist instructional staff as well as to provide time to

review and discuss student data. These plans tie directly to the instructional methods outlined while also supporting teacher growth.

Areas of Concern

- The applicant lays out proficiency goals that are based on Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA and Math proficiency rates for local schools. However, these goals may be too ambitious. For example, it may not be realistic for a student who is multiple grade levels behind their peers to achieve proficiency after only one year of enrollment. The proposed goals in the initial years are aligned to state and SPCSA goals but may need to be adjusted once baseline student achievement data can be established.
- During the capacity interview, the proposed governing board members and representatives of the CMO were unable to articulate the academic plan with the same cohesion and clarity that was evident in the written narrative.
- During the scenario-based question within the capacity interview, the CMO founder expressed concern about how the school would adapt if more English Learners enrolled in the school than had been anticipated, stressing how hard it would be to find qualified staff. While the applicant was able to identify some action steps for addressing this scenario, the approach was not cohesive and much of the discussion was facilitated or led by individuals who are not proposed board members or proposed employees.

Operations Section

The proposed governing board seeks to contract with a Charter Management Organization (CMO) Eagle Charter Schools, which has shown a true dedication to serving at-risk students who need and is seeking to develop successful schools outside of Washington D.C. This was made clear during the capacity interview as both the Committee to Form and CMO representatives are mission-aligned, focused on creating high-quality seats for students.

Despite these strengths, the review committee and SPCSA staff identified a number of concerns that resulted in this section being rated as 'Approaches the Standard'. The proposed board was unable to answer several questions regarding the contents of the application, including their responsibility to provide oversight of the school and the CMO, as well as specifics around the reporting structures outlined in the application. The capacity interview did not leave reviewers with a clearer picture of the organizational makeup to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials. Additionally, questions remain about the demand in the community for the proposed school.

Areas of Strength

- The Committee to Form proposes to partner with a CMO comprised of staff with significant experience working with the Washington, D.C.-based Eagle Academy schools.
- The Committee to Form's hiring plan supports its mission and vision, and includes posting, screening, telephone interviews, lesson demonstration, team interview, background and reference check and finally if applicable an offer letter. Additionally, the application offers competitive salaries for teachers and staff.
- The applicant proposes using Carver Governance training and will complete 10 additional hours of training throughout the year. The Board will also refer to the "User's Guide to Fiscal Oversight" produced by the National Charter School Resource Center to provide a reference of strong governance best practices and additional checklists to ensure sufficient goals, policies, and procedures are in place.
- The application lays out plans for frequent monitoring, evaluations, data analysis, and communication between the principal and the instructional staff. In addition, the application indicates that professional development will be structured to improve performance.

Areas of Concern

- The proposed board does not include anyone with a finance or legal background, and there is not a clear plan and timeline for finding a potential board member with these qualifications.
- Throughout the capacity interview, the board struggled to provide additional details or clarification regarding the proposal, leading to concerns about the board's preparedness to oversee the launch of the school and hold the CMO and school leader accountable. In addition, the proposed board did not articulate a clear a structure that would enable it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the CMO. The board appeared to be relying on the CMO to collect, and analyze this information for them, which leads to oversight and accountability concerns.
- Overall, the board goals were vague, especially in comparison to the academic goals from the previous section of the application. For example, the board proposes to meet quarterly to review information about the progress of the school. One proposed growth test is given three times a

year, but the board will only review the results semiannually. This example and others lead to questions about whether the governing board would be positioned to monitor and quickly adjust the program according to student needs.

- The proposed organizational and reporting structure is not clearly defined, raising questions about appropriate oversight and accountability within the organization. Specifically, the narrative description of the roles and responsibilities of the COO, CMO and Principal do not align with the job descriptions or what was shared during the capacity interview. There is not a clear delineation of management roles and lines of authority, raising concerns about how the school can operate as a sound organization. In addition, it remains unclear as to who the COO would be employed by, the CMO or the school, as two different answers were provided during the capacity interview.
- The application does not define who is responsible for key human resource functions. Specifically, it is not clear what responsibilities lie with the COO versus the CMO, which is compounded by the fact that there is contradicting information as to whether the COO is an employee of the school or of the CMO.
- The applicant has not identified a school leader and does not provide a detailed plan to do so. Additionally, while the application states that the CMO is responsible for coaching and training the principal there is limited information provided about what this coaching will look like. Given that the proposed school would open in less than a year and be translated from a model that is based on the east coast, there are significant concerns about whether school leaders would be selected and fully prepared to launch the school by the fall of 2021.
- While the proposed model emphasizes meeting the social and emotional needs of students, the school does not allocate a counselor until the third year of operation. While the staffing plan does include one school psychologist throughout the proposed six-year term, enrollment increases significantly leading to questions about whether the school would be appropriately staffed to meet the needs of students and presents a disconnect between the staffing plan and the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.
- The student recruitment and enrollment plan provide minimal information on how the school will ensure full enrollment beginning in year one. While the school provides interest from approximately 160 students, this represents less than a quarter of the first-year enrollment. Additionally, the enrollment plan proposes that the school open with full classes in every grade level K-5 without an allowance for harder-to-recruit grade levels.
- During the incubation year, the proposed COO would split her time between Washington, D.C. and Nevada and is projected to work 25% on the launch of the proposed Nevada school. Additionally, the principal, once selected would also be working part time, at approximately 25%. Given the substantial work to launch the school, meet all incubation year milestones, and enroll nearly 700 students this does not appear to be sufficient staff capacity. While the application states that the school hopes to raise funds to use to hire additional staff for the incubation year no details are provided.
- The application does not provide a comprehensive leadership development plan. Given that the proposal is to replicate existing schools across the country, substantial professional development is likely necessary to ensure fidelity to the model.
- Details regarding plans for essential services are not fully developed. For example, other than stating that the Eagle Academy would contract with a food service provider and comply with the

National School Lunch Program, no details are provided. In addition, clear metrics and a process for evaluating the effectiveness of services is not provided.

- The applicant has not identified a facility and did not provide any evidence of potential facilities within the price range and target community that meet the outlined needs. While members of the CMO have experience with facility development, there is not a detailed, time-bound plan to procure and prepare a facility. In addition, the financing scenario provided includes an annual debt service of over \$600,000 which could pose a substantial challenge should the proposed school not meet enrollment targets.

Financial Section

The financial plan presented appears to account for all major expenditures and generally aligns with the narrative. The review committee did identify a few key weaknesses within this section, however. Considerable reservations exist about the proposed organizational structure and segregation of financial duties, and it remains unclear how the proposed board will remain informed about critical financial decisions. This was compounded during the capacity interview as the proposed board did not demonstrate the capacity to oversee the financial obligations of the school. There are also some lingering questions about the current state of fundraising. If the school relies on Eagle Charter Schools, Inc. for a significant donation in year one, it may be difficult to hold the organization accountable in the long-term. For these reasons, this section was rated as 'Approaches the Standard'.

Areas of Strength

- The narrative provides evidence that there would be financial control systems and policies in place to ensure that only allowable expenses would be made.
- The proposed Educational Services Agreement includes a significant funding commitment to help ensure that essential services can be funded appropriately, and that the Committee to Form could implement their plans immediately if authorized.
- In General, the financial plan and budgeting priorities align to the proposed model. Key staffing and programming elements appear to be captured within the budget and anticipated costs are reasonable.

Areas of Concern

- During the capacity interview, the review committee developed significant concerns about the financial duties of the proposed board, and their ability to provide oversight to the proposed CMO, Eagle Charter Schools. Proposed board members did not demonstrate an ability to deliver meaningful oversight of the school financials or to oversee the financial obligations of the school.
- It is not clear that there is an appropriate segregation of financial duties, and the organizational chart raises concerns about which entities will be responsible for financial management on a day-to-day basis. The narrative and draft financial policies reinforce these concerns. This is compounded by the lack of clarity around who the COO is employed by as the COO would be responsible for finances.
- Limited details regarding fundraising are provided within the application. While the proposed CMO clarified a commitment of \$150,000 during the interview, which is consistent with the narrative, it is concerning that there do not appear to be fundraising efforts already underway. Should the CMO donate substantial funds to start the school, this may impact the board's ability to hold the CMO accountable.
- While the proposed model emphasizes meeting the social and emotional needs of students, the staffing plan includes one school physiologist throughout the proposed six-year term and does not add a counselor until the third year of the school. This raises questions about whether sufficient resources have been allocated to meet the needs of students and presents a disconnect between the budget and the proposed model.

- The budget includes facility costs based on projected lease costs. However, the proposed costs for facility development, if a suitable facility for lease cannot be identified, are significantly higher. This raises questions about viability, especially since potential facilities to lease were not identified.

Addendum

The addendum section is required for those applications that seek to contract with a CMO or EMO or are applying for sponsorship directly. Because Eagle Academy of Nevada contemplates contracting with a CMO, this component of the application was required.

There are a few identified strengths within this component, including that Eagle Charter Schools, Inc. is an established CMO in Washington D.C. and has experience supporting schools. However, gaps exist between the roles of the proposed CMO and the governing board of the charter school. These gaps created concern about the governing board's ability to hold the CMO to account in academic, financial, and organizational outcomes because the governing board was so reliant on the CMO to assist them in oversight. For these reasons, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated this section as 'Approaches the Standard'.

Areas of Strength

- This school is a replication of a high performing school. It is also clear the applicant understands the need to have high performing schools in Nevada. The applicant was also transparent with regard to their plans for opening one school in Nevada and this thoughtful approach showed their understanding that capacity and strategy go hand in hand.
- The applicant included a draft services agreement with their charter application. The draft services agreement lays out the responsibilities of both the school and the CMO and no inappropriate terms were included.

Areas of Concern

- The application does not describe how essential elements of the organization's model will be infused in the Nevada Schools. Rather, the application includes a statement that this is the responsibility of the CMO with limited additional details.
- During the capacity interview, neither the proposed board nor the CMO leadership demonstrated evidence that they were well versed in the Nevada charter landscape. In addition, it did not appear that the proposed board had a strong handle on what would be needed to launch a school, including what would be required for student outreach and enrollment retention, governance, staffing, professional development, finances, and facilities. While the application included information on these topics, the proposed board could not articulate or build on the proposal as outlined in the charter application.
- Many of the key responsibilities are delegated to the CMO (academic, financial, administrative), which is not uncommon. However, during the capacity interview, the board did not demonstrate a firm understanding of the proposal, raising concerns about their preparedness to monitor for effective implementation by the CMO and school staff.
- As detailed in previous sections, there remain questions regarding the organizational structure and delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school. Of particular concern is the COO role and who this individual is employed by and reports to.
- The application does not outline structured plans for future growth even though the application contemplates opening more schools in Nevada.

Capacity Interview Summary

Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the review committee conducted a virtual capacity interview of the applicant to assess the capacity to execute the application’s overall plan. The capacity interview for Eagle Charter Schools of Nevada was conducted on Thursday, October 1, and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form attended the interview. Additionally, two representatives from Eagle Charter Schools, Inc the proposed Charter Management Organization (CMO), and one application consultant, attended the capacity interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

Board Governance	Community Partnerships
Leadership Team	Curriculum & Instructional Design
School Management Contracts	At-Risk Students & Special Populations
Facilities	Staffing Plan
Parent and Community Engagement	

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that probed the Committee to Form’s capacity to develop a plan in response to data.

District Input

Per Assembly Bill 462 (2019), the SPCSA solicited input from the Clark County School District regarding this application.³ The timeline regarding this request for input is below and the response provided by the Clark County School district is attached.

- August 26, 2020 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input.
- September 28, 2020 – Written input provided from CCSD to SPCSA.

³ Assembly Bill 462 (2019) section 6.3, subsection 1, paragraph (d): “The 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.”

Appendix (Rubric Detail)

The information below indicates *rubric criteria that the applicant did not substantially meet*.

Meeting the Need

- **Targeted Plan**
 - *Demonstrated capacity, credible plans, and thorough research and analysis in order to intentionally serve the identified student populations, prevent at-risk students from dropping out, and/or provide more high-quality schools in underserved areas, as defined in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.*
- **Parent and Community Involvement**
 - *Demonstrates clear evidence of the involvement of parents, neighborhood, and/or community members representative of target population in the development of the plan.*
 - *The committee to form demonstrates their ties to and/or knowledge of the target community*
 - *Identifies specific partnerships which are shown to be relevant to the needs of the target population, including partners located in the community that the applicant intends to serve.*
 - *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 target population.*

Academic Plan

- **At-Risk Students and Special Populations**
 - *Describes the specific services that will be provided for students within and outside the classroom, including curriculum and instruction and exposure to co-teaching.*
 - *Devotes adequate resources and staff to meeting the needs of all students.*
 - *Provides a detailed plan for appropriate professional development to teachers and staff to ensure they can support and accelerate the learning of at-risk and special population students which is aligned to the budget and overall PD plan.*

Operations Plan

- **Board Governance**
 - *Proposed governance structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials.*
 - *Clear delineation of authority and working relationship between the governing body and school staff.*
 - *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 set to reflect school-specific programs, if applicable (e.g., STEM, fine arts, blended learning, alternative programs, etc.)*
 - *Qualifications and experience levels of governing body members with accounting and finance experience significantly exceeds the statutory minimum requirements and demonstrates a proven track record of successful management or oversight of a multi-million-dollar entity.*
 - *Qualifications and experience levels of governing body members with legal experience significantly exceeds the statutory minimum requirements and demonstrates a proven track record of successful management or oversight of*

- *Articulates aggressive plan for recruiting eligible students to the school and describes specific actionable steps for ensuring the school is fully enrolled.*
- *Demonstrated interest and intent to enroll commitments by a significant number of parents for Year 1. These forms should include the following information at minimum:*
 - o *Parent name and contact information*
 - o *Zip code of residency*
 - o *Student name(s) and grade levels for the proposed opening year*
- **Incubation Year Development**
 - *Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals (these may be either designed by or outsourced by the operator)*
 - *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*
- **Services**
 - *Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific non-academic services, including, but not limited to:*
 - o *Supporting transportation, food service, facilities management, nursing, and purchasing processes, and school safety.*
 - o *Staff structure/plan is adequate for the proposed school and aligns with the educational program; lines of authority are clear.*
 - *IT plans should include consideration of: User access control policies, limitation of access rights and procedures for removing access from departing employees.*
 - o *Policies for data stored on personal and portable devices aimed at minimizing inadvertent disclosing of information, such as theft or misplaced equipment.*
 - o *Strategy for information backups and disaster recovery.*
 - o *Intruder prevention strategies, including physical and electronic intrusion.*
 - o *Malware and malicious software prevention and removal strategy.*
 - o *An effective plan for managing student information, including Infinite Campus, evidence of contact with the vendor to price and arrange for training, and the provision of appropriate on-site on contract staffing and support resources and an information security plan for staff, students, parents, and contractors.*
 - *Costs of services are realistic and align with budget and academic program.*
 - *Committee to form articulate clear metrics and process for evaluating effectiveness of services.*
- **Facilities**
 - *Identifies a viable educational facility or facilities that meets the needs of the students and accommodates the programmatic and operational needs of the school(s) over the charter term as described throughout the application—OR—outlines in detail the plan and timeline to identify and secure facilities as needed*
 - *If a facility has not yet been identified*
 - o *Description of anticipated facilities needs including evidence that the facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment*
 - o *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.
- 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).
- Plan for finding a location including a proposed schedule for doing so.
- A clear, time bound plan to engage with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities.

Financial Plan

- There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational chart and job descriptions.
- School level budget priorities are consistent with the operator's model, including but not limited to: educational program, staffing, and facility
- All funds from external sources are guaranteed with money in hand or letter of award and grant terms.
- Assumptions about facilities in all financial statements correspond to a conservative facility plan and account for possible contingencies.

Addendum

- **Scale Strategy**
 - The plan to scale the model to new sites is adequately resourced and staffed appropriately.
 - Includes plan to infuse NV schools with the essential elements of the organization's model.
 - Clear, appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school sites.
 - Organization charts clearly indicate lines of authority between the board, network, and schools.
- **School Management Contracts**
 - Clear rationale for selection of Educational Management Organization (EMO/CMO)/Charter Management Organization (CMO).
 - Demonstrates capacity and commitment of the governing board to oversee the EMO/CMO effectively:
 - Plan for board to monitor/evaluate the EMO/CMO's performance
 - Appropriate internal controls guide the relationship
 - Describes how the governing board will ensure fulfillment of performance expectations
 - Discloses and addresses any potential conflicts of interest (real or perceived)