

Charter School Application Report

TEACH Las Vegas

Recommendation from the Summer 2020 Charter Application Cycle

General Information

Proposed Name	TEACH Las Vegas
Proposed Mission	To create a high quality, innovative K – 12 teaching and learning environment in North Las Vegas that focuses on literacy; integrating state-of-the-art technologies across the core curriculum to achieve academic proficiency for all students
Proposed CMO	TEACH Public Schools
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: Kindergarten – 7 th grade Full-Scale: Kindergarten – 12 th grade
Proposed Opening	August 2021
Proposed Location	4624 – 4660 N. Rancho Drive Las Vegas, NV 89130 School anticipates primarily serving 89130, 89108, 89032, 89107, 89129 zip codes.

Process/Key Dates for TEACH Las Vegas

- April 13, 2020 – New Charter Application Training
- March 2, 2020 – Notice of Intent is received
- October 1, 2020 – Application is received¹
- November 12, 2020 - Capacity Interview is conducted²
- December 11, 2020 – Recommendation is presented

¹ The Authority approved a Good Cause Exemption for the TEACH Las Vegas on June 26, 2020, allowing the application to be submitted outside the normal Summer Application window (July 1 – 15, 2020).

² The TEACH Las Vegas 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	75	75	75	75	75	75
1	50	75	75	75	75	75
2	25	50	75	75	75	75
3	25	25	50	75	75	75
4	25	25	25	50	75	75
5	25	25	25	25	50	75
6	50	50	50	50	50	75
7	50	50	50	50	50	75
8		50	50	50	50	75
9			75	75	75	75
10				75	75	75
11					75	75
12						75
Total	325	425	550	675	800	975

Executive Summary and Recommendation

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

The review committee and SPCSA staff found that the TEACH Las Vegas application attempts to meet the Geographic component within the SPCSA Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment as the proposal has identified a target community made up of five zip codes, three of which have a large number of 1- and 2-star schools. Many of the schools in the identified zip codes also serve a high percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, but the identified location is within a zip code with fewer 1- and 2-star schools. However, little evidence was provided within the application that demonstrates clear evidence of concrete partnerships, and there are concerns about the limited community engagement that has occurred to date as well as the presented demand for the school. These concerns led to a rating of ‘Approaches the Standard’ for this section.

The academic plan was also rated as ‘Approaches the Standard’. While the review committee did find that the proposed curricula was detailed and provided evidence that the academic program is aligned to Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS), a number of gaps were also identified that led to this rating. Chief among them, the proposed academic model, specifically an emphasis on project-based learning for younger students, raised questions. It was not clear that adequate supports are in place to support at-risk students or those that may be classified as EL students. More information is needed to understand the assessment plan and how it can assist the school in tracking student progress and performance.

Overall, the Operations plan was rated as 'Approaches the Standard'. Notable strengths included the proposed CMO, which is seeking to develop successful schools outside of Los Angeles, CA and appears to be mission-aligned to the goals of the SPCSA. Additionally, a prospective facility has been identified and during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form reiterated a commitment to providing transportation to students. Despite these strengths, the review committee and SPCSA staff identified a number of concerns, including the proposed staffing plan, roles and responsibilities of the leadership team, and the ability to adequately serve at-risk students and EL learners. Questions remain about the current demand in the community for the proposed school.

The review committee identified several strengths and weaknesses within the financial plan that led to a rating of 'Approaches the Standard' for this section. The financial plan presented appears to account for all major expenditures and generally aligns with the narrative, and the CMO possesses substantial financial expertise and has demonstrated the ability to provide timely information to the board should financial issues arise, or if cashflow becomes a problem. Among the concerns identified were the proposed revenues and expenditures included in the incubation year budget, and it is not clear that the estimates for student transportation expenditures beginning in Year 1 are sufficient to adequately ensure that students needing this service have access.

Finally, the Addendum was rated as 'Approaches the Standard' as well. While TEACH Public Schools is an established CMO, and the proposal includes an identified school leader, several shortcomings, such as the capacity of the current governing board and the lack of clear development and recruitment plan for future staff members at the proposed school, prevented this section from being rated any higher.

For these reasons, in addition to those described throughout this memo, staff's recommendation is to deny the charter school application for TEACH Las Vegas.

Proposed motion: Deny the TEACH Las Vegas 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). Delegate to staff the responsibility to meet and confer with the applicant on the method to correct the identified deficiencies.

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	Approaches the Standard
Academic Plan³	Approaches the Standard
Transformational Change	Meets the Standard
Curriculum & Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion & High School Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Approaches the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches 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	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Approaches the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Approaches the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Meets the Standard
Facilities	Meets the Standard
Ongoing Operations	Meets the Standard
Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard
Addendum	Approaches the Standard
Leadership for Expansion	Approaches the Standard
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard
School Management Contracts	Approaches the Standard

³ The TEACH Las Vegas 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 made up of five zip codes, three of which have a large number of 1- and 2-star schools. Many of the schools in the identified zip codes also serve a high percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. While the applicant has identified a location within a zip code with fewer 1- and 2-star schools (89130), the applicant proposes to provide transportation services to enable the school to better recruit and serve low-income families. Additionally, the proposal presents a mission and vision statements that tie to creating a high-quality school in the identified community, and the application has a robust plan for parent and community engagement should the school be authorized.

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. This was confirmed during the capacity interview. Additionally, evidence of demand for the school is limited, especially in hard-to-fill grades that are frequently difficult to fill in Year 1 of operation.

Areas of Strength

- The mission of the school is clear, with a focus on literacy while integrating state of the art technologies to achieve proficiency. Additionally, the vision describes how the school will foster student success both inside and outside of the school, helping to explain how the school will work with the community to achieve student success.
- The Committee to Form and proposed CMO demonstrate a desire to serve a disadvantaged population of students by specifically planning to locate in an area of Las Vegas with some 1 and 2-star schools and giving priority to students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch. Additionally, the TEACH Public Schools network has experience educating students from low-income backgrounds, EL students and students with disabilities.
- The Committee to Form and proposed CMO present a plan to continue parent engagement through the opening of the school with materials/information presented in parents' home languages and schoolwide family events that will be organized by the Executive Director and future parents. Parent workshops are also contemplated in the application and aim to cover topics that are of interest to students and parents.

Areas of Concern

- The application did not present clear evidence of involvement of prospective parents, neighborhood, or community members representative of the target population in the development of the plan. This concern was reaffirmed during the capacity interview, signaling that additional work is necessary to ensure that the plan adequately addresses the specific needs of the community that the school intends to serve.
- While the Committee to Form demonstrates an intent to continue to develop community partnerships post-authorization, the application mainly provides limited evidence of established community partnerships. Letters of support are included, but do not reference specific deliverables, nor do they outline accountabilities of both parties to provide services that may help

meet the needs of the target population. A limited number of identified partners are local to the community in which the school intends to locate.

- The Committee to Form was unable to provide credible plans or strategies to ensure that hard-to-fill grade levels are fully enrolled during the first year of operations. The proposal contemplates serving a large number of students in grades K-1 and 6-7 in Year 1. While the applicant provided evidence of nearly 100 potential students, or approximately 30% of the proposed first year enrollment, the application and capacity interview did not provide sufficient evidence of demand, particularly in the grade levels with proposed larger classes.

Academic Section

The review committee identified many strengths within the written application. The proposed curricula are detailed within the application and provide evidence that the academic program is aligned to Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS). The application also provides a detailed description of how student progress towards promotion and ultimately graduation through parent communication. Professional development plans are detailed and have the potential to support staff as they work to accelerate student learning.

Despite these strengths, a number of gaps were identified within this section by the review committee that resulted in this section being rated as 'Approaches the Standard'. The proposed academic model, specifically an emphasis on project-based learning for younger students, raises questions, and it is not clear that adequate supports are in place to support at-risk students or those that may be classified as EL students. During the capacity interview, additional clarity about the proposed schedules for students was provided, but concerns remain about the calendar and whether or not it meets required standards. Finally, more information is needed to understand the assessment plan and how it can assist the school in tracking student progress and performance.

Areas of Strength

- The proposed academic program places a strong emphasis on data as each student will have a Personalized Educational Program (PEP) which will outline goals based on assessment data. Goals will be tracked, and the applicant provides a plan to drive student achievement at a school level based on disaggregated student data to ensure goals reflect all subgroups.
- Plans for professional development are robust, fully developed and connect to the proposed instructional model. The application details plans to provide professional development for teachers through summer sessions, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and other ongoing opportunities to support them in the delivery of the model. Additionally, the application outlines a thoughtful approach to develop teachers through the observation process. It is clear that systems and structures are in place to identify and support teachers that may need additional help.
- The Committee to Form provides evidence of a strong plan to ensure promotion and graduation requirements are met. The applicant team demonstrates a plan to regularly communicate progress to parents and students through monthly progress reports, report cards twice a year, and parent-teacher conferences twice a year. The application demonstrates a clear understanding of Nevada's graduation requirements.
- The application includes a fully developed curricula and materials that show a multi-tiered approach while also aligning with the proposed instructional strategies such as differentiation. The detailed plan provides evidence that the academic model aligns to the Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS), and the application notes various electives that will also be offered as part of the proposed academic program.

Areas of Concern

- The application emphasizes project-based learning as a key component of the proposed academic

model, yet during the capacity interview, it is not clear that this approach may be well-suited to the younger students enrolling at the school, and responses from the Committee to Form lacked depth and clarity. More information is needed to understand how project-based learning would be implemented so as to result in transformational change for students. Additional questions remain about the emphasis on differentiation and how it will lead to strong execution of the proposed model and instructional design for the school.

- Gaps exist between the proposed model and the staffing plan. It is not clear that the school will be able to implement the proposed instructional program with a strong emphasis on data driven instruction, especially for at-risk students or those behind grade level. The school proposes to employ a limited number of data personnel and a counselor is not employed until the third year.
- Limited evidence was provided within the application that the proposed school has a robust and aligned assessment plan that can ensure adequate tracking student performance and achievement. Other than MAP or the state mandated assessments, no other assessments or tracking mechanisms were referenced. More information is needed to ensure that internal assessments will provide sufficiently rich data for the evaluation of student performance and the education program, and that TEACH staff will be utilizing a clearly defined process to support student instruction.
- The academic data from the CMO, as presented within the application, raises questions about the ability of the school to provide families with a high-quality, 4 or 5-star school option immediately. It is not clear that the schools in operation would earn a 4 or 5-star rating under the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). Additionally, presented data shows a decline in some of the student populations, and this is concerning given the projected student demographic that the school anticipates serving. Responses from the capacity interview did not provide evidence that the proposed academic model would generate strong academic results on the Authority's performance framework.
- The Committee to Form was unable to clearly articulate and defend the stated approaches for serving EL students, which would comprise a large portion of the projected student body. The application included inconsistencies regarding the EL coordinator role, and it is not clear that the school has adequate capacity to effectively serve identified students.
- During the capacity interview, the applicant confirmed that the school would provide instruction on Friday. However, this does not match the narrative, raising questions about whether the proposed calendar meets the minimum requirement of instructional days. More information is needed to clarify if the proposed schedule, which includes half-days once a week, are sufficient.
- While the proposed school would not serve high school grades in year 1, a draft memorandum of understanding between the charter school and the college or university through which the credits will be earned and a term sheet are not included. More information is needed to understand how the school would meet this requirement.

Operations Section

The proposed governing board seeks to contract with a Charter Management Organization (CMO) TEACH Public Schools, which is seeking to develop successful schools outside of Los Angeles, CA. 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. Additionally, a prospective facility has been identified and during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form reiterated a commitment to providing transportation to 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'. Inconsistencies between the narrative, proposed staffing plan, and budget raise questions about the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team, and the ability to adequately serve at-risk students and EL learners. Questions remain about the current demand in the community for the proposed school. Finally, the incubation year plan is not sufficiently detailed to ensure that appropriate accountability structures, roles and responsibilities are all clearly defined so as to lead to a successful opening.

Areas of Strength

- The Committee to Form proposes to partner with a CMO comprised of staff with significant experience working in Los Angeles-based TEACH Public Schools.
- The Committee to Form and proposed CMO have identified a realistic facility option, and the application includes a realistic projection of the number of classrooms required to execute the proposed academic plan. Furthermore, the application notes that the proposed facility does include space for other activities outlined in the narrative such as physical education. Finally, during the capacity interview, it was made clear that the CMO has established relationships and experience to effectively oversee facilities.
- The proposed school plans to offer transportation to students in response to feedback from the community. While there may be some questions about the allocation of funds in the budget to adequately cover these expenses, a commitment to transporting students is a key feature of the operational plan and ensures that the academic program is accessible to students.

Areas of Concern

- While members of the governing board were very knowledgeable regarding the proposed academic plan, oversight of the CMO, as well as a next steps with regard to community engagement, more evidence is needed to understand how the proposed board as a whole has the capacity to effectively govern the school and execute on all responsibilities, including monitoring school performance, operations and financials. Additionally, limited evidence was provided that demonstrates that sufficient financial capacity is present on the current board.
- As stated previously, inconsistencies between the proposed academic model and the staffing plan were identified. When asked during the capacity interview about these outstanding questions, the proposed governing board were unable to provide additional clarity, and responses were contradictory. It is concerning that a school which expects to serve a large number of EL students would not have a coordinator overseeing this work until Year 4. Additionally, questions remain

about other critical positions not being filled until midway through a charter term such as teacher aides, assistants, and counselors. As presented, the school's plan to serve student populations is not adequate.

- The roles and responsibilities of the proposed leadership team, specifically the Superintendent and Executive Director remain underdeveloped. The proposed structure does not demonstrate effective assignment of management roles and distribution of responsibilities.
- The applicant's student enrollment and recruitment plan lacks evidence that the school will be able to meet its proposed enrollment targets in Year 1. The proposal contemplates serving a large number of students in K-1 and 6-7 in the first year of operation. However, current enrollment levels presented in the application do not indicate that the school has sufficient numbers at this time to adequately support proposed enrollment levels. Future monthly meetings with prospective parents were described during the interview, but few other methods of enrollment were shared. Moreover, the lack of established community partnerships heightens the concern that there is a sufficient community presence to support the school at this time.
- The incubation year plan is underdeveloped and may not include all requisite tasks that would need to be completed prior to opening. More information is needed to understand the plans for continued parent and community engagement and establishing community partners. Additionally, it is not clear that all startup expenses are appropriately allocated during this time. More information is needed to ensure that key milestones and concrete actions by the appropriate party are accounted for in the plan.
- The presented plan to recruit and hire high-quality teachers is not compelling, and the strategy to recruit teachers with California credentials raises questions about how this may translate to Nevada. More clarity is needed to understand the hiring plan and who will lead that critical effort during the incubation year.

Financial Section

The financial plan presented appears to account for all major expenditures and generally aligns with the narrative. The Committee to Form and CMO representatives also provided examples of how any budget deficits stemming from low enrollment might be addressed. Finally, the CMO possess substantial financial expertise and demonstrated the ability to provide timely information to the board should financial issues arise, or if cashflow becomes a problem.

The review committee did identify a few minor weaknesses within this section. It is concerning that there are no revenues or expenditures included in the incubation year budget, and it is not clear that the estimates for student transportation expenditures beginning in Year 1 are sufficient to adequately ensure that students needing this service have access. Despite these concerns, the review committee rated found that this section 'Approaches the Standard'.

Areas of Strength

- 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. Proposed teacher salaries appear to be reasonable.
- During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form and CMO representatives were able to describe a variety of reasonable approaches and or steps that could be taken in response to potential budget cuts. Mission-critical expenses were protected and realistic cuts, such as eliminating teaching positions or specific grade levels in Year 1, were contemplated.
- The presented budget does not suggest that the school will become insolvent or lack access to a necessary amount of liquidity. CMO representatives possess significant experience and the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely information to the proposed governing board. Additionally, the Committee to Form demonstrated a strong understanding of cashflows as they relate to grants.
- The applicant noted that while the budget did not include any additional funds beyond those that are guaranteed, they have identified additional sources of revenue that could be made available to the school. During the capacity interview, the applicant named the Revolving Loan program as well as possible funding from Opportunity 180 as potential sources of funds, neither of which are included in the proposed budget.

Areas of Concern

- Questions remain about the proposed budget for the incubation year. No revenue or expenses are included. While the Committee to Form and CMO provided some additional clarity during the capacity interview, it remains unclear how probable expenses such as marketing and recruitment might be covered.
- Some inconsistencies between the narrative and proposed budget exist. For example, the proposed staffing plan for Special Education services does not align with the narrative description for year 1. This is an essential service that may preclude the committee to form from implementing their plan.
- The applicant contemplates providing transportation to students, but it is unclear if the information and cost estimates provided will be sufficient to offer this important service to a large number of students. This concern is exacerbated by a lack of identified student demand, which if more developed, would likely allow the Committee to Form to make more accurate cost assumptions.

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 TEACH Las Vegas contemplates contracting with a CMO, this component of the application was required.

There are a few identified strengths within this component. TEACH Public Schools is an established CMO in Los Angeles, CA and has an established network that currently supports schools. Additionally, the Committee to Form has an identified school leader that has experience within the TEACH network. Several shortcomings were identified that resulted in this section being rated as 'Approaches the Standard'. These include questions about the tools to be used by the governing board to monitor and evaluate the CMO on at least an annual basis and a lack of clear development and recruitment plan for future staff members at the proposed school.

Areas of Strength

- The proposed school is to be part of the TEACH Public Schools network, an established network in Los Angeles, CA. It is also clear the applicant understands the need to have high performing schools in Nevada.
- The Committee to Form has identified a school leader that has a wealth of experience, is qualified, and is familiar with the TEACH Public Schools model.
- A draft contract between the proposed governing board and the CMO is included within the charter application. The contract specifies the duties/services that the CMO will provide to the governing board and school at the beginning of the charter term.

Areas of Concern

- While the application describe the services to be provided to the governing board and school by the CMO once the school is in operation, there is not a clear outline of services to be provided during the incubation year by the CMO. The application is transparent that the CMO has been doing the majority of work to date, but this lack of clarity raises questions about the incubation year, especially because there are few expenditures listed during this time. During the capacity interview it was noted that the school does not include any fundraising dollars in the budget, and that there is an intent to apply for a Revolving Loan if approved to cover some expenses, but more clarity around roles and responsibilities during the incubation year is necessary to evaluate if the organization has sufficient infrastructure.
- The draft contract does not provide sufficient detail with regard to performance evaluation measures and mechanisms for the CMO. It is not readily clear how the CMO will be annually evaluated by the governing board. Moreover, insufficient detail is provided about how the governing board will monitor the performance expectations of the contract.
- The draft contract raises some questions regarding intellectual property, renewal provisions and the impact that termination could have on the existing school and board. Specifically, it is not clear which entity would own the academic program if the CMO was terminated, nor is the services agreement sufficiently clear about how the CMO could end the agreement. The draft agreement goes on to state that services continue until terminated, raising concerns that this could be an automatic renewal provision.

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 TEACH Las Vegas was conducted on Thursday, November 12, and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form attended the interview. Additionally, two representatives from TEACH Public Schools, the proposed Charter Management Organization (CMO), and a representative from Charter Impact, a financial management and operational support service provider, attended the capacity interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

Curriculum and Instructional Design	Mission and Vision
Driving for Results	Board Governance
At-Risk Students & Special Populations	Leadership Team
School Structure: Calendar and Schedule	Staffing Plan
Parent and Community Involvement	School Management Contracts
Targeted Plan	Financial Plan

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.⁴ The timeline regarding this request for input is below and the response provided by the Clark County School district is attached.

- October 7, 2020 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input.
- November 13, 2020 – Written input provided from CCSD to SPCSA.

⁴ 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

- *Clear and comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.*

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.*
- *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

Curriculum and Instructional Design

- *Instructional strategies are proven to be well-suited to the student population.*
- *Instructional programs offer a continuum of services to students through a tiered system of interventions, ensuring that all students, including those who are in need of remediation, English Learners, and those who are intellectually gifted, are able to build the knowledge base necessary to access rigorous instruction.*

Dual Credit Partnerships

- *A draft memorandum of understanding between the charter school and the college or university through which the credits will be earned and a term sheet.*
- *The partnership reflects in the memorandum of understanding is shown to be both appropriate for high school students seeking advanced coursework.*

Driving for Results

- *There is a clear process for setting, monitoring and/or revising internal leading indicator academic goals.*
- *There is a clear delineation between assessments utilized for internal monitoring by the governing body, staff, and leadership and those which are sufficiently rigorous, valid, and reliable to be presented to the Authority, the state, parents, and the general public.*
- *Internal assessment selections will provide sufficiently rich data for evaluation of the education program AND fully align with State assessments, State standards, and the curriculum as presented.*
- *The assessment plan is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate collection and analysis of individual student, student cohorts, school level, and network-level performance over time, including a clear process for setting and monitoring ambitious academic goals.*

At-Risk Students and Special Populations

- *The committee to form 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.*
- *The committee to form demonstrates that the school's response to early signs of behavioral*

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, fellow teachers, and with support, as needed, from the school's social worker.

- *Devotes adequate resources and staff to meeting the needs to all students.*

School Structure: Calendar and Schedule

- *Proposed calendar meets or exceeds the minimum of 180 (or equivalent) days of instruction.*

Operations Plan

Board Governance

- *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 to school-specific programs.*
- *The board puts into place a structure that enables it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the EMO/CMO.*
- *The board provides logical evidence that the school will achieve its target student outcomes pursuant to the NSPF and the SPCSA Performance Framework outcomes pursuant to the NSPF and SPCSA Performance Framework if the school leader satisfies the standards set forth by the board.*

Leadership Team

- *Structure demonstrates effective assignment of management roles and distribution of responsibilities for instructional leadership, curriculum, personnel, budgeting, financial management, management of state categorical revenue streams, special education and ELL programming, legal compliance, state reporting, external relations, and any unique, school-specific staffing needs.*
- *Leadership job description identifies qualifications and competencies of the lead person that align with the school's mission and program and demonstrate capacity to successfully manage the school.*

Staffing Plan

- *Appropriately staffed to meet the needs of the expected student population, including special student populations.*
- *Staffing plan matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.*
- *Staffing plan aligns to the applicant's commitment to meet the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.*

Human Resources

- *Articulates process for recruiting and hiring high quality teachers and leaders.*
- *School staffing structure that ensures high-quality teacher support/development, student/family support, effective school operations, and compliance with all applicable policies and procedures.*

Student Recruitment and Enrollment

- *The enrollment plan, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.*
- *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: parent name and contact information, zip code of residency, student name(s) and grade levels for the proposed opening year.*

Incubation Year Development

- *Provides key milestones for the planning year, as well as concrete actions and accountability,*

that will ensure that the school is ready for a successful launch. These plans should identify the individuals responsible for leading Year 0 initiatives. If a third party (EMO/CMO) is going to implement portions of the Year 0 plan, the committee to form has provided documentation that articulates related terms and services.

- *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.*

Financial Plan

- *Projections are based on accurate, conservative and legally compliant assumptions.*
- *Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for ALL budget line items to allow for assessment of fiscal viability.*
- *No essential services are funded at amounts that would preclude the committee to form from implementing their plan.*

Addendum

Leadership for Expansion

- *Network-level plan for sourcing and training potential school leaders, including qualifications and competencies is aligned with the mission and programs.*
- *Comprehensive leadership recruitment and development plan for sourcing new leadership; little if any used passive methods such as internet job boards.*

Scale Strategy

- *Organization has sufficient infrastructure (or plan to develop same) to support the proposed network of schools, including shared services and the costs associated with them.*
- *Clear, appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school sites.*

School Management Contracts

- *Clearly defined contract terms including: contract duration; roles and responsibilities of the school governing board, school staff, and EMO/CMO-specific services and resources to be provided by the EMO/CMO; performance evaluation measures and mechanisms; compensation to be paid to the provider; financial controls and oversight; methods of contract oversight and enforcement; investment disclosure; and conditions for renewal and termination of the contract, and alignment of the key performance indicators for the EMO/CMO and the hierarchy of sanctions for poor performance with the SPCSA academic, financial, and organizational frameworks and intervention ladder.*