Call for Quality Charter Schools Evaluation Rubric



CONTENTS

| 1 E | Evaluation Overview | 4 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.1 | 1 Rubric Ratings | 4 |
| 1.2 | 2 Criteria for Approval | 4 |
| 1.3 | 3 Instructions for Evaluators | 5 |
| 1.4 | 4 Applicant and Reviewer Information | 5 |
| 2 1 | Meeting the Need | 6 |
| 2.1 | 1 Mission and Vision | 6 |
| 2.2 | 2 Targeted Plan | 7 |
| 2.3 | 3 Parent and Community Involvement | 9 |
| 3 A | Academic Plan | 10 |
| 3.1 | 1 Transformational Change | 10 |
| 3.2 | 2 Curriculum and Instructional Design | 11 |
| 3.3 | 3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements | 12 |
| 3.4 | 4 Driving for Results | 13 |
| 3.5 | 5 At-Risk Students and Special Populations | 15 |
| 3.6 | 6 Professional Development | 18 |
| 3.7 | 7 School Culture | 19 |
| 3.8 | 8 Student Discipline | 20 |
| 3.9 | 9 School Calendar and Schedule | 21 |
| 3.1 | 10 Dual Credit Partnerships | 22 |
| 3.1 | 11 Programs of Distance Education | 23 |
| 4 (| Operations Plan | 24 |
| 4 1 | 1 Board Governance | 24 |

| 4.2 | Leadership Team | 26 |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.3 | Staffing Plan | 28 |
| 4.4 | Human Resources | 29 |
| 4.5 | Student Recruitment and Enrollment | 30 |
| 4.6 | Incubation Year Development | 32 |
| 4.7 | Services | 33 |
| 4.8 | Facilities | 34 |
| 5 Fin | ancial Plan | 36 |
| 6 Ado | dendum | 38 |
| 6.1 | Past Performance | 38 |
| 6.2 | Scale Strategy | 40 |
| 6.3 | Network Capacity | 41 |
| 6.4 | School Management Contracts | 42 |
| 6.5 | Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly | 44 |

1 EVALUATION OVERVIEW

1.1 RUBRIC RATINGS

The Evaluation Rubric is the tool used by application evaluators and is completed individually by each evaluator. The Evaluation Rubric contains criteria for each section of the proposal. When conducting an evaluation of an application, evaluators rate and provide a narrative analysis of each section of the application. Within each section and subsection, specific criterion define the expectations for a response that "Meets the Standard." In general, the following definitions guide evaluator ratings:

| Rating | Characteristics |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Meets the Standard (MS) | 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 (AS) | 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 (DNMS) | 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. |

In addition to meeting the criteria that are specific to that section, each part of the proposal should align with the overall mission, academic program, budget, and other sections of the application.

1.2 CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

An applicant must "Meet the Standard" in all four, or five, if applicable¹, main sections of the application (Meeting the Need, Academic Plan, Operations Plan, Finance Plan, and Addendum, if applicable) by the end of the application and evaluation process to be recommended for authorization. If an application "Meets the Standard" in all but one section, and "Approaches the Standard" in the one remaining section, the application and proposed new charter school may be recommended for authorization if the remaining issues are specific and limited and the outstanding deficiencies can be addressed through conditions.

State Public Charter School Authority

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.

1.3 Instructions for Evaluators

Instructions for Evaluators

- 1. Fill in your name and the name of the applicant.
- 2. For each subsection (ex. 3.1 Transformational Change) of the application, you should do the following during your initial individual analysis of the proposal:
 - a. Select a rating for each rubric criteria by checking the appropriate box. One box should be selected for each criterion.
 - b. Based upon criteria ratings, select the overall best fit rating for the section. One box should be selected for the overall rating.
 - c. Populate the "Strengths" area with notable positive aspects of the response in alignment with the rubric. Be sure to include page references where applicable.
 - d. Populate the "Weaknesses" area with weaknesses based on the rubric. Again, reference relevant page numbers.
 - e. Use the "Clarifying Questions" area to present key questions and areas that need to be clarified or confirmed in writing.
 - f. Use the "Probing Questions" area to present key questions which need to be addressed and areas that need to be clarified or confirmed but would be best addressed through a verbal response during the capacity interview.
- 3. Save the document (as a PDF) using this naming convention: SPCSA Eval_School Name_YOUR LAST NAME.pdf (For example, for the request for Sagebrush Charter Schools by Rebecca Feiden, the file name would be: SPCSA Eval_Sagebrush_FEIDEN.doc.) Email the completed rubric to Danny Peltier (dpeltier@spcsa.nv.gov) and Jennifer J. King (Jennifer.King@spcsa.nv.gov).
- 4. Following the capacity interview, you will receive a post-capacity interview rubric template to identify any changes to the original ratings and corresponding rationale.
- 5. Please ensure that all feedback and commentary are written professionally and in complete sentences. Cite page numbers for your comments and questions.

1.4 APPLICANT AND REVIEWER INFORMATION

| Reviewer Name: | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Application Reviewed: | | | | |
| Date: | | | | |

2 MEETING THE NEED

2.1 MISSION AND VISION

| 2.1 Mission and Vision | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|------------------------|
| Criteria | | | | Rating |
| · | ing mission statement which expland which is reflected throughout the | ins the role of the school in meeting the application. | e needs of the community and | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Vision describes success (beyon | d graduation) for students if the sc | chool fulfills its mission. | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| · · | • | nonstrate will improve the long-term on monically disadvantaged students, at-r | • | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| School's plan, in alignment with the mission and vision, satisfies at least one statutory purpose²: 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. | | | | |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | \square Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response Clarifying Questions (may be bestor) Probing Questions (may be bestor) | esponse: | g capacity interview): | | |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **6** of **44**

² NRS 388A.246(2)

2.2 TARGETED PLAN

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|------------------------|
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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 ³ : 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 (ELs), 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 | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page 7 of 44

³ NRS 388A.220(6) and NRS 388A.249

- 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.

| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | \square Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Strengths of the Applicant's Resp | oonse: | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's Ro | esponse: | | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be bes | t suited for a written response): | | |
| • | | | |
| Probing Questions (may be best | suited for a verbal response durir | ng capacity interview): | |
| <u> </u> | | | |

2.3 PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

| 2.5 I ARENT AND COMMONITY INVOLVEMENT | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Criteria | Rating | | | | | |
| Demonstrates ties to and/or knowledge of the identified community and explains how the proposed school will build upon community assets. | | | | | | |
| Intentional and thoughtful strategies for engaging with community members, families, and parents representative of the community served. Illustrates, with examples, that parents, neighborhood, and community members representative of the community to helped shape the school proposal. | | | | | | |
| Outlines a thoughtful plan to proactively engage parents, community members, and other neighborhood partners from the tin school is approved and once the school is operating. | me that the | | | | | |
| Describes meaningful opportunities for all parents to contribute to the school community and be active partners, including par students with disabilities and English language learners. | rents of | | | | | |
| Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condenrollment ⁴ . | lition of □ MS □ AS □ DNMS | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet | the Standard (DNMS) | | | | | |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: | | | | | | |
| arifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): | | | | | | |

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **9** of **44**

⁴ NAC 388A.538(1)

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 Transformational Change

| Criteria | | | | Rating | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school's success. | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | |
| Provides a specific description of | how the proposal will be implem | ented to ensure fidelity to the model. | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| 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. | | | | | |
| | | ompelling evidence of success in schools ationale for the feature that is supported | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) | |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Respo | onse: | | | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • | | | | | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be best | suited for a written response): | | | | |

State Public Charter School Authority
Rev. 11/18/2022
Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric
Page 10 of 44

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

3.2 CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

| | | | | · · | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Criteria | | | | Rating MS | |
| Describes instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision, academic program, and | | | | | |
| instructional strategies. Instruct | tional model and learning environr | ment will engage students in ways that | are culturally responsive and | ☐ AS | |
| relevant. | | | | ☐ DNMS | |
| Identifies curricula for all core a | cademic subjects and demonstrate | es that they align to the Nevada Acader | mic Content Standards ⁵ . | □ MS | |
| | , | , 3 | | □ AS | |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS | |
| Includes a logical plan for delive | ering required courses including ar | ts, computer education and technology | , health, and physical education. | ☐ MS | |
| J. | | | · · · | □ AS | |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS | |
| Demonstrates that instructiona | I strategies are well suited to the id | dentified student population and will er | nable effective differentiation. | ☐ MS | |
| | | | | □ AS | |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS | |
| 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. | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | program, the application outlines a logic | al plan that is aligned with the | □ MS | |
| | • | t growth as well as the State's requirem | | □ AS | |
| education ⁶ . | tional model, and goals for staden | t growth as well as the state s requirem | ients for career and teenmear | ☐ DNMS | |
| education. | | | | □ N/A | |
| 2. | | | | | |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard | (DNMS) | |
| | | | | | |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Res | ponse: | | | | |
| • | | | | | |
| Meaknesses of the Annlicant's R | Resnonse: | | | | |

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric

Page **11** of **44**

⁵ https://doe.nv.gov/Nevada_Academic_Content_Standards/

⁶ https://doe.nv.gov/CTE/

3.3 PROMOTION AND GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

| Criteria Cri | Rating | | | | | |
|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students. | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard | ard (DNMS) | | | | | |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): | | | | | | |

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

⁷ https://doe.nv.gov/High School Graduation/

3.4 DRIVING FOR RESULTS

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|------------------------|
| 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 Framework⁸ and/or the Authority Performance Framework⁹ 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students and monitoring for disparities in academic performance between student groups. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Logical plan for using assessment data to drive key decisions aimed at improving academic outcomes. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA's Performance Frameworks. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (I | DNMS) |

Strengths of the Applicant's Response:

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric

Page **13** of **44**

https://doe.nv.gov/Accountability/NSPF/
 https://charterschools.nv.gov/ForSchools/Accountability/

Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response:

. . . .

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

•

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

3.5 AT-RISK STUDENTS AND SPECIAL POPULATIONS

| Criteria Cri | Rating |
|--|------------------------|
| 3.5.1 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Presents a reasonable plan and identifies the parties responsible for communicating with parents regarding remediation needs. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 3.5.2 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| For students with disabilities ¹⁰ : | □ MS |
| Provides a logical plan to screen all students and to ensure that struggling students are evaluated for special education services early and accurately. | ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | |

¹⁰ Refer to NRS 388.417 to 388.459 and NAC 388.215 to 388.284 for statutes and regulations regarding serving students with disabilities.

| • Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): | |
|--|------------------------|
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: | |
| | 257 |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| For homeless/migrant students¹⁵: 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Articulates process for monitoring compliance with state and federal laws pertaining to serving students with disabilities¹². For middle and high schools, presents a logical and thorough plan for developing and implementing transition plans¹³. For English language learners¹⁴ 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. | |
| 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/coordinators¹¹. | |
| | |

State Public Charter School Authority

Rev. 11/18/2022

Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric

¹¹ NAC 388.165 to 388.171

¹² NAC 388.294

¹³ NAC 388.195 and NAC 388.284

¹⁴ Refer to NRS 388.406 and NAC 388.525 and NAC 388.655 for statutes and regulations regarding serving English language learners

¹⁵ Refer to NAC 392.205 to 392.225

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•



3.6 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

| Criteria | | | | Rating |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | evelopment that will be offered du ed and any specialized component | uring the incubation year to effectively su ts of the educational model. | upport the academic program, | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Provides a summary of profession including topics and structures. | onal development opportunities tl | hroughout the school year to effectively | support the academic program, | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Explains teacher coaching plans | that will effectively support teach | ner development, including responsible p | arties. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Demonstrates how professional development will support all teachers in meeting the needs of special populations including students with disabilities and English language learners. | | | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| Cost of any third party provided | professional development is refle | ected in the budget. | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Res | oonse: | | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's R • | esponse: | | | |
| • | st suited for a written response): | | | |
| robing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): | | | | |

3.7 SCHOOL CULTURE

| Criteria Cri | Rating |
|--|------------------------|
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Describes a concrete plan for norming social/cultural expectations at the start of each year as well as for students who enter mid-year. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Provides plans to establish a culture of high expectations with students/families and teachers/staff and promote a positive school culture. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: | |
| • | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: | |
| • | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): | |
| • | |
| Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): | |
| • | |

3.8 STUDENT DISCIPLINE

| Criteria | | | | Rating |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|------------------|
| Presents sound policies for stude statutes and regulations ¹⁶ . | ent discipline, suspension, and ex | pulsion including procedures for due pr | ocess which align to Nevada | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Describes the proactive use of re | estorative justice practices, includ | ing prior to suspensions or expulsions. | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Clear designation of staff respon | sible for implementing the discip | line plan, including maintenance of stud | dent records and data. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| A plan to ensure that certain sturights of student with disabilities | | ortionately impacted by discipline polic | ies, including protection of the | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| | lear and measurable. There is a p g maintenance of discipline recor | lan, and designated personnel, for mor ds. | itoring and reporting related to | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard | (DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Resp • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Re | | | | |
| - | | | | |

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

State Public Charter School Authority
Rev. 11/18/2022
Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric
Page 20 of 44

¹⁶ NRS 392.4655 to 392.472

3.9 SCHOOL CALENDAR AND SCHEDULE

| | • | | | |
|---|---|---|--|------------------------|
| Criteria | | | | Rating |
| Minimum of 180 (or ed) 43,200 minutes of class 54,000 minutes of class 59,400 minutes of class | le meets or exceeds applicable statequivalent) days of instruction ¹⁷ . Is stroom instruction/year for grades is stroom instruction/year for grades is stroom instruction /year for grades is of instruction for High School cou | 3-6. 57-12 ¹⁸ . | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Calendar and schedule support | implementation of the academic p | orogram. | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Alignment between teacher an | d student schedules. | | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Outlines meaningful goals for stabsent. | tudent attendance and plans to mo | onitor and intervene to prevent student | s from becoming chronically | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Presents sound policies for stude customized to the charter school | | ding procedures for due process that co | mply with state laws ²⁰ and are | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard | (DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Res | sponse: | | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's I • | Response: | | | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be be | est suited for a written response): | | | |
| Probing Questions (may be best | suited for a verbal response durin | ng capacity interview): | | |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **21** of **44**

¹⁷ NAC 387.120 to 387.125 ¹⁸ NAC 387.131 ¹⁹ NAC 389.040 ²⁰ NRS 392.130 to 392.160

3 10 DUAL CREDIT PARTNERSHIPS²¹

| 5.10 DOAL CREDIT I ARTINERSHIPS | |
|---|------------------------|
| Criteria | Rating |
| 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 ²² . | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Specific plans for monitoring students enrolled in the dual credit program to ensure they have sufficient supports and resources to successfully earn college credits. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Appl | icable (N/A) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • | icable (IVA) |
| Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): | |

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

State Public Charter School Authority
Rev. 11/18/2022
Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric

²¹ This section is only required for applicants proposing a high school program.

²² NRS 389.310

2 11 DEOCRAMS OF DISTANCE EDUCATION 23

| 5.11 PROGRAMS OF DISTANCE EDUCATION | |
|--|------------------------|
| Criteria | Rating |
| 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 ²⁴ . | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Detailed, justifiable plan regarding student attendance which meets minimum state requirements. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Detailed plan for ongoing communication with parents. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Comprehensive set of criteria for enrolling students that corresponds with a clear, logical, and accessible enrollment plan. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Presents a logical and research-based plan to serve homeless and/or migrant students in a distance education setting. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Appli | cable (N/A) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): • | |

State Public Charter School Authority

Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

 $^{^{23}}$ This section is only required for applicants proposing to offer distance education. 24 NRS 388.820-388.874 and NAC 388.800-388.860

4 OPERATIONS PLAN

4.1 BOARD GOVERNANCE

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|------------------------|
| Proposed governance structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Clear delineation of authority and working relationship between the governing body, school staff and any committees, advisory bodies, and/or councils. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| The board puts into place a structure that enables it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the performance of the school. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. ²⁵ | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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 ²⁶ , 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| If the governing body is not fully developed, a clear plan and timeline for expanding capacity prior to the opening of the school. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **24** of **44**

 $^{^{25}}$ This may be evaluated during the capacity interview. 26 NRS $\underline{\rm 388A.320}$

| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
|--|------------------------|
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): • Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): • | |

4.2 LEADERSHIP TEAM

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|--|
| The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ 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. | ☐ MS☐ AS☐ DNMS☐ 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (I | DNMS) |

Strengths of the Applicant's Response:

Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response:

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **26** of **44**

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•



43 STAFFING PLAN

| T.5 SIAITING LAN | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------|
| Criteria | | | | Rating |
| Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program. | | | ☐ MS ☐ AS | |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS |
| Matches the proposed budget a | nd is explicitly aligned to both bu | dget narrative assumptions and to budge | t calculations. | ☐ MS |
| | | | | □ AS |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS |
| Demonstrates an understanding | g of expected student population a | and aligns to the applicant's commitment | to meet the needs of special | ☐ MS |
| populations and the community | the school intends to serve. | | | ☐ AS |
| · · | | | | ☐ DNMS |
| Ensures sufficient capacity to en | nable high-quality teacher support | :/development, student/family support, e | ffective school operations, and | ☐ MS |
| compliance with all applicable p | olicies and procedures. | | | □ AS |
| соттривное ител вы времоваете р | choice and procedures. | | | ☐ DNMS |
| Demonstrates reasonable student-teacher ratios based on the proposed model and statutory student-teacher ratios for special education | | | ☐ MS | |
| are met (22:1 for students with severe disabilities ²⁷). | | | ☐ AS | |
| | , | | | ☐ DNMS |
| | | | | |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Resp | oonse: | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's R | esponse: | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be bes | st suited for a written response): | | | |
| _ | | | | |

²⁷ NAC 388.150

State Public Charter School Authority
Rev. 11/18/2022
Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric
Page 28 of 44

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

4.4 HUMAN RESOURCES

| Criteria | Rating | |
|---|------------------------|--|
| 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. | | |
| Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS | |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (I | DNMS) | |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • | | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): • | | |
| Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): • | | |

4.5 STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT

| Criteria | Rating |
|---|------------------------|
| 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. 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years includes realistic and appropriate targets, timelines, staff capacity, and monitoring plan to provide confidence that the school will meet its minimum enrollment. <i>Note, the enrollment audit for new schools which determines initial per pupil funding is conducted on or before June 15 of each year</i> ²⁸ . | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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 ²⁹ , application and enrollment timelines ³⁰ , lotteries ³¹ , weighted lotteries ³² , enrollment preferences ³³ , and backfilling vacant seats when students withdraw. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |

²⁸ NRS 388A.417

²⁹ NRS 388A.450

³⁰ NRS 388A.453(7)

³¹ NRS 388A.453(5)

³² NAC 388A.536 33 NRS 388A.456

| Overa | ll Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | \square Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Strengths of the A | pplicant's Respo | nse: | | |
| • Weaknesses of the | e Applicant's Res | ponse: | | |
| Clarifying Question • | ns (may be best s | suited for a written response): | | |
| Probing Questions | s (may be best su | ited for a verbal response durin | ng capacity interview): | |
| • | | | | |
| | | | | |

4.6 INCUBATION YEAR DEVELOPMENT

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|---------------------------------|
| a successful launch. Incubation year plan: | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |
| goals. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 0 will enable the school to reach its Year 0 milestones and goals. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| | □ MS □ AS □ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (D | NMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): • Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): | |

State Public Charter School Authority
Rev. 11/18/2022
Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric
Page 32 of 44

4.7 SERVICES

| Criteria | Rating |
|---|--------------|
| Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific non-academic services, including, but not limited to | ☐ MS |
| transportation, food service, facilities management, nursing, and purchasing processes, and school safety. | \square AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Articulates a reasonable process and timeline for ensuring school will have information technology infrastructure, equipment, software, | ☐ MS |
| and policies to support the school operations and model, including plans for data security and privacy. | \square AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Operations plan for services and information technology demonstrates sufficient staff/contactor capacity to implement the plan, including | ☐ MS |
| clear lines of authority. | \square AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Costs of services are realistic and align with budget. | ☐ MS |
| | \square AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services. | ☐ MS |
| | ☐ AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| | |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strongths of the Applicant's Perpense | |

Strengths of the Applicant's Response:

Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response:

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

4.8 FACILITIES

| Criteria | Rating |
|---|------------------------|
| Facility plans in the short and long-term are reasonable and meet the needs of the projected student population and proposed program. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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 school³⁴. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ 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 | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page 34 of 44

³⁴ NRS 388A.360(1)

| 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 ³⁵ . | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | | isition, development, renovation, and r | • | ☐ MS ☐ AS |
| | uring that the partner meets exp | partner, Committee to Form or CMO hectations. | as thorough plans for managing | ☐ DNMS |
| Plans for facility maintenance wi | Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students. | | | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| | | | | |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard (| DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Resp. • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Resp. • Clarifying Questions (may be best) | esponse: | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): | | | | |
| • | | | | |

³⁵ NRS 388A.360(1)

FINANCIAL PLAN

| Criteria | Rating |
|---|------------------------|
| The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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) ³⁶ . | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities, as applicable. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Projections are accurate, conservative, and legally compliant. This includes appropriate allocations for required expenditures such as sponsorship fee ³⁷ , Public Employee Retirement System contributions ³⁸ , etc. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for all budget line items to allow for the assessment of fiscal viability. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations. | ☐ MS ☐ AS |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **36** of **44**

³⁶ NAC 388A.730(2)

³⁷ NRS 388A.414 38 NRS 388A.533

| | | | | ☐ DNMS |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------|
| All funds from external sources that are included in the budget are guaranteed with cash in hand or letter of award and grant terms. | | | | ☐ MS |
| | | | | \square AS |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS |
| There is no evidence that the sc | hool ever will become insolvent o | r lack access to the necessary amount of | of liquidity. | ☐ MS |
| | | | | ☐ AS |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS |
| Assumptions about facilities in a | all financial statements correspond | d to a conservative facility plan and acc | ount for possible contingencies. | ☐ MS |
| | | | | ☐ AS |
| | | | | ☐ DNMS |
| | | | | (DAIA 4C) |
| Overall Rating: | ☐ Meets the Standard (MS) | ☐ Approaches the Standard (AS) | ☐ Does not Meet the Standard | (DNMS) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Res | nonso: | | | |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Kesp | polise. | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's R | lesponse: | | | |
| • | | | | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be bes | st suited for a written response): | | | |
| ciamying questions (may be bes | or sairea joi a miniteli respensej. | | | |
| | | | | |
| Probing Questions (may be best | suited for a verbal response durir | ng capacity interview): | | |
| • | | | | |
| | | | | |

6 Addendum³⁹

6.1 PAST PERFORMANCE⁴⁰

In addition to the questions asked in this section, SPCSA staff typically contact the Authorizer of existing schools affiliated with the CMO/EMO regarding the past performance of those schools.

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Academic Performance data for schools affiliated with the CMO/EMO demonstrate strong performance equivalent to 4- or 5-star performance on the NSPF. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| The CMO/EMO and affiliated schools have no significant audit findings within the last three years. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Any legal issues, including contract terminations, are satisfactorily explained. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Appli | cable (N/A) |

Strengths of the Applicant's Response:

•

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page 38 of 44

³⁹ This section is only required for CMO applicants applying directly for sponsorship and Committee to Form applicants proposing to contract with a CMO or EMO

⁴⁰ Pursuant to NRS 388A.249(2), in reviewing a charter application the SPCSA must consider the "academic, financial and organizational performance of any charter schools that currently hold a contract with the proposed operators, including, without limitation, a Charter Management Organization or Educational Management Organization, of the proposed charter school."

Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response:

. ..

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

•

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

6.2 SCALE STRATEGY

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|------------------------|
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Meaningful focus on expansion in Nevada and commitment of organizational resources to support quality school openings and operations. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| The plan to scale the model to Nevada is thorough, realistic, and adequately resourced at both the CMO/EMO and school levels. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Plans for sourcing and training potential school leaders, including qualifications and competencies, is aligned with the mission and programs. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Previous scale-up endeavors are shown to have been successful with student performance data and organizational financial data (if applicable). | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Includes plan to infuse Nevada school(s) with the essential elements of CMO/EMO model. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Appli | cable (N/A) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: | |

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

6.3 NETWORK CAPACITY

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|-------------|
| CMO/EMO has sufficient infrastructure and staff capacity (or plan to develop same) to support the proposed network of schools, including | ☐ MS |
| shared services and the costs associated with them. | ☐ AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Organization charts clearly indicate lines of authority between the board, CMO/EMO, and schools. | ☐ MS |
| | ☐ AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Clearly describes the roles and responsibilities of the CMO/EMO leadership team. | ☐ MS |
| | ☐ AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Sufficient evidence is provided that the staffing plan for the CMO/EMO can support the proposed scale strategy. | ☐ MS |
| | ☐ AS |
| | ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Appli | cable (N/A) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: | |
| | |
| | |

Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response:

•

Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response):

•

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

6.4 SCHOOL MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS

| Criteria | Rating |
|--|-----------------------------|
| If applicable, clear rationale for selection of the CMO/EMO. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A ☐ MS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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)⁴¹. Any real or perceived conflict is disclosed and adequately addressed. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| 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 ⁴² . 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |
| Clearly defined contract terms⁴³ 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |

State Public Charter School Authority Rev. 11/18/2022 Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric Page **42** of **44**

⁴¹ NAC 388A.525(2)
⁴² NAC 388A.580(4). Though permissible, this arrangement is unusual.
⁴³ NRS 388A.246(36)

| 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 ⁴⁴ . | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
|---|------------------------|
| Complies with Nevada laws and regulations⁴⁵ 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. 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. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Applie | cable (N/A) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): • Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview): • | |

State Public Charter School Authority
Rev. 11/18/2022
Call for Quality Charter School – Evaluation Rubric
Page 43 of 44

⁴⁴ NRS 388A.393 ⁴⁵ NRS 388A.393 and NAC 388A.580

6.5 CHARTER MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS APPLYING FOR SPONSORSHIP DIRECTLY⁴⁶

| 0.5 CHARTER MANAGEMENT GROANIZATIONS AFFETING FOR SPONSORSHIP DIRECTED | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Criteria Cri | Rating |
| The application clearly and logically explains the extent to which the governance model of the Charter Management Organization requires a waiver from the governance provisions of the charter school law pursuant to NRS 388A.243 . | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS |
| If the Charter Management Organization is from another state, the application provides a comprehensive, actionable plan to ensure that the board will balance fidelity to its mission with appropriate input and oversight from Nevada residents. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |
| If the non-profit's current board will govern the charter school, the application outlines clear, logical, and comprehensive steps to transform its board membership to meet statutory requirements in NRS 388A.320, mission, and bylaws to assume its new duties. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |
| If a new board has been formed, the application clearly delineates the new board's relationship to the existing non-profit board and the governance responsibilities of both entities as it relates to the proposed school. | ☐ MS ☐ AS ☐ DNMS ☐ N/A |
| Overall Rating: Meets the Standard (MS) Approaches the Standard (AS) Does not Meet the Standard (DNMS) Not Appli | icable (N/A) |
| Strengths of the Applicant's Response: • | |
| Weaknesses of the Applicant's Response: • | |
| Clarifying Questions (may be best suited for a written response): | |

Probing Questions (may be best suited for a verbal response during capacity interview):

•

⁴⁶ This section is only required for CMO applicants applying directly for sponsorship.