

New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

December 8, 2023



Thrive Point Academy of Nevada

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed School Name	Thrive Point Academy of Nevada
Proposed EMO/CMO	Learning Matters Education Group (EMO)
Proposed Mission and Vision	<p>Mission: Thrive Point Academy of Nevada’s mission is to offer a schooling experience, including credit recovery, to at-risk students who have been suspended from another school, have habitual disciplinary issues, are academically disadvantaged, have been adjudicated, and/or have an Individualized Educational Plan in underserved communities and prepare all Thrive Point students for their Next Big Step in life, whether postsecondary education, the workforce, and/or military enlistment.</p> <p>Vision: To prepare Nevadan students for their next big step in life, supporting them through three pillars of success; Action, Engagement, and Achievement, and to be the preferred choice in personalized learning for at-risk high school students living in underserved communities</p>
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: 9-12 Full Scale: 9-12
Proposed Opening	August 2024
Proposed Location	Clark County; 204 S. Decatur Blvd. #210, Las Vegas, NV 89107
Proposed Zip Codes to be Served	89107, 89102, 89106, 89108, 89117, 89128, 89145, 89146

PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
K						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9	75	100	125	150	175	200
10	75	100	125	150	175	200
11	75	125	175	225	275	325
12	75	125	175	225	275	325
Total	300	450	600	750	900	1050

CONTENTS

- 1 Overview and Recommendation 4
- 2 Meeting the Need 7
- 3 Academic Plan 11
- 4 Operations Plan 18
- 5 Financial Plan 24
- 6 Addendum 26
- 7 Application Process Details 29
- Appendix A 31

1 OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The SPCSA conducts a rigorous review of new charter school applications. This process includes the submission to the SPCSA of a written notice of intent to submit a new charter school application 90 days prior to the submission of the new charter school application; the submission to the SPCSA of the actual new charter school application between April 15 and April 30 of each year; the review of the new charter school application by the SPCSA – including the review of the new charter school application by outside reviewers and a capacity interview with the applicant team. The application is rated against the SPCSA’s new charter school application evaluation rubric and, as stated in the evaluation rubric, an applicant must Meet the Standard in all four, or five, if applicable¹, main sections of the application (Meeting the Need, Academic Plan, Operations Plan, Finance Plan, and Addendum, if applicable) by the end of the application and evaluation process to be recommended for authorization. If an application Meets the Standard in all but one section, and Approaches the Standard in the one remaining section, the application and proposed new charter school may be recommended for authorization if the remaining issues are specific and limited and the outstanding deficiencies can be addressed through conditions. In addition, as part of the review process, the SPCSA seeks input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located. The input provided by the school district is posted along with other relevant materials for this application for consideration by the SPCSA board.

It is important to note that there is also an opportunity for an unsuccessful new charter school applicant to resubmit its charter school application, as well as an opportunity for an unsuccessful applicant to appeal the denial of its application. Thrive Point Academy of Nevada (TPAN) chose to resubmit the charter application in accordance with SPCSA process and this resubmission was rated against the SPCSA’s rubric. For more details regarding the SPCSA’s application process, please see Appendix A.

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

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

During the August 25, 2023, Authority meeting, SPCSA staff presented the findings of the initial review team and SPCSA staff for the Thrive Point Academy of Nevada charter application. The initial application was found to exhibit shortcomings within all five components of the submitted application. The review team and SPCSA staff found that the proposed Meeting the Need, Academic, Operations, Financial and Addendum sections did not meet standards as outlined in the charter application rubric. The Authority voted on August 25, 2023, to deny the TPAN charter application. A second review team comprised of SPCSA staff and an external reviewer reviewed the resubmitted TPAN application

¹ Charter Management Organizations applying for sponsorship directly, as well as Committee to Form applicants that propose to contact with a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Educational Management Organization (EMO) are required to complete the Addendum section of the application and therefore will be rated in five main sections. All other applicants are not required to complete the Addendum section and are only rated on four main sections.

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

after it was received on September 28, 2023. The review team approached rating the resubmission with two primary considerations:

- To determine if the applicant had corrected the original deficiencies found in the initial application; and
- To verify that the applicant’s resubmission did not change the rating of any component in the rubric that was previously determined to ‘Meet Standard’.

Upon resubmission, the second review team determined that several of the previously identified deficiencies had been addressed, and the ratings against the charter application rubric reflect these changes. Mostly notably, the resubmission made improvements in various components within the Meeting the Need and Operations sections. The resubmission includes revised board goals that are mission-specific or tied to school performance as measured under the SPCSA Performance Frameworks. Sufficient clarity was provided with regards to the proposed board, including their roles and responsibilities. Additionally, the resubmission provided more detail regarding proposed partnerships and a significant increase in student interest from the proposed zip codes in which the school plans to serve.

The review committee also identified several important improvements within the Academics section. Additional detail and clarity were provided in the At-Risk and Special Populations component. The narrative includes improved strategies for special populations, and significantly more detail regarding how the proposed school would identify and support students with disabilities. Despite this progress, the review team found that goals regarding policy and procedures for the oversight of students with special needs, students learning English language, and students who have been emancipated or homeless and having no family support while in attendance need to be further defined.

The review team found that improvements were made to the Financial Plan section. Specifically, the school clarified the facility concerns within the Operations Plan which led to more clarity regarding the school financial plan in its initial years of operation.

Finally, with regard to the Addendum section, the resubmission provided clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities of school leadership, the proposed board, and the Education Management Organization (EMO). Additionally, the resubmission affirms the proposed board’s plans to evaluate the EMO using an established tool adopted by the local board and incorporated into the contract. For these reasons, as well as those detailed in the remainder of this memo, this section was rated as ‘Meets the Standard’. The resubmission included a number of additional improvements that resulted in many subsections of the application being rated as ‘Meets the Standard’. As a result, SPCSA staff’s recommendation is to approve, with conditions, the Thrive Point Academy of Nevada charter school application as resubmitted.

Resubmission Application Section	New Rating
Meeting the Need	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan	Meets the Standard
Operations Plan	Meets the Standard
Financial Plan	Meets the Standard
Addendum ³	Meets the Standard

³ In accordance with NRS 388A.249, the SPCSA is required to consider the academic, financial, and organizational performance of any charter schools that currently hold a contract with the proposed CMO or EMO. This information is evaluated through the Addendum section, which is required for applicants that propose to contract with an EMO or CMO.

1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

Proposed motion: Approve the Thrive Point Academy of Nevada resubmitted application as submitted during the 2023 Application Cycle, with the conditions as permitted by NAC 388A.410 and as outlined below, based on a finding that the applicant has met the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3) in that the applicant has demonstrated competence in accordance with the criteria for approval prescribed by the SPCSA that will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school.

1. Enrollment will be capped at 450 students in year two and each remaining year of the charter contract. Once the school is officially approved for the Alternative Performance Framework by the Nevada State Board of Education, the board may apply for an amendment to increase enrollment. If approved, the Thrive Point of Nevada enrollment cap will be:

School Year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-2030
Grade Levels	9-12	9-12	9-12	9-12	9-12	9-12
Enrollment Cap	300	450	450	450	450	450

2. The SPCSA will defer the issuance of academic Notices until the school is eligible to apply for the Alternative Performance Framework. If Thrive Point Academy of Nevada does not qualify for the Alternative Performance Framework, deferred Notices will be issued.
3. By March 15, 2024, provide a detailed plan, along with policy and procedures for the oversight of
 - a. students with special needs, including a policy detailing how the TPAN model will serve students with severe disabilities.
 - b. students learning English language.
 - c. students who have been emancipated, or homeless and having no family support while in attendance.
 - d. student discipline, including an updated Discipline Policy removing the use of the term “Zero Tolerance” or providing additional context with regard to the meaning of “Zero Tolerance.”
4. By January 15, 2024, provide a detailed chart displaying which staff members, in addition to the school leader, will provide strong levels of support while the school enrollment is capped at 450. Identify who will be responsible for the duties of the following roles until these positions may be hired.
 - a. Workforce Coordinator
 - b. Community Partnership Coordinator
 - c. Social Worker
 - d. Retention Specialist
5. Complete the SPCSA pre-opening process for new charter schools. Pursuant to NAC 288A.410, all conditions set forth above must be met for the school to open for the 2024-2025 school year.

1.3 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION SECTION RATINGS

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

Application Section	Initial Rating	Resubmission Rating
Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Does Not Meet the Standard	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Transformational Change	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard

Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Does Not Meet the Standard	Approaches the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Approaches the Standard	Approaches the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
Programs of Distance Education	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard	Meets the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Staffing Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet the Standard	Meets the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Addendum	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Past Performance	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Network Capacity	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
School Management Contract	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard

2 MEETING THE NEED

2.1 SECTION RATINGS

Application Section	Initial Rating	Resubmission Rating
Meeting the Need	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Does Not Meet the Standard	Meets the Standard

2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

As presented in the resubmission, which included minimal changes from the original application, the Mission and Vision was rated as Meets the Standard. The Thrive Point Academy of Nevada vision describes preparing Nevada students for their next big step in life by supporting them through Action, Engagement, and Achievement. The proposed school is focused on a mission of “mastery-based learning in online, remote, and in-person settings, that is transformative, personalized, that fosters meaningful connections, that engages hearts and minds and that intentionally helps students plan for their next big step, whether that be career or college readiness, is the most effective way to help all students succeed.”

The Targeted Plan section was rated as Meets the Standard in the resubmission. The Committee to Form intends to align to several components of the SPCSA’s Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment by proposing a school model aimed at supporting students at risk of dropping out of school. Upon resubmission, the applicant was able to provide additional details and clarity regarding evidence that the Applicant had a thorough understanding of the community, specifically the students, demographics, and educational needs of the proposed location. Several members of the Committee to Form have ties to the Las Vegas community and the resubmitted application provided additional details regarding how those ties would lead to a successful school with close ties to the community. Additionally, the resubmitted application’s 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. Finally, the resubmission presents sufficient evidence that the proposed school will have the necessary capacity to adequately serve students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. The resubmission includes modified enrollment projections for each of these subgroups and clarifies the model that the school will utilize to effectively serve each of these subgroups.

The Parent and Community Involvement section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard in the initial application submission due to a lack of specific information regarding outreach to both proposed parents and the community at large. Subsequently, in the application resubmission, the Committee to Form was able to provide a significant increase in evidence of demand along with proposed partnerships with the community. The Applicant provided several memorandums of understanding for proposed community partnerships with Thrive Point Academy of Nevada which contained accountabilities of both parties that were clear, measurable, and time-specific from the partner and are relevant to the needs of the identified population. Additionally, the Committee to Form provided meaningful opportunities for all parents to contribute to the school community and be active partners, including parents of students with disabilities and English language learners. TPAN provided additional zip codes the school proposes serving. Those zip codes are 89102, 89106, 89108, 89117, 89128, 89145, 89146 and are zip adjacent to 89107 and within a three-mile radius of the proposed school site. TPAN also provided over 200 signatures from interested high school students with roughly half of those living in and around the proposed zip codes. This represented a significant increase from the initial submission.

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

2.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

2.3.1 Mission and Vision: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clear, measurable, and compelling mission statement which explains the role of the school in meeting the needs of the community and intended student population, and which is reflected throughout the application.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Vision describes success (beyond graduation) for students if the school fulfills its mission.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Committee to Form/CMO aims to achieve outcomes that they demonstrate will improve the long-term quality of life of all students served, including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School’s plan, in alignment with the mission and vision, satisfies at least one statutory purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the academic achievement of pupils. Encouraging the use of effective and innovative methods of teaching. Providing an accurate measurement of the educational achievement of pupils. Establishing accountability and transparency of public schools. Providing a method for public schools to measure achievement based upon the performance of the schools, AND/OR 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating new professional opportunities for teachers. 	
---	--

2.3.2 Targeted Plan: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the community and students to be served, including the demographics and educational needs of the intended student population, as well as the current school options within the community.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed educational model is clearly described and addresses a need(s) related to student outcomes in the identified community that is either shown to exist with data or is in response to demonstrated demand for a particular school model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>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:</p> <p>1. Demographics: Applicants meeting this need will propose a school model that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, and thorough research and analysis in order to intentionally enroll and serve the following student groups, each of which has been identified as historically underperforming based on data provided by the NDE: students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL), English language learners (ELLs), students with disabilities (those with an Individual Education Program, or IEP), students in foster care, and students experiencing homelessness. Successful applicants will demonstrate the capacity to support these student groups in making rapid academic growth and achieving academic performance above the state average. Applicants intending to enroll and serve student groups that have historically underperformed can be most impactful when they alleviate barriers to access, such as by providing meals through the National School Lunch Program, providing student transportation, proactively translating written communication to commonly spoken languages, and offering robust social work and counseling services.</p> <p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received a 1- or 2-star NSPF rating for the 2018-19 school year, AND • Continues to have an NSPF index score below 50 as of the 2021-22 school year. <p>Successful applicants will demonstrate the capacity to effectively meet the needs of students who will transfer from 1- or 2- star schools that continue to have an index score below 50 in order to drive rapid academic growth and achieve academic performance above the state average. Additionally, applicants meeting this need will provide intentional plans for partnering with the community and building on identified community assets to meet the needs of students within the community. Simply adding a school option in a community with 1- or 2-star schools that continue to have an index score below 50 will not inherently lead to effectively meeting the community needs. Rather, schools must establish trust with the community by working in partnership to intentionally meet the needs of the students and community. Alternative 3-, 4- or 5-star school options in communities where a significant percentage of students are attending a 1- or 2-star school that continues to have an index score below 50 can be most impactful when there are limited or no public charter school options available in the community.</p> <p>2b. Academic Need: Students at risk of dropping out of school: Applicants meeting this need will propose a public charter school model that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, and thorough research and analysis to enroll and prevent at-risk students from dropping out of school and put them on track for successful high school completion with concrete post-secondary plans that will put them on a trajectory toward economic success. Models may include but are not limited to programs designed for student groups that are most at-risk of dropping out or programs aimed at enabling credit-deficient students to get back on track to graduate. Applicants should demonstrate a strong understanding of grade-level appropriate indicators for successful high school completion, such as early literacy, attendance, and credit sufficiency and plans to enable students to successfully meet these milestones. Public charter schools aimed at enrolling and preventing at-risk students from dropping out of school can be most impactful when they offer a unique academic experience for students and/or are closely aligned to Nevada's priorities for workforce and economic development.</p> <p><i>Pursuant to NRS 388A.249(2), the SPCSA must consider the degree to which the proposed charter school will address the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment as part of the application review. Additionally, in accordance with NRS 388A.249(3) the SPCSA may only approve an application to form a charter school if, in addition to meeting other requirements, the proposed charter school will address one or more of the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

2.3.3 Parent and Community Involvement: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates ties to and/or knowledge of the identified community and explains how the proposed school will build upon community assets.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Intentional and thoughtful strategies for engaging with community members, families, and parents representative of the community to be served. Illustrates, with examples, that parents, neighborhood, and community members representative of the community to be served helped shape the school proposal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines a thoughtful plan to proactively engage parents, community members, and other neighborhood partners from the time that the school is approved and once the school is operating.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes meaningful opportunities for all parents to contribute to the school community and be active partners, including parents of students with disabilities and English language learners.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies key supporters, partners, or resources that are directly tied to the stated outcomes of the school, including community partners that are located in and/or serve the identified zip codes. Partnerships are evidenced by specific letters of commitment outlining the accountabilities of both parties and clear, measurable, time-specific deliverables from the partner which are clearly relevant to the needs of the identified population, and do not reflect a paid vendor relationship.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Transformational Change section was rated as Meets the Standard. The narrative describes an academic program that has students and staff rethink how they approach education and includes nurturing a growth mindset for students and adults. Upon resubmission, the Applicant was able to provide a more specific description of how this proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model. For example, the Committee to Form was able to provide additional clarity regarding the use of Student Success Plans, Academic Learning Plans, and Individualized Education Plans and how each plan would relate to the teachers and Student Success Coaches (SSC). In each case, a certified educational professional works with the SSCs to ensure a cohesive systemic method to use distinct features of each plan to ensure student success. Finally, as will be discussed later in this recommendation, the Applicant was able to clarify and connect the proposed school model with the proposed targeted zip codes and was able to provide additional explanation that helped the review team understand how alignment between the model and mission would provide operational aspects that are key to transformational change.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design was rated as Meets the Standard. Similar to the Transformational Change section, the Applicant was able to describe an instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision and provided additional information as to how this model and curriculum would be implemented in this proposed community. Specifically, the Applicant stated the curriculum and instructional strategies would be effective for students with disabilities and English Learners, and the resubmitted application provided a more in-depth discussion, and evidence, about how courses are differentiated to meet individual student learning needs.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements section was rated as Meet the Standard. The Applicant was able to articulate promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served and demonstrated a high expectation of students who would enroll at Thrive Point Academy of Nevada. Due to the uniqueness of the proposed model, the narrative includes structures to support students at risk of dropping out, including those who are over age for their grade, those needing to access credit recovery options, and those performing significantly below grade level.

The Driving for Results section was rated as Meets the Standard upon resubmission. A key concern for reviewers during the initial application review was a lack of specific detail regarding how the Applicant would track progress towards academic goals and ensure the success of all students including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, and at-risk students. During the resubmission, the review team found that the Applicant provided a more in-depth description to how teachers would use data to track student growth and support student subgroups, and there was additional clarity relating to how the school would use this data to inform instruction. The Applicant noted it also may adjust hours that the campus is open based on feedback from students, families, and staff. Additionally, the Applicant stated they continue to implement ongoing data analysis which enables directing customized human capital, tools, and programs to each school based on its unique situation. The Applicant went on to explain that the community-focused approach would ensure students in every setting access individualized assistance. The proposed board members who previously appeared to be reliant on the proposed Educational Management Organization (EMO) to guide them on academic outcome data showed an increase in knowledge and understanding between the initial submission and the resubmission.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations section improved upon resubmission, but the review team still had some concern which led to a rating of Approaches the Standard. While the review team was left with some ongoing concerns, the team felt these could be addressed through conditions in the approval. The review team had significant concerns regarding how the Applicant would remediate academically underperforming students and meet the needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learner students in the initial charter application submission. The Applicant was able to provide additional information and insight regarding this concern which helped the review team better understand the remediation process. The Applicant explained that in addition to traditional academic metrics like grades and test scores, the Applicant would emphasize socio-emotional benchmarks, resilience indicators, and life circumstance factors such as housing stability. Additionally, Student Success Coaches will maintain specialized dashboards for student caseloads and focus on nuanced indicators that highlight individual progress and areas of concern specific to our alternative education setting. However, the review team found that the application would benefit from additional detail describing how the proposed school would use specific instructional programs and strategies to provide a continuum of services for students with disabilities. The review team has included a condition as part of the recommendation to address this concern. The resubmitted narrative built on general statements that showed the Applicant is aware of federal and state requirements and further articulated how these requirements will be met through the implementation of the Thrive Point educational model. Overall, the Applicant improved the At-Risk Student Population section between the initial application and the resubmission, but additional work is needed as part of the pre-opening process.

The Professional Development section was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant proposed a model that would call for both teachers and Student Success Coaches who would work in tandem to both educate and assist students. The narrative provides a list of professional development topics and the target audience and additional clarity was provided in the resubmission regarding how teachers and Student Success Coaches would be trained to implement the unique instructional model and meet the needs of the student population. In addition, the Applicant states that teachers will be given a scorecard to track areas for professional growth and the resubmission provided additional information to the review team in how these scorecards would be incorporated into the model to assess professional growth.

The School Culture section remained rated as Approaches the Standard. As noted in the initial submission recommendation, it was clear from the application that the proposed EMO has a vision for the culture that would serve as a model for this proposed school. This vision was evident throughout the application and appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate were described. However, there was also a lack of clear and measurable goals to monitor the overall culture of the school. Given the unique online/hybrid model the Applicant proposes, clearly defined goals and strategies that account for both in-person and online learners are critical to realize the culture that is envisioned. However, the review team noted the EMO operates schools in other states and no findings were made that would lead the review team to believe this school would not be able to translate the cultures of those schools into a successful school in Nevada.

The Student Discipline section remains rated as Approaches the Standard. The application presented a comprehensive list of expectations and rules for students as well as how each infraction would be handled. Again, the proposed EMO has experience implementing discipline plans in its other schools, and it was articulated in the application. However, the review team found several mentions of a Zero-Tolerance policy in the Applicant’s discipline policy. In a closer review of the policy, the review team found that the use of the term Zero-Tolerance may have been used in a way in which it was not meant to be interpreted, and thus, the review team called for a condition for the Applicant to provide an updated discipline policy that would eliminate the use of the term prior to opening.

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

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

The Programs of Distance Education section was rated as Meets the Standard. The narrative outlined a distance education program that includes a comprehensive set of criteria for enrolling students that corresponds with a clear, logical, and accessible enrollment plan. An issue that arose during the initial submission about a misunderstanding between the Committee to Form and the proposed EMO regarding whether students would be able to attend online full-time or not was addressed. Additionally, the review team was concerned with the lack of a detailed, justifiable, approach for interactions between the pupils and teachers that aligned with the proposed instructional minutes. This concern was addressed with additional information regarding the role of both teachers, Student Success Coaches, and other staff that provided clarity regarding the implementation of the program described in the application.

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

3.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

3.3.1 Transformational Change: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school’s success.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Ambitious, yet achievable plan to further the SPCSA’s strategic goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide families with 4- or 5-star school. • Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds - including those from historically underserved student groups. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that the key features of the proposed school can be implemented together in a coherent and cohesive manner that will drive towards meeting the proposed mission and vision.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Distinguishing features of the proposed school are supported by compelling evidence of success in schools implementing similar programs while serving similar student populations or a demonstration of rationale for the feature that is supported by a logic model and plans to study effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.2 Curriculum and Instructional Design: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision, academic program, and instructional strategies. Instructional model and learning environment will engage students in ways that are culturally responsive and relevant.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies curricula for all core academic subjects and demonstrates that they align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Includes a logical plan for delivering required courses including arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that instructional strategies are well suited to the identified student population and will enable effective differentiation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates how the instructional model and curriculum will enable all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level to build the knowledge base necessary to access rigorous instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If the school intends to include a career and technical education program, the application outlines a logical plan that is aligned with the school's mission, vision, instructional model, and goals for student growth as well as the State's requirements for career and technical education.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

3.3.3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Structures are in place to support students at risk of dropping out, including those who are over age for their grade, those needing to access credit recovery options, and those performing significantly below grade level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If proposing a high school program, clearly articulates high school graduation requirements which align with Nevada Graduation Requirements and will ensure that students graduate college and career ready.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

3.3.4 Driving for Results: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission-specific academic goals explicitly complement or supplement, but do not replace, the SPCSA's performance standards. All such indicators, measures, and metrics are rigorous, valid, reliable, and objectively verifiable. • Annual performance and growth goals align to the Nevada School Performance Framework and/or the Authority Performance Framework and will put the school on a trajectory to meet SPCSA performance standards. • Quarterly performance targets can be used to develop a plan for monitoring and reporting academic performance gaps and a process for using data to support instruction and inform professional development. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students and monitoring for disparities in academic performance between student groups.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Explanation of corrective actions that will be taken if the school fails to meet achievement outcomes at the classroom, cohort, special population and/or school-wide level (throughout the year or at end of year), including the party responsible for implementing these actions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Internal assessment selections will provide sufficiently rich data for evaluation of the education program, are valid and reliable, and are fully align with state assessments, Nevada Academic Content Standards, and the curriculum as presented.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The assessment plan is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate collection and analysis of individual student, student cohort, special populations, and school level data (interim, annual, year over year), including a clear process for setting and monitoring ambitious academic goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Logical plan for using assessment data to drive key decisions aimed at improving academic outcomes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA's Performance Frameworks.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.5 At-Risk Students and Special Populations: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
At Risk Students	
Provides a clear and research-based process for identifying at-risk students and their needs, including those with academic and behavioral needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the methods according to which the school will remediate academically underperforming students, including the system according to which the school will track progress, facilitate teacher collaboration, and the research supporting the school's remediation strategy.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The school's Response to Intervention system differentiates planning for each student according to the significance of their need, providing a continuum of programs, strategies, and supports that corresponds with the needs identified for each student and is supported by research.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents a reasonable plan and identifies the parties responsible for communicating with parents regarding remediation needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that the school's response to early signs of behavioral and/or social emotional needs will be met with positive interventions and restorative justice practices. The school will utilize differentiated support for each student in collaboration with the students' parents, teachers, and with support, as needed, from other school staff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Special Populations	
Demonstrates the Committee to Form or CMO's track record of success serving a wide range of students with disabilities (mild, moderate, and severe), English language learners, homeless and migrant students, and intellectually gifted students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For students with disabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a logical plan to screen all students and to ensure that struggling students are evaluated for special education services early and accurately. Presents a plan for student evaluation and developing IEPs that contain rigorous goals and instructional plans that are suitable to meet those students' goals. Presents a monitoring plan that will enable relevant staff to track the progress of all students with IEPs towards the goals articulated in their respective plans. Demonstrates that the school will be able to provide all special education and related services needed either by the staff listed on their organization chart or identified external groups with whom they can contract to provide needed services. Specifies full Nevada licensure for all special education teachers/coordinators. Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. Articulates process for monitoring compliance with state and federal laws pertaining to serving students with disabilities. For middle and high schools, presents a logical and thorough plan for developing and implementing transition plans. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For English language learners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes for identifying English language learners are well-defined, including administration of placement assessments and communications to parents and teachers. Indicates full Nevada licensure for all English language learners teachers/coordinators. Describes the specific services that will be provided for students within and outside the classroom, including curriculum and instruction and exposure to co-teaching. Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For intellectually gifted students, demonstrates that the school will extend their learning offerings such that those students have access to unique, tailored opportunities. The proposed staffing structure demonstrates sufficient staffing and teacher support to implement the plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For homeless/migrant students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents a logical and systematic method according to which the school will identify homeless and/or migrant students. Clear plan to assess and meet the needs of students and identified as homeless and/or migrant. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.6 Professional Development: Meets the Standard

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

	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates how professional development will support all teachers in meeting the needs of special populations including students with disabilities and English language learners.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear identification of the persons or organizations responsible for professional development. If professional development is to be provided by contracted third party, the third party has appropriate expertise.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Cost of any third party provided professional development is reflected in the budget.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.7 School Culture: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate that will allow for fulfillment of the school's stated mission and vision, as well as the school's stated academic goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a concrete plan for norming social/cultural expectations at the start of each year as well as for students who enter mid-year.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Provides plans to establish a culture of high expectations with students/families and teachers/staff and promote a positive school culture.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Dress code and/or uniform policy is age-appropriate, and the applicant articulates how the proposed school will ensure that uniform requirements do not create a barrier for economically disadvantaged students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.8 Student Discipline: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Presents sound policies for student discipline, suspension, and expulsion including procedures for due process which align to Nevada statutes and regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
A plan to ensure that certain student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies, including protection of the rights of students with disabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Goals for student behavior are clear and measurable. There is a plan, and designated personnel, for monitoring and reporting related to behavior goals as well as ongoing maintenance of discipline records.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.9 School Calendar and Schedule: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed Calendar and schedule meets or exceeds applicable statutory and regulatory requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 180 (or equivalent) days of instruction. • 43,200 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades k-2. • 54,000 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades 3-6. • 59,400 minutes of classroom instruction /year for grades 7-12. • Minimum of 120 hours of instruction for High School courses. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Calendar and schedule support implementation of the academic program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Alignment between teacher and student schedules.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents sound policies for student attendance and truancy including procedures for due process that comply with state laws and are customized to the charter school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.10 Dual Credit Partnerships: Meets the Standard

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

3.3.11 Programs of Distance Education: Meets the Standard

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

4 OPERATIONS PLAN

4.1 SECTION RATINGS

Application Section	Initial Rating	Resubmission Rating
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard	Meets the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Staffing Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet the Standard	Meets the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard

4.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Board Governance section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard in the initial submission. Upon resubmission, the Applicant provided additional clarity and substantial improvement which led to the review team rating the resubmission as Meets the Standard. During the initial capacity interview, it became evident that proposed members of the Committee to Form who would transition to become board members for the proposed school were not fully prepared for the duties that would come with serving on a charter school board. Throughout the resubmission process, the proposed board showed a substantial increase in the overall capacity and knowledge needed in overseeing a charter school and EMO. The resubmission provided the review team with a much clearer picture of a structure to gather data to monitor the school. The proposed board includes passionate individuals who bring a range of experience and expertise, and the resubmission was able to provide a more robust narrative that showed that proposed board members would be well versed in critical aspects of the proposed model, such as the hybrid and fully remote learning options. Additionally, the Applicant was able to increase educational capacity to its board through another educational expert on the proposed board. In addition, the narrative expanded on an initially narrow role for the board focused primarily on hiring and overseeing the principal and explained a more robust set of items the board would oversee which included oversight of the EMO, Academics, Organizational, and, Financial outcomes of the school.

The Leadership Team section was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant was able to identify a proposed principal that has experience working at a school with a similar model. The proposed school leader demonstrates a range of experience serving various student populations (students with disabilities, English language learners, students in need of remediation, and students above or below grade level). Additional clarity was provided that showed a cohesive explanation of the model, mission, and vision of the school between the proposed leader, proposed board, and proposed EMO.

The Staffing Plan section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard in the initial submission and Approaches the Standard in the resubmitted application. There is still a lack of consistency around the overall staffing plan of the proposed school. For example, while the resubmitted application was able to address concerns regarding the staffing plan for English Language Learners, there were still some instances of disconnect between the narrative and proposed staffing plan in the resubmission. The resubmitted application noted the importance of social workers, but this position wasn't proposed to be filled until after Year 1 of operation. When asked to clarify, the Applicant said the position would be hired in Year 1. Since this position was not included in Year 1 budget projections, the Applicant must update the proposed budget and staffing plan to ensure the resources and budget align. The review team has included a condition

to allow the Applicant to address Staffing Plan concerns found in the resubmission. The Applicant was able to clarify the role of Student Success Coaches in relation to teachers remained upon resubmission. Additionally, the Applicant was able to clarify the recruitment and retainment of high-quality teachers and provide more specific strategies to recruit teachers to a school with such a unique model.

The Human Resources section was rated as Meets the Standard. As noted in the Staffing Plan section, the Applicant was able to better articulate recruitment and hiring processes and strategies likely to result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body. Additionally, the explanation of the Student Success Coach and how those individuals would be recruited and retained was also clarified which gave the review team a better understanding of how those individual would fit in with the overall staffing, and recruitment, of the school.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment section was rated as Meets the Standard upon resubmission. The review team's considerable concerns with the recruitment plan that was presented as part of the initial application were addressed through resubmission. The initial application submission contained little evidence of demand from interested students and families. In the resubmission, the Applicant was able to provide additional evidence of demand and the Applicant chose to broaden the zip codes that were proposed to be served. Additionally, the Applicant has demonstrated ongoing recruitment efforts and increased demand, which addressed concerns about the alignment between the stated community to be served and the recruitment efforts. Finally, while the Applicant was able to address concerns in the resubmitted application, which led to the review team rating the Student Recruitment and Enrollment section as Meets the Standard, the review team still did have concern regarding the proposed growth of the school in its first few years of operation. Because this charter school proposes serving such a unique student base, much of which hinges on the approval of the Nevada Department of Education to be rated on the Alternative Performance Framework, the review team has recommended a condition that the school's total enrollment be capped based on the Year 2 projection until the school is able to provide evidence it has qualified for, and will be rated on, the NDE's Alternative Performance Framework. Specifics regarding this cap can be found as part of the proposed motion.

The Incubation Year Development section was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant was able to provide key milestones for the planning year and the EMO has shown experience in opening and operating charter schools in other states. Additional details were provided that showed comprehensive leadership development plans, which include training aligned with incubation year goals. Hiring plans for key positions were clarified and the review team's concern that the proposed board would be overly reliant on the EMO to fill gaps during the incubation year was addressed.

The Services section was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant was able to provide a plan that articulated a reasonable process and timeline for ensuring the school will have information technology infrastructure, equipment, software, and policies to support the school operations and model, including plans for data security and privacy. Additionally, and as stated below, the plans for facility maintenance and management were clarified upon resubmission.

The Facilities section was rated Meets the Standard. The narrative identifies a facility for the proposed charter school and questions regarding the proposed facility, and possible future facilities were addressed through the resubmitted application. During the initial application's capacity interview, when asked about the facility plans, the Applicant explained that the identified facility could house up to 800 students and there would need to be additional school locations added to accommodate the projected enrollment growth up to 1,400 students, which led to concerns that the proposed facility plan would not be viable if only one facility were allowed to be operated. Through the resubmission process, the Applicant was able to provide a logical and viable plan for a charter school which contemplated only one facility through the first years of operation. The Applicant was able to modify projected enrollments that were in line with both the facility capacity and the charter school's proposed model of online/hybrid learning. As noted above, the review team has recommended an enrollment cap through at least the first three years of the school's operation and will request an updated facility lease and budget that shows viability through the school's pre-opening process.

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

4.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

4.3.1 Board Governance: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed governance structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear delineation of authority and working relationship between the governing body, school staff and any committees, advisory bodies, and/or councils.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The board puts into place a structure that enables it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the performance of the school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that the membership of the governing body will contribute the wide range of relevant knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to oversee a successful charter school, including but not limited to educational, financial, accounting, legal, and community experience and expertise, as well as special skill sets to reflect school-specific programs, if applicable (e.g., STEM, fine arts, blended learning, alternative programs, etc.). The proposed governing body members demonstrate capacity and expertise to successfully oversee a school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides evidence that the governing body fulfills (or describes reasonable and detailed plans to ensure that the governing body will fulfill) statutory requirements for board membership, including at minimum, one teacher or other person licensed pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS; one teacher or other person licensed pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS or a school administrator; one parent or legal guardian of a pupil enrolled in the charter school who is not a teacher or an administrator at the charter school; and two individuals with knowledge and expertise in one or more of the following areas: accounting, financial services, law, or human resources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If the governing body is not fully developed, a clear plan and timeline for expanding capacity prior to the opening of the school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Shows that the governing body is or describes specific strategies to ensure that the governing body will be representative of the identified community and describes plans for engaging with the community in order to ensure that community voice is meaningfully incorporated into the governing body’s decision-making.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members, charter holder board members and staff, or charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity nor any supervisory or business relationships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Proposed conflict of interest policy, ethics policy, and bylaws are reasonable and compliant. Bylaws contemplate a mechanism for removal of governing body members if needed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides plans for meaningful, appropriate training for board members on a regular basis. Governance training is provided by experienced, third parties and addresses on-boarding for new members, or when the composition of the board changes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.2 Leadership Team: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO are demonstrable with empirical data related to student performance, including students from diverse backgrounds and experiences, students with disabilities, English language learners, and other special populations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If identified, school leader demonstrates a range of experience serving all students (students with disabilities, English language learners, students in need of remediation, and students above or below grade level) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leadership role at a high-performing and/or high growth school, • experience establishing a high-performing culture with students and staff, and • responsibility for significant student achievement gains with demographics similar to the proposed school. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

If the school leader is not yet identified, explains the timeframe and the method by which the board will recruit and select a candidate who demonstrates qualifications and competencies aligned with the school’s mission and program and has experience working with special populations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Structure of the school leadership team will allow for effective management of the school and staff and demonstrates appropriate assignment of management roles and distribution of responsibilities for instructional leadership, curriculum, personnel, budgeting, financial management, special education and EL programming, legal compliance, state reporting, external relations, and any unique, school-specific staffing needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School leadership team job descriptions or resumes identify qualifications and competencies of the administration that align with the school’s mission and program and demonstrate capacity to successfully manage the school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comprehensive plan for coaching, support, and evaluation of school leadership. The board articulates a clear, ambitious, data-driven set of standards and criteria that the school leader must satisfy to keep the school on track to achieve its vision.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.3 Staffing Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates an understanding of expected student population and aligns to the applicant’s commitment to meet the needs of special populations and the community the school intends to serve.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Ensures sufficient capacity to enable high-quality teacher support/development, student/family support, effective school operations, and compliance with all applicable policies and procedures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates reasonable student-teacher ratios based on the proposed model and statutory student-teacher ratios for special education are met (22:1 for students with severe disabilities).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.4 Human Resources: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Articulates recruitment and hiring processes and strategies likely to result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Essential recruitment, hiring, and dismissal functions and processes, such as background checks, payroll, benefits, and employee relations, are clearly described and responsible parties are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system is likely to retain and promote talented staff, allows for re-structuring and removal of staff as needed, creates opportunities for leadership development, and sets clear expectations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system identifies low-performing teacher or leader performance, provides plans, support, and training for improvement, and provides the steps the school leadership will take in instances of persistent low-performance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverages proactive, grassroots strategies such as door-to-door visits, open houses, and forums, and community conversations over the internet, social media, or other passive tactics which disproportionately benefit more advantaged populations. Includes specific plans to ensure equal access to interested families including families in poverty, students zoned to attend 1- and 2-star schools, students with disabilities, EL students, and other at-risk students as defined in the SPCSA’s Needs Assessment. Demonstrates an understanding of the identified community. Is likely to allow the school to enroll a representative student population based on surrounding zoned schools or a mission-specific educationally disadvantaged population. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years includes realistic and appropriate targets, timelines, staff capacity, and monitoring plan to provide confidence that the school will meet its minimum enrollment. <i>Note, the enrollment audit for new schools which determines initial per pupil funding is conducted on or before June 15 of each year.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The application and enrollment process adequately addresses and is compliant with Nevada laws and regulations regarding notification to families within a 2-mile radius during the incubation year, application and enrollment timelines, lotteries, weighted lotteries, enrollment preferences, and backfilling vacant seats when students withdraw.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The recruitment and enrollment plan as well as planned enrollment numbers for year 1 and subsequent years are aligned with the staffing plan and budget, including projected recruitment expenses.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrated interest from parents of students in the appropriate grade level to enroll in year 1 and originating in the identified communities or zip codes to be served (approximately 30% of year 1 enrollment). Demand should be demonstrated through meeting sign in sheets or intent to enroll forms that capture, at minimum, parent name, student grade levels, and zip code of residence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Proactive and detailed plan for maintaining engagement with parents of prospective students who have already demonstrated interest and converting interest into actual applications for enrollment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.6 Incubation Year Development: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Provides key milestones for the planning year, as well as concrete actions and accountability, which will ensure that the school is ready for a successful launch. Incubation year plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that any program-specific components will be ready to begin on the first day of school. Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure the school will be operationally ready to open. Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that the SPCSA Pre-Opening Requirements will be met. <i>Note it is not necessary to duplicate every SPCSA pre-opening requirement into your incubation year plan. Instead, focus on the activities that will ensure success and the major milestones that must be met.</i> Clearly identifies the individuals responsible for leading year 0 initiatives and meeting year 0 milestones. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If a third party (including an CMO/EMO) will implement portions of the Year 0 plan, these actions should align to the contract or additional documentation presented later in the application.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the function of any employees in Year 0, as well as the funding source for associated compensation. The staffing outlined for Year 0 will enable the school to reach its Year 0 milestones and goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.7 Services: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific non-academic services, including, but not limited to transportation, food service, facilities management, nursing, and purchasing processes, and school safety.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates a reasonable process and timeline for ensuring school will have information technology infrastructure, equipment, software, and policies to support the school operations and model, including plans for data security and privacy.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Operations plan for services and information technology demonstrates sufficient staff/contactor capacity to implement the plan, including clear lines of authority.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Costs of services are realistic and align with budget.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.8 Facilities: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Facility plans in the short and long-term are reasonable and meet the needs of the projected student population and proposed program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If a facility (including a temporary facility) has been identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. Projected costs associated with the proposed facility, including purchase price, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance, as applicable, are reasonable and supported by evidence. A sound plan for construction, renovations, or tenant improvements including sufficient funds and a realistic timeline for completion. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. • Evidence that the applicant has engaged with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. • Assurance that the proposed facility will comply with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school. 	
<p>If a facility (or permanent facility) has not yet been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of anticipated facilities needs that will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. • Inclusion of costs associated with the anticipated facilities needs in the budget including renovation, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance. • Evidence to indicate that facilities-related budget assumptions are realistic based on anticipated location, size, etc. • A realistic, timebound plan for selecting and preparing a facility that will meet the programmatic needs and budgetary constraints. • A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. • A clear, time bound plan to engage with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. • Assurance that the proposed location will be in compliance with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<p>Demonstrated capacity to manage facility selection, leasing, acquisition, development, renovation, and management, as applicable. If Committee to Form or CMO has identified a facility development partner, Committee to Form or CMO has thorough plans for managing the partner relationship and ensuring that the partner meets expectations.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

5 FINANCIAL PLAN

5.1 SECTION RATINGS

Application Section	Initial Rating	Resubmission Rating
Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section was rated as Meets the Standard upon resubmission. The Applicant was able to provide a budget that was generally aligned with the mission, vision, and operational aspects of the proposed school. There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities. In addition, projections appear accurate, conservative, and legally compliant. Concerns regarding the feasibility of the proposed budget in the event the school was unable to grow at the rate projected in the application were partially addressed and will need to be further addressed through the school’s pre-opening process. The staffing plan and budget line items related to positions referenced previously in this memo will need to be addressed as well. Overall, the Financial Plan’s budgeted priorities are consistent with the proposed model and there was appropriate segregation of financial duties and facility concerns were addressed as part of the resubmission.

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

5.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

5.3.1 Financial Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The school protects mission-critical expenses when faced with budget cuts and commits to maintaining financial viability. The budget does not appropriate for any fund any amount in excess of the budget resources of that fund (in any single year).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities, as applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Projections are accurate, conservative, and legally compliant. This includes appropriate allocations for required expenditures such as sponsorship fee, Public Employee Retirement System contributions, etc.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Budget priorities are consistent with the proposed model, including but not limited to educational program, staffing, and facility, and budget priorities are aligned with the proposed enrollment plan, including any enrollment growth.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for all budget line items to allow for the assessment of fiscal viability.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Current ratio based on proposed budget of at least 1.1 on a monthly basis is either 1.1 or better or is between 1.0 and 1.1 and trending positive from the immediately prior year.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

All funds from external sources that are included in the budget are guaranteed with cash in hand or letter of award and grant terms.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
There is no evidence that the school ever will become insolvent or lack access to the necessary amount of liquidity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Assumptions about facilities in all financial statements correspond to a conservative facility plan and account for possible contingencies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

6 ADDENDUM

6.1 SECTION RATINGS

Application Section	Initial Rating	Resubmission Rating
Addendum	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Past Performance	Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
Network Capacity	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard
School Management Contract	Approaches the Standard	Meets the Standard

6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

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

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

The Scale Strategy section was rated as Meets the Standard. The proposed EMO has shown it is able to operate charter schools in multiple states, and the resubmission provided a more thorough plan to scale the model to Nevada. As mentioned in previous sections, the EMO, along with the Committee to Form, has conducted outreach to students and families in the proposed location to determine how to adapt the school’s model to meet the local needs, which was found to not have been the case during the review of the initial application. As discussed earlier, the scale strategy includes an updated viable growth plan which will be capped until the school qualifies to be rated under NDE’s Alternative Performance Framework and will not be contingent on adding additional sites beginning in year two of the charter contract.

The Network Capacity section was rated as Meets the Standard. The application described the roles and responsibilities of the EMO leadership team and organization charts clearly and indicate lines of authority between the board, EMO, and school. Concerns about whether there is sufficient capacity and infrastructure to support the expansion to Nevada were addressed throughout the entire resubmitted application narrative. Ultimately, the review team found that the Applicant had done considerably more planning through its resubmission process in order to implement the model with fidelity.

The School Management Contract section was rated as Meets the Standard. The proposed contract includes appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school. Additionally, the review team found the contract complies with Nevada laws and regulations regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors. However, the review team continues to have questions regarding the service fee proposed in the school

management contract. The fee is estimated to be 23% of school revenues which is considerably higher than most other EMO fees in Nevada, but the Applicant was able to provide some clarity around the staffing that would be provided by the EMO based upon the proposed fee structure. Finally, the review team had considerable concern with the proposed board’s ability to oversee and hold the EMO accountable in the initial charter application and capacity interview. As stated previously in the Operations Plan, the proposed board was also able to provide a clearer description of how they would ensure fulfillment of performance expectations. The proposed board initially appeared to be overly reliant on the EMO but through the resubmission process, the review team found the board was able to more clearly articulate its roles and responsibilities with regard to oversight of the EMO.

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

6.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

6.3.1 Past Performance: Meets the Standard

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

6.3.2 Scale Strategy: Approaches the Standard

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

6.3.3 Network Capacity: Approaches the Standard

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

6.3.4 School Management Contract: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
If applicable, clear rationale for selection of the CMO/EMO.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Clear, appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school. The functions table presented in this section should align to the contract.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates capacity and commitment of the governing board to oversee the CMO/EMO effectively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for board to monitor/evaluate the CMO/EMO's performance. Appropriate internal controls guide the relationship. Describes how the governing board will ensure fulfillment of performance expectations. There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives) nor any supervisory or business relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives). Any real or perceived conflict is disclosed and adequately addressed. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clearly outlines the roles/responsibilities of the CMO/EMO in the year prior to the school's opening. Services and supports during year 0 are documentation in the management contract or another agreement to ensure that governing board can hold CMO/EMO accountable for delivery of services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If the administrative head of the charter school or any key personnel of the charter school are directly employed by the CMO/EMO, there are provisions to ensure board approval of the individual(s) selected for this/these roles. Structures are in place to ensure that the governing board can hold the administrative head and any key personnel employed by the CMO/EMO accountable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Clearly defined contract terms including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The duration of the proposed contract, A clear description of the fees to be paid to the proposed CMO/EMO and a clear description of the services that the proposed CMO/EMO will be providing to the proposed charter school, A description of the roles and responsibilities of the proposed governing body of the charter school, the employees of the proposed charter school, and the proposed CMO/EMO, A clear description of the oversight responsibilities of the proposed governing body over the proposed CMO/EMO and how the proposed governing body will evaluate the performance of the proposed CMO/EMO, and Any renewal or termination provisions. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Costs for services are justified, reasonable, and commensurate with the services provided. The management contract does not authorize the payment of fees to the CMO/EMO which are not attributable to the actual services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Complies with Nevada laws and regulations regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors, including EMOs and CMOs, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract with CMO/EMO is subordinate to the charter contract, Initial contract term is no more than two years, Contract with CMO/EMO does not give the CMO/EMO direct control of educational services, financial decisions, the appointment of members of the governing body, or the hiring and dismissal of an administrator or financial officer of the charter school or proposed charter school, and Contract with CMO/EMO does not include any automatic renewal terms. The contract does not allow for any form of leverage – including but not limited to severance fees and facilities ownership – by which the CMO/EMO can ensure renewal of their contract. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

7 APPLICATION PROCESS DETAILS

7.1 TIMELINE

SPCSA staff offered a five-part training series regarding the New Charter School Application process. Each training was recorded and posted to the SPCSA's website: https://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application_Packet/. Below is a summary of the training that was provided.

- December 5, 2022 – Application Overview and Process
- January 11, 2023 – Application Cover Sheet and Meeting the Need Section
- January 24, 2023 – Academic Plan
- February 9, 2023 – Financial Plan
- February 27, 2023 – Operations Plan and Addendum Section

Below are key dates related to the Thrive Point Academy of Nevada charter school application.

- January 27, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada Application is received
- May 17, 2023 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input⁴
- June 27, 2023 – Clarifying Questions sent to applicant; responses received within four business days
- July 7, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada capacity interview is conducted
- August 2, 2023 – Input provided by CCSD
- August 25, 2023 – Recommendation is presented
- August 30, 2023 – Meet and Confer between the SPCSA and the Thrive Point Academy of Nevada's recommendation for denial and resubmission process
- September 28, 2023 – Thrive Point Academy of Nevada's resubmitted application is received
- December 8, 2023 – Resubmission Recommendation is presented

7.2 CAPACITY INTERVIEW

Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the review committee conducted a capacity interview of the applicant to assess the capacity to execute the application's overall plan. The capacity interview for Thrive Point Academy of Nevada was conducted on July 14, 2023 and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form attended the interview, along with the proposed principal. Additionally, three representatives from Learning Matters Education Group, the proposed EMO, one representative from Thrive Point Academy in Arizona, and the school's legal counsel attended the capacity interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

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

⁴ Pursuant to NRS 388A.249, the SPCSA solicited input from the Clark County School District regarding this application. NRS 388A.249(2)(a) requires that "[t]he proposed sponsor of a charter school shall, in reviewing an application to form a charter school...If the proposed sponsor is not the board of trustees of a school district, solicit input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located."

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

THE CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION “NOTICE OF INTENT”

The charter school application process begins with the submission of a written “notice of intent” to submit a new charter school application. See NAC 388A.260(2). This notice of intent is a brief document, submitted to the SPCSA 90 days prior to the submission of the applicant’s new charter school application, stating, among other things, the name of the proposed charter school, contact information for the applicant, the proposed location of the charter school, and the grade levels and number of students the proposed charter school seeks to serve.

THE SPCSA’S PROPOSED CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION WINDOW

In December 2021, Nevada’s Legislative Commission approved proposed regulation R043-21, which amended Nevada Administrative Code 388A.260(1). With this change, the SPCSA moved from two new charter school application windows each year (previously in January and July of each year), to a single annual application window. As a result, new charter school applications now must be submitted to the SPCSA between April 15 and April 30 of each year.

Part of the intent behind the change to NAC 388A.260(1), and the move from two annual application windows to a single application window in April of each year, was to allow sufficient time to ensure that a newly approved charter school opens successfully. That is, upon receipt of a new charter school application in April, the SPCSA’s review process (as described in greater detail below), typically takes four to eight months – meaning that a new charter school application that is received in April will be approved or denied by the SPCSA in August or December. This timeline allows a newly approved charter school nine to 12 months to successfully execute the charter school’s incubation year plan and ensures a successfully opening of the charter school.

Note that NAC 388A.260(1) still contains a “good cause” provision whereby a new charter school applicant may, for “good cause,” request that the SPCSA accept a new charter school application outside the annual April 15 – April 30 window. However, if the SPCSA approves a “good cause” exemption to submit a new charter school application outside of the annual April application window, a notice of intent to submit a new charter school application must still be submitted to the SPCSA 90 days prior to receipt of the actual application. In practice, this means that upon approval of a good cause exemption by the SPCSA, allowing an applicant to submit a new charter school application outside of the typical April application window, an applicant will submit its new charter school application 90 days after approval of the good cause exemption and receipt of the applicant’s notice of intent.

THE REQUIRED CONTENTS OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

NRS 388A.246 and NAC 388A.135-160 detail the requirements related to a new charter school application. Note that these statutes and regulations related to the required contents of a new charter school applications are extensive.⁵

⁵ Although the following list is not all-inclusive, among the required contents of a new charter school application are the following:

- The name of the proposed charter school;
- The date on which the proposed charter school seeks to open;
- Grade levels and the proposed enrollment that the charter school seeks to serve;
- A summary of the plan for the proposed charter school, including the mission, vision and goals of the proposed charter school;
- Information regarding the indicators, metrics and measures that the proposed charter school will use to evaluate the academic, organizational, and financial performance of the proposed charter school;
- The organization structure of the proposed charter school;
- Information regarding the committee to form and the proposed governance of the charter school;

COMPLETENESS CHECK

After receiving a new charter school application, the SPCSA, pursuant to NRS 388A.249(3)(a)(2) and NAC 388A.260(2) conducts a “completeness check” of the application to ensure that the new charter school application contains all the information required by NRS 388A.246 and NAC 388A.135-160. If a new charter school application does not contain all the information required by Nevada’s charter school statutes and regulations, if practicable, the SPCSA follows up with the applicant to obtain the required information. If not, the applicant is asked to submit a new, complete charter school application during the next application cycle.

WITHDRAWAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

NAC 388A.260(3) allows an applicant to withdraw a new charter school application upon written notice to the SPCSA. An applicant may decide to withdraw its application due to significant concerns regarding the completeness of the application, or because it is evident after a cursory review of the new charter school application that the proposed charter school application is not fully developed.

THE SPCSA’S REVIEW OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

Once a new charter school application is deemed complete in accordance with 388A.249(3)(a)(2) and NAC 388A.260(2), the SPCSA begins its substantive review of the new charter school application.

NRS 388A.249(2)(a) requires the SPCSA to conduct a “thorough review” of the new charter school application. This “thorough review” requires that the SPCSA establish a review team to review and evaluate the new charter school application and include in the review team persons with knowledge and expertise regarding the academic, financial, and organizational facets of charter school that are not employed by the SPCSA – these persons are often referred to as “external reviewers.” NRS 388A.249(2)(a) and NAC 388A.260(4).

As part of this “thorough evaluation” the SPCSA is required to conduct an interview with the applicant to elicit clarifying or additional information about the proposed charter school and determine the ability of the applicant to establish a high-quality charter school – this is the “capacity interview” conducted by the SPCSA. NRS 388A.249(2)(b) and NAC 388A.260(4)(b)(2)

-
- Information regarding the proposed administrative head of the proposed charter school;
 - Information regarding how teachers and staff will be recruited and hired;
 - Course and curriculum information, including any dual-credit programs for high school students (if applicable);
 - Information regarding serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, an at-risk student;
 - The organization structure of the proposed charter school;
 - Information regarding the committee to form and the proposed governance of the charter school;
 - Information regarding the proposed administrative head of the proposed charter school;
 - Information regarding how teachers and staff will be recruited and hired;
 - The proposed charter school’s calendar;
 - Information regarding any proposed facility for the proposed charter school;
 - Equipment, furniture, and fixtures that the proposed charter school will utilize;
 - Transportation, if applicable;
 - Health and safety requirements;
 - Student records;
 - Extracurricular activities and dress code;
 - Discipline policies;
 - Budget;
 - Enrollment and any lottery process and procedures;
 - Information regarding required insurance

In its review of the charter school application, the SPCSA is required to evaluate the new charter school application based on documented evidence collected through the process of reviewing the application and the information gleaned during the capacity interview. See NRS 388A.249(2)(b) and (e).

The determination regarding whether to grant a new charter school application is to be based on the ability of the applicants to establish a high-quality charter school. NRS 388A.249(2)(b). The SPCSA may approve a new charter school application if:

- The application complies with all charter school laws and regulations;
- The application is complete;
- The applicant has demonstrated competence in accordance with the SPCSA's new charter school application rubric demonstrating that approval of the new charter school application will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school;
- The application meets the criteria contained in the SPCSA's academic and demographic needs assessment; and
- Sufficient input has been received the public. NRS 388A.249(3).

The North Star of the review team's evaluation of the new charter school application is the SPCSA's new charter school application rubric. NRS 388A.249(2)(b). The rubric is broken into four major sections, plus an addendum. Rating options for each section are Meets the Standard; Approaches the Standard; Does not Meet the Standard. These are defined as follows:

- **Meets the Standard:** The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school is expected to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the plan effectively and result in a 4- or 5-star school.
- **Approaches the Standard:** The response meets the criteria in many respects but lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas.
- **Does Not Meet the Standard:** The response is undeveloped or incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation and/or raises serious questions about the coherence of the application and whether it is original work; raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant's ability to carry it out.

Detailed descriptions of each rubric item can be found in the full rubric located on the SPCSA Application website:

http://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application_Packet/

Once the review team reviews and scores the new charter school application, the SPCSA's Executive Director, or his or her designee, forwards his or her recommendation to the SPCSA Board for its consideration. NAC 388A.260(6)

THE SPCSA'S APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

The SPCSA Board is required to consider a new charter school application at a public meeting held no more than 120 days (or later if agreed to by the applicant) after receipt of the new charter school application. NRS 388A.255(1).

RESUBMISSION AND APPEAL OF A DENIAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

If a new charter application is denied, an unsuccessful applicant will be provided with a written notice setting out the deficiencies contained in the new charter school application. If the applicant chooses to do so, the applicant may resubmit the applicant's new charter school application within 30 days after receiving the written notice of deficiencies. NRS 388A.255(2). Given the lengthy and rigorous application process utilized by the SPCSA in regard to charter applications, as well as the limited timeframe specified in NRS 388A.255(2) for an unsuccessful applicant to resubmit their charter application, the SPCSA encourages only those unsuccessful applicants that the SPCSA has found limited or specific areas where the application does not meet standards to resubmit their charter application. Unsuccessful

applicants that the SPCSA has found numerous or significant issues within the application that do not meet standard are encouraged to submit a new charter application during the SPCSA's next application window.

If a new charter school application is denied after resubmission, the unsuccessful applicant may then appeal the denial to the district court in which the proposed charter school was to be located. NRS 388A.255(3).