

# New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

August 23, 2024



## Nevada Early College & Career Academy (Necca Academy)

### GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Proposed School Name</b>	Nevada Early College & Career Academy (Necca Academy)
<b>Proposed EMO/CMO</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Proposed Mission and Vision</b>	<p><b>Mission:</b> To increase access to dual enrollment opportunities for at-risk youth groups, thereby setting students of all backgrounds on a path of academic excellence and personal fulfillment.</p> <p><b>Vision:</b> 1. Close the high school graduation gap among at-risk student groups compared to their peers.                  2. Create equitable access to dual enrollment, providing students of all backgrounds a head start in college and career readiness.                  3. Increase academic achievement among at-risk student groups compared to their peers, including math and English proficiency.                  4. Set students of all backgrounds on a positive trajectory for success in college and career through building academic, social, emotional and practical skills.</p>
<b>Proposed Grade Configuration</b>	Opening: 10-12 Full Scale: 9-12
<b>Proposed Opening</b>	August 2025
<b>Proposed Location</b>	Clark County; North Las Vegas
<b>Proposed Zip Codes to be Served</b>	89032, 89031, 89030, 89106

### PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31
K						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9	0	0	50	50	50	50
10	100	50	50	100	100	125
11	100	175	125	125	175	175
12	100	150	225	200	200	250
<b>Total</b>	300	375	450	475	525	600

# CONTENTS

---

1	Overview and Recommendation	3
2	Meeting the Need	5
3	Academic Plan	8
4	Operations Plan	15
5	Financial Plan	22
6	Application Process Details	24
	Appendix A	26

# 1 OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

---

## 1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The SPCSA conducts a rigorous review of new charter school applications. This process includes the submission to the SPCSA of a written notice of intent to submit a new charter school application 90 days prior to the submission of the new charter school application; the submission to the SPCSA of the actual new charter school application between April 15 and April 30 of each year; the review of the new charter school application by the SPCSA – including the review of the new charter school application by outside reviewers and a capacity interview with the applicant team. The application is rated against the SPCSA’s new charter school application evaluation rubric and, as stated in the evaluation rubric, an applicant must Meet the Standard in all four, or five, if applicable<sup>1</sup>, main sections of the application (Meeting the Need, Academic Plan, Operations Plan, Finance Plan, and Addendum, if applicable) by the end of the application and evaluation process to be recommended for authorization. If an application Meets the Standard in all but one section, and Approaches the Standard in the one remaining section, the application and proposed new charter school may be recommended for authorization if the remaining issues are specific and limited and the outstanding deficiencies can be addressed through conditions. In addition, as part of the review process, the SPCSA seeks input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located. The input provided by the school district is posted along with other relevant materials for this application for consideration by the SPCSA board.

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

The review committee and SPCSA staff determined that one of the four main sections of the application Meet the Standard as outlined in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard
Financial Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard

Details regarding the rating for each component of the application can be found in Section 1.3 of this report. Based on these ratings and the findings summarized within the remainder of this report, the SPCSA staff’s recommendation is to deny the Nevada Early College & Career Academy (Necca Academy) Charter School charter school application.

## 1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

**Proposed motion:** *Deny the Nevada Early College & Career Academy (Necca Academy) Charter School application as submitted during the 2024 Application Cycle based on a finding that the applicant has failed to satisfy the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3) in that the applicant has failed to demonstrate competence in accordance with the criteria for approval prescribed by the SPCSA that will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school. Designate Director Mackedon to meet and confer with the applicant.*

---

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

### 1.3 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.

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

## 2 MEETING THE NEED

---

### 2.1 SECTION RATINGS

Meeting the Need	Meets the Standard
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Meets the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Approaches the Standard

### 2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Mission and Vision section was rated as Meets the Standard. Necca Academy's proposed mission includes increasing access to dual enrollment opportunities for at-risk youth groups. The mission statement is clear, measurable, and compelling, explaining the school's role in meeting community and student needs. Additionally, the mission and vision are reflected throughout the application and were evident during the capacity interview.

The Targeted Plan section was rated as Meets the Standard. In both the written application and during the capacity interview, the Applicant demonstrated a thorough understanding of the community and students to be served, including the demographics and educational needs of the intended student population. The Applicant also provided data showing a need for the proposed school and an understanding of the area where the school would primarily serve. However, the Committee to Form did not articulate how the proposed academic program differed from what is available in high schools within Nevada and how it would be successful with various identified target student groups.

The Parent and Community Involvement section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form provided some intentional strategies for engagement, such as "Feet on the Street" campaigns, family feedback forums, and community partner info sessions. However, it is not clear whether parents, neighborhood, and community members representative of the community to be served contributed to shaping the school proposal. Although the Committee to Form mentioned "The Big Push" grassroots marketing, the narrative did not provide information about how the community input informed the proposal. Additionally, the narrative lacked details on comprehensive outreach efforts to inform parents and the students they planned to serve, including an explanation of why the academic program would be well-suited to those students and the outline of a plan to target the students. The Committee to Form included 17 strategic partnerships in the written application, including three Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) organizations and one service provider. However, Attachment 3 primarily includes letters of general support for the proposed school and the members of the Committee to Form. Only four partnerships are supported with specific letters of commitment: Bamboo Sunrise offers support with referrals and professional development; Pro Sports Rx offers support with referrals, motivational speaker, and a donation; Joanna Zirbes offers a donation; and John Peace offers IT support.

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"> <li>Improving the academic achievement of pupils.</li> <li>Encouraging the use of effective and innovative methods of teaching.</li> <li>Providing an accurate measurement of the educational achievement of pupils.</li> <li>Establishing accountability and transparency of public schools.</li> <li>Providing a method for public schools to measure achievement based upon the performance of the schools, AND/OR</li> <li>Creating new professional opportunities for teachers.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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
Demonstrates a commitment to meeting at least one of, and preferably multiple, academic, or demographic needs identified in the <a href="#">SPCAS's Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment</a> : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Demographics:</b> 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.</li> <li><b>Academic Need: Geographies with 1- and 2-star schools that continue to have an index score below 50:</b> 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               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Received a 1- or 2-star NSPF rating for the 2018-19 school year, AND</li> <li>Continues to have an NSPF index score below 50 as of the 2021-22 school year.</li> </ul>               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.             </li> <li><b>Academic Need: Students at risk of dropping out of school:</b> 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</li> </ol>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

grade-level appropriate indicators for successful high school completion, such as early literacy, attendance, and credit sufficiency and plans to enable students to successfully meet these milestones. Public charter schools aimed at enrolling and preventing at-risk students from dropping out of school can be most impactful when they offer a unique academic experience for students and/or are closely aligned to Nevada’s priorities for workforce and economic development.

*Pursuant to [NRS 388A.249\(2\)](#), the SPCSA must consider the degree to which the proposed charter school will address the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment as part of the application review. Additionally, in accordance with [NRS 388A.249\(3\)](#) the SPCSA may only approve an application to form a charter school if, in addition to meeting other requirements, the proposed charter school will address one or more of the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.*

**2.3.3 Parent and Community Involvement: Approaches 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3 ACADEMIC PLAN

---

#### 3.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

#### 3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Transformational Change section was rated as Approaches the Standard. While the written application provided a compelling theory of change, the Applicant was unable to articulate why their academic model was suited to meet the intended outcomes for the targeted student groups. Specifically, the Applicant spoke at length throughout the capacity interview about the importance of dual-enrollment program for post-secondary success, but they were unable to articulate how this proposed program would clearly lead to the student success for the targeted student population. The Applicant was able to outline some key features of the proposed school, including the reliance on NSHE institutions for dual enrollment; however, there was a lack of a clear plan as to how the academic model would be implemented with fidelity with details lacking in staffing, instructional time, and overall model delivery. During the capacity interview, the Applicant provided one Nevada high school with a similar model as evidence of success; however, the referenced school serves a different student population than this application contemplates, and the Committee to Form was unable to clearly articulate how the additional supports would be built in to best serve the identified population.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design section was rated as Approaches the Standard. Prior to the capacity interview, the review team had concerns around how the proposed school would support 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. This was discussed during the capacity interview and the Committee to Form was unable to provide context and clarity around how the proposed program would clearly lead to student success or how the proposed school would meet the high academic goals identified within the application. The written application indicates that Necca Academy will outsource all core academic instruction to an NSHE partner, except in the case of students needing remediation prior to entering an NSHE course. BrightMinds is the proposed primary provider for elective courses, such as physical education. Necca Academy staff will only teach model-specific classes such as Life Skills. Additionally, the Committee to Form discussed the college level dual enrollment courses providing core classes and credit for 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students, which is outside the scope of the traditional dual enrollment pathway. The application did not include evidence from NSHE partners that would indicate they are prepared to serve students in those early grades through dual enrollment courses in core academic subjects.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application outlines a course progression that aligns with the Nevada Graduation requirements. The application does not include promotion



standards or school-specific graduation standards. There are no clear structures contemplated to support students at risk of dropping out, needing to access credit recovery options, or performing significantly below grade level.

The Driving for Results section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form has set attainable achievement goals for students within their academic model. However, the written responses and capacity interview revealed a significant lack of understanding of the targeted student population. Specifically, during the capacity interview, there was a lack of clarity regarding the student population to be served and how the educational model would cater to these students. This led to an overall absence of a comprehensive plan to meet the academic goals outlined in the application. The school has a model-specific tiered structure for supporting students, where Level 1 students have the lowest achievement levels and receive daily attention and support from teachers who also serve as Student Academic Success Specialists (SASS). Students who are identified as Level 3 are able to primarily work independently and receive lower levels of SASS interventions and touch points. The application assumed that a majority of students would enter the school at Level 2 and be ready to manage their own learning with less frequent supports and contact from their SASS. However, in the capacity interview, the Committee to Form outlined a plan to enroll students who are significantly at-risk and not currently succeeding in a traditional academic setting. It was not clear how these students would succeed within the proposed academic model without significant support. Further, the current academic model does not contemplate this higher level of support that is likely needed for this targeted population. It is, therefore, not clear how the proposed school will meet or exceed the stated academic goals. The Applicant outlined general corrective actions the school will take if it falls short of student academic achievement goals, but there are no specific actions outlined. Additionally, the written application identifies the governing board as responsible party for the early identification of any academic shortcomings; however, the proposed board members did not participate in discussion or provide responses regarding academics during the capacity interview.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The Applicant provided limited descriptions of interventions, supports, and services for struggling students and did not provide clearly defined processes and procedures for identifying at-risk students or the research/rationale for the identified remediation methods. The application indicated that remediation progress would be measured through a student's tiered support level, but it was not clear if this aligned with the proposed staffing model and the small number of SASS roles the Applicant includes in the staffing plan and budget. Additionally, when asked how the school would serve a larger number of students identified as Level 1, based on the evaluations of the actual incoming student body, the Committee to Form only indicated that they could alter the student-to-SASS ratio if needed, which may result in students receiving the appropriate services. As noted above, the school also likely underestimated how many students will need daily touch points within the academic model based on the type of student it intends to serve. Finally, the significant lack of detail around how the school would support special populations and provide the required service time, especially for students with disabilities and English Language Learners, resulted in significant concern from the review team and SPCSA staff.

The Professional Development section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form has outlined the school's professional development plan, which involves 40 hours of role-specific training for staff members. This includes four weeks of training before the start of classes, as well as training and support for the Learning Management System (LMS), StrongMind curriculum, and social-emotional learning (SEL) trainers. However, the costs of those trainings are not included in the financial plan workbook. The Applicant did not discuss how the core components of the identified professional development will support the effective implementation of the education program. The written application outlines a plan for monthly one on ones with direct supervisors but not additional teacher coaching plans to support teacher development. The outlined plan includes one day dedicated to special education and English Language Learner professional development topics, but that will not be enough for teachers to best meet the needs of the identified student population.

The School Culture section was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant has defined core values as "Be Authentically You, Seek Balance, Get Connected, and Champion Voices & Choices." The written application lists various activities and strategies for modeling and practicing each of these values. The Applicant has also identified ten key performance

indicators to track the school's cultural climate. The written application indicates that school culture will primarily be built into the SEL curriculum through the life skills course. However, norming the culture for staff and students is not discussed.

The Student Discipline section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The written application indicates that the proposed policy is not fully developed. However, the Committee to Form anticipates a need for the staff to develop trauma-informed skills and a restorative justice mindset to best meet the needs of the targeted student population. Though there is a plan to provide a quarterly discipline update, the written application does not outline a design to ensure that discipline practices do not disproportionately impact certain student populations or a response for if a discipline disparity is identified. Additionally, there are no identified goals or behavior expectations for student behavior.

The School Calendar and Schedule section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. It was difficult for the review team to determine and assess the minutes of instruction proposed, but the proposed calendar anticipates 180 days of instruction. The written application lacks clarity regarding the school schedule needed to implement the proposed academic model. During the capacity interview, specific questions were asked about the role of the SASS and their daily schedule, but it is not clear how the SASS will effectively manage the proposed tasks based on the schedules provided in the application and described in the interview. Furthermore, it is unclear how the proposed staff and student schedule would be adjusted if the student population that enrolls differs significantly from the Committee to Form's projections. Therefore, it remains unclear how the proposed academic model could be implemented based on the information provided in the application and capacity interview. The written application includes a goal of average daily attendance for each month to be higher than 75% and outlines five strategies for monitoring attendance. However, the review team determined this to be a low average attendance rate and needed additional information regarding attendance policies and procedures for due process that are in compliance with state laws and customized to the proposed school.

The Dual Credit Partnerships section was rated as Approaches the Standard. While the application provides letters of support from two NSHE institutions, there is no evidence of an established partnership with a college or university. In the written application, the Applicant identifies the College of Southern Nevada and Truckee Meadows Community College as enthusiastic and excited to offer dual enrollment and programming to 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students, which are grade levels that are not typically served by dual enrollment, especially for core content. However, the letters of support provided by both entities do not demonstrate any plans or references to serving younger high school students. The lack of specific details surrounding a dual credit partnership, particularly regarding the significant expansion of dual enrollment of core content to 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade, suggests that more research and work is required.

The Programs of Distance Education section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant indicates that select courses will be offered through distance learning to accommodate different learning styles using the StrongMind curriculum; however, the written application does not provide a plan or timeline for applying to the Nevada Department of Education to become an approved provider of distance education. The Applicant selected Canvas as a software tool that offers a variety of embedded data points regarding active time, assignment completion time, and student attendance. The written application includes relevant information relevant information for the proctoring of state mandated assessments. There are also plans for parent teacher conferences, including two in the first semester of enrollment and one in each semester after. Limited information was provided regarding how appropriate services would be offered to students with disabilities and English language learners through the distance education model.

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

### 3.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

### 3.3.1 Transformational Change: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school's success.	<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"> <li>• Provide families with 4- or 5-star school.</li> <li>• Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds - including those from historically underserved student groups.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision, academic program, and instructional strategies. Instructional model and learning environment will engage students in ways that are culturally responsive and relevant.	<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Includes a logical plan for delivering required courses including arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that instructional strategies are well suited to the identified student population and will enable effective differentiation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

### 3.3.3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
All academic goals and targets are expressed in SMART terms (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound) and demonstrate a commitment to ensuring the success of all students including students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, at-risk students, and students above or below grade level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mission-specific academic goals</b> 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.</li> <li>• <b>Annual performance and growth goals</b> 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.</li> <li>• <b>Quarterly performance targets</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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
<b>Organizational and financial goals</b> 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: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
<b>At Risk Students</b>	
Provides a clear and research-based process for identifying at-risk students and their needs, including those with academic and behavioral needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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
<b>Special Populations</b>	
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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"> <li>Provides a logical plan to screen all students and to ensure that struggling students are evaluated for special education services early and accurately.</li> <li>Presents a plan for student evaluation and developing IEPs that contain rigorous goals and instructional plans that are suitable to meet those students' goals.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress.</li> <li>Articulates process for monitoring compliance with state and federal laws pertaining to serving students with disabilities.</li> <li>For middle and high schools, presents a logical and thorough plan for developing and implementing transition plans.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For English language learners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes for identifying English language learners are well-defined, including administration of placement assessments and communications to parents and teachers.</li> <li>Indicates full Nevada licensure for all English language learners teachers/coordinators.</li> <li>Describes the specific services that will be provided for students within and outside the classroom, including curriculum and instruction and exposure to co-teaching.</li> <li>Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For homeless/migrant students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents a logical and systematic method according to which the school will identify homeless and/or migrant students.</li> <li>• Clear plan to assess and meet the needs of students and identified as homeless and/or migrant.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3.3.6 Professional Development: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clearly describes professional development that will be offered during the incubation year to effectively support the academic program, including the topics to be covered and any specialized components of the educational model.	<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Explains teacher coaching plans that will effectively support teacher development, including responsible parties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Cost of any third party provided professional development is reflected in the budget.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3.3.7 School Culture: Meets 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed Calendar and schedule meets or exceeds applicable statutory and regulatory requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum of 180 (or equivalent) days of instruction.</li> <li>• 43,200 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades k-2.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 54,000 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades 3-6.</li> <li>• 59,400 minutes of classroom instruction /year for grades 7-12.</li> <li>• Minimum of 120 hours of instruction for High School courses.</li> </ul>	
Calendar and schedule support implementation of the academic program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Alignment between teacher and student schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3.3.10 Dual Credit Partnerships: Approaches 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3.3.11 Programs of Distance Education: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes plan and timeline to garner necessary approvals from the Nevada Department of Education for the distance education program and courses. For courses that are already approved, documentation is provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Detailed, justifiable plan regarding student attendance which meets minimum state requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents a logical and research-based plan to serve homeless and/or migrant students in a distance education setting.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## 4 OPERATIONS PLAN

---

### 4.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

### 4.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Operations Plan was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. Zero 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. The written application outlines a plan for the following committees: executive, academic (meets once a semester), finance (meets twice a year), and culture (meets quarterly). However, the information proposed in the written application lacks sufficient detail about the board's governance structure, the committees to be used, and the frequency of committee meetings to ensure effective governance. During the capacity interview, the director of operations mentioned that they believed the quarterly meeting cadence was a best practice among other operators/boards. While this is in alignment with statutory requirements, quarterly meetings are typically insufficient for new schools. Additionally, the board members did not provide additional information about their understanding of the school, the academic model, or their governance role during the capacity interview, especially related to their fiduciary responsibility in charter governance. During the capacity interview, the proposed board members were unable to demonstrate financial knowledge or familiarity with the submitted budget, and the proposed director of operations answered all the finance questions. The proposed board members do meet the statutory requirements for board membership, but it is unclear whether the governing board members truly understand their academic, organizational, and fiduciary responsibility in charter governance. Based on the capacity interview, it was evident that there was insufficient evidence to show that the board was prepared to govern the school. The written application and capacity interview did indicate there are no prohibited familial relationships and provided a proposed conflict of interest policy, ethics policy, and draft bylaws. Finally, the written application contemplated a three-step onboarding process for new board members but did not outline a plan for any training for the founding board or additional ongoing board trainings.

The Leadership Team section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The Applicant has identified a proposed principal with some relevant experience. However, the organizational chart does not align with the narrative. Specifically, the reporting structure between the Executive Director, School Principal, and Operations Director is unclear. The application does not describe the specific workstreams led by each leadership team member. Additionally, the written application does not directly respond to the prompt regarding the Committee to Form's experience and expertise in named areas. The written application does not describe sufficient experience of the Committee to Form related to special education and English Language Learner services; staff recruitment, hiring, and development; and family and community outreach and engagement. Finally, a school leader and director of operations have been identified, and the candidates demonstrate a range of experience serving a variety of student populations. Both the written application and the capacity interview also lacked a detailed description of how the board will coach, support, and evaluate the proposed leadership team.

The Staffing Plan section was rated as Approaches the Standard. There was a lack of clarity around the overall staffing plan and its alignment to the proposed academic program. For example, during the capacity interview, the Applicant was asked to describe the role and responsibilities of the Student Academic Success Specialist (SASS), and how it may shift with the changing student populations. While the Committee to Form stated that the best way to achieve its identified academic results was to have a low student-to-SASS ratio, they indicated that the model could work if it had up to a 75 student-to-SASS ratio. Even with the lower ratio used in the budget projections, it was unclear to the review team how the SASS role could execute all the identified responsibilities. Additionally, the staffing chart and organizational chart did not fully align. For example, it was not clear how the school planned to staff the special education and English Language Learner roles, in addition to the normal responsibilities of the SASS role, and if these individuals could fulfill both normal SASS responsibilities and support special populations. In the scenario-based question, the Committee to Form discussed letting SASS roles go in October if they needed to hire additional staff to support student needs. However, it was unclear if the Committee to Form recognized the broader impact such a decision may have on the school. Finally, it was noted during the capacity interview that the staffing plan provided in the written application did not align with the contents of the proposed budget. Overall, the review team concluded there was insufficient evidence that the school staff as proposed would be able to effectively implement the proposed academic plan given the proposed student population.

The Human Resources section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The written application mentions that they will align their hiring guidelines with those of the Clark County School District and proactively search for candidates with skills, experience, and credentials that will best support the community (e.g., bilingual, English Language Learner, special education, etc.). Five primary recruitment strategies are identified: referrals, community outreach, job board postings, partnering with local universities, and social media. However, during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form was unable to specifically and clearly explain the recruitment and hiring processes and strategies. The written application includes a well-rounded list of employment benefits, including competitive compensation, health benefits, and performance-based incentives. However, the specific compensation schedule and rewards and incentives plan were not included in the information provided to the review team. Overall, it remains unclear to the review team how the Applicant plans to address the ongoing teaching shortages and ensure a high-quality staff can implement the school's unique model. Furthermore, important details about plans to retain high-performing teachers, human resources processes, and the performance management system are lacking.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The written application identifies approximately nine recruitment strategies with a timeline for implementation. Additionally, the application and enrollment process outlined in the written application is in compliance with Nevada laws and regulations. The Applicant included documentation for about 130 students who expressed an interest in the model, though not all students will be in the grade levels identified for the first year of operation. However, the review team was left with questions after the capacity interview regarding the Committee to Form's understanding of the identified community. The written application lacks clarity about the targeted student population the school plans to serve and, consequently, how they plan to recruit the students. During the capacity interview, the Applicant mentioned a plan to serve at-risk students, specifically students in foster care and students experience homelessness. Later in the interview, the Applicant stated a plan to enroll high-achieving 9th and 10th graders within the model. When asked how these students would access the proposed academic plan, the Applicant mentioned that they would take most of their classes on college campuses. The review team has ongoing concerns about the proposed school and model not providing sufficient foundation for the identified student population to effectively access the relevant academic information in the dual enrollment model. Overall, the Committee to Form was unable to provide a clear vision for the student population, explain how the proposed population would be realistically recruited into the program, and how the students would successfully progress through the academic program.

The Incubation Year Development section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. In the written application, the Committee to Form provided an incubation year table and a planning table that includes many of the necessary activities and milestones that are critical components for the planning year. However, there was insufficient information



regarding key areas, including information technology, student recruitment and enrollment, and staff recruitment and hiring. The written application lists three outlined steps for leadership development: principal and operations director working together with mentors to identify the leadership framework, operations director volunteering 80 hours in a high performing school, and attending leadership conferences and seminars if the budget allows. The review team determined this plan was not specific or concrete enough to result in fully developed leaders by the beginning of the first year of operations. The written application indicates that the principal, operations director, and one member of the Committee to Form will work on a volunteer basis during the incubation year, and hiring plans for the key leadership positions remain unclear to the review team. For the incubation year (Y0), the budget workbook includes no expenditures except \$5000 for legal support. As a result, the proposed school would not be able to pay rent, purchase any supplies, furniture, curriculum, or pay any salaries until after the start of school in Year 1 begins. This was a concern for the review team. Finally, the review team noted that there were no responsibilities for the proposed board during the incubation year. The Committee to Form as a whole was unable to demonstrate understanding regarding the challenges of opening a school and did not articulate a commitment of time and effort during the incubation year.

The Services section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. While the written application outlined general guidelines for the selection of vendors, the Applicant was not able to provide clear plans for transportation in the written application or during the capacity interview. The details regarding how and where the proposed costs were included in the budget and how the proposed vehicle fleet could support the participant load remain unclear to the review team and SPCSA staff. The written application indicates that the IT infrastructure and network will be donated and supported for three years, but there was no specific plan or timeline for implementation. A plan for metrics and processes for evaluating the effectiveness of the contracted services was not provided.

The Facilities section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant identified a facility at 4830 West Craig Road, North Las Vegas, NV 89030 for occupancy if the application is approved. However, the Committee to Form was unable to provide a clear explanation of how the proposed facility could accommodate all students on a daily basis. This includes providing services for high-need students, such as pull-out services for IEP and ELL students, adequate space for one-on-one services, tutoring, and counseling, and enough space for confidential and privacy-protected meetings. The Committee to Form did not provide a facility maintenance plan to ensure the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Operations Plan as Does Not Meet the Standard.

### 4.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

#### 4.3.1 Board Governance: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed governance structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and financials.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Demonstrates that the membership of the governing body embodies (or has clear plans to embody prior to the opening of the school) 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.).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
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 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
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. Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed governing board members demonstrate a deep understanding of the educational model, organization's mission, and what mission achievement looks like.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed governing body members demonstrate ownership and a commitment to ensuring the school's success through active engagement in the development of the charter proposal and capacity interview.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed governing body demonstrates the ability to work together to solve problems.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed governing body members demonstrate that they understand the role of the board in governing the school, including the responsibility for ensuring a high-quality school	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For schools contracting with an EMO or CMO, the governing board demonstrates an understanding of their role in overseeing the EMO/CMO and holding the EMO/CMO accountable for delivering results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

#### 4.3.2 Leadership Team: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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"> <li>• leadership role at a high-performing and/or high growth school,</li> <li>• experience establishing a high-performing culture with students and staff, and</li> <li>• responsibility for significant student achievement gains with demographics similar to the proposed school.</li> </ul>	<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If members of the school leadership team have been identified, they demonstrate deep knowledge of the proposed academic model and an understanding of how the school's mission support students and families.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

If members of the school leadership team have been identified, they demonstrate the ability to work together to solve problems. This includes seeing opportunities in challenges and an openness to multiple perspectives and strategies that support the school and its students and families.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
---	--

#### 4.3.3 Staffing Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Does Not Meet 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### 4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Demonstrates an understanding of the identified community.</li> <li>Is likely to allow the school to enroll a representative student population based on surrounding zoned schools or a mission-specific educationally disadvantaged population.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Does Not Meet 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"> <li>Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that any program-specific components will be ready to begin on the first day of school.</li> <li>Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure the school will be operationally ready to open.</li> <li>Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that the <a href="#">SPCSA Pre-Opening Requirements</a> 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></li> <li>Clearly identifies the individuals responsible for leading year 0 initiatives and meeting year 0 milestones.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates that they understand the challenges of opening a school and articulate a commitment and understanding of what it will take to ensure a successful launch of the school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates that they can work together to solve problems.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates that they are well versed in the incubation year plan and are committed to following through with the implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates that they are actively engaged throughout the application process and plan to maintain active engagement through the incubation year.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### 4.3.7 Services: Does Not Meet 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Costs of services are realistic and align with budget.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### 4.3.8 Facilities: Approaches the Standard

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Evidence that the applicant has engaged with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	
<p>If a facility (or permanent facility) has not yet been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of anticipated facilities needs that will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment.</li> <li>• Inclusion of costs associated with the anticipated facilities needs in the budget including renovation, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance.</li> <li>• Evidence to indicate that facilities-related budget assumptions are realistic based on anticipated location, size, etc.</li> <li>• A realistic, timebound plan for selecting and preparing a facility that will meet the programmatic needs and budgetary constraints.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A clear, time bound plan to engage with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Financial Plan	Does Not Meet the Standard
----------------	----------------------------

## 5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The Committee to Form proposes contracting with a back-office provider, Charter Impact, for accounting, purchasing, payroll management, and audit process. The Committee to Form has also identified a proposed treasurer, but the candidate does not appear to have a financial background, and it does not appear that any other members of the Committee to Form have significant, relevant financial experience. The written application demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of cash flow, expense projections, revenue projections, and the management of a school year financial cycle. The proposed Director of Operations attempted to clarify the financial plan responses during the capacity interview, but several significant shortcomings in this section remain. During the capacity interview, the proposed governing board provided little to no input on any financial questions, leaving the review committee without evidence that the proposed board understands its fiduciary duty to provide the proper oversight of the proposed school. Additionally, there was no further input regarding spending priorities and timing for essential spending during the incubation year. Furthermore, the board members did not address any of the budget and financial elements during the scenario conversation, which directly dealt with staffing challenges and the hiring/firing of staff.

The Committee to Form lacks a sufficient contingency plan if they don't receive Charter School Program (CSP) funds. They did not include the CSP grant money in the pre-opening year revenue amount, which is in alignment with SPCSA guidance; however, the Committee to Form was also unable to provide plans for proposed expenditures for the incubation year assuming that funds were received. Even if they were to receive the grant, there is a lack of evidence that the school has the financial oversight and knowledge to carry out the necessary financial plans to implement the proposed academic plan. When asked about the required expenses for the pre-opening year, the Committee to Form only mentioned the facility deposit as a cost and provided no further information about the funding or cost of other necessary purchases in Year 0. Additionally, the review team is concerned that not having any paid positions during the incubation year is unrealistic to successfully launch a new charter school. Overall, the proposed board was unable to demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the proposed school's finances and its ability to fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Financial Plan as Does Not Meet 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: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 APPLICATION PROCESS DETAILS

---

### 6.1 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/](https://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application_Packet/). Below is a summary of the training that was provided.

- December 11, 2023 – Application Overview and Process
- January 10, 2024 – Application Cover Sheet and Meeting the Need Section
- January 23, 2024 – Academic Plan Section
- February 8, 2024 – Operations Plan and Addendum Section
- February 26, 2024 – Financial Plan Section

Below are key dates related to the Nevada Early College & Career Academy (Necca Academy) Charter School charter school application.

- January 29, 2024 – Nevada Early College & Career Academy Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2024 – Nevada Early College & Career Academy (Necca Academy) Application is received
- June 5, 2024 – Memo sent to Clark County School District soliciting input<sup>2</sup>
- July 5, 2024 – Clarifying Questions sent to Applicant; responses received within 4 business days
- July 18, 2024 – Necca Academy Capacity Interview is conducted
- August 9, 2024 – Input provided by Clark County School District
- August 23, 2024 – Recommendation is presented

### 6.2 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 Necca Academy Charter School took place on July 18, 2024, and lasted approximately 120 minutes. All members of the Committee to Form, except two, attended the interview. A representative from Charter Impact, a back-office provider, also attended. The questions during the capacity interview focused on various areas:

- Mission and Vision
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Transformational Change
- School Culture
- School Calendar and Schedule
- Board Governance
- Leadership Team
- Staffing Plan
- Incubation Year Development
- Financial Plan

---

<sup>2</sup> 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."



Prior to the capacity interview, the review committee sent the Applicant team a list of clarifying 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.

The interview also included a scenario-based question that tested the Committee to Form's ability to respond to an enrollment report and Tiered Support Levels. The hypothetical data showed that the support levels in different tiers differed from what was initially predicted. The goal was to determine the steps that the Board and Executive Director would take in response to these results and how the results would affect their staffing plan and the use of funds from the school budget.

## 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.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> 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/](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).