

# New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

August 22, 2025



## Purpose Leadership Academy

### GENERAL INFORMATION

---

<b>Proposed School Name</b>	Purpose Leadership Academy (PLA)
<b>Proposed EMO/CMO</b>	N/A
<b>Proposed Mission and Vision</b>	<p>Mission: The mission of Purpose Leadership Academy is to elevate, educate, and inspire African American and Hispanic male student leaders in grades K-8 to define and reach their full potential through project-based learning, restorative pride circles, and socio-emotional learning by excelling in scholastic achievement and embracing Leadership, Identity, Integrity, Scholarship, Humanity, and Service.</p> <p>Vision: Purpose Leadership Academy envisions a 5-star school where African American and Hispanic male students thrive academically and personally, becoming critically conscious change-makers who lead with service as a guiding purpose. We are committed to fostering restorative spaces for meaningful discussions on identity and community, empowering individuals to embrace their identities and connect self-awareness with academic success. Our academy serves as a community anchor, promoting healthy relationships, civic engagement, and culturally relevant learning. Through data-driven practices and safe, inclusive environments, we aim to disrupt cycles of poverty, inspire innovation, and build bridges for lasting, generational change.</p>
<b>Proposed Grade Configuration</b>	Opening: K-3 Full Scale: K-8
<b>Proposed Opening</b>	August 2026
<b>Proposed Location</b>	Clark County; 89030, 89106, or 89115
<b>Proposed Zip Codes to be Served</b>	89030, 89106, 89110, 89115, 89156

# PLANNED ENROLLMENT

---

	<b>2026-27</b>	<b>2027-28</b>	<b>2028-29</b>	<b>2029-30</b>	<b>2030-31</b>	<b>2031-32</b>
<b>K</b>	54	54	54	54	54	54
<b>1</b>	54	54	54	54	54	54
<b>2</b>	27	54	54	54	54	54
<b>3</b>	27	54	54	54	54	54
<b>4</b>		27	54	54	54	54
<b>5</b>			27	54	54	54
<b>6</b>				27	54	54
<b>7</b>					27	54
<b>8</b>						27
<b>9</b>						
<b>10</b>						
<b>11</b>						
<b>12</b>						
<b>Total</b>	162	243	297	351	405	459

# CONTENTS

---

1	Overview and Recommendation	4
2	Meeting the Need	6
3	Academic Plan	9
4	Operations Plan	16
5	Financial Plan	23
6	Application Process Details	25
	Appendix A	27

# 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 none 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	Approaches the Standard
Academic Plan	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Financial Plan	Approaches 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 Purpose Leadership Academy charter school application.

## 1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

**Proposed motion:** *Deny the Purpose Leadership Academy application as submitted during the 2025 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>Approaches the Standard</b>
Mission and Vision	Approaches the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Approaches the Standard
<b>Academic Plan<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>
Transformational Change	Does Not Meet the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Meets the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Meets the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Approaches the Standard
<b>Operations Plan</b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>
Board Governance	Approaches the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard
<b>Financial Plan</b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Purpose Leadership Academy proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Dual Credit Partnerships. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

## 2 MEETING THE NEED

---

### 2.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

### 2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Meeting the Need section was rated as Approaches the Standard. None of the three subsections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Mission and Vision subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. Purpose Leadership Academy presents a clear and compelling mission statement, and its emphasis on Leadership, Identity, Integrity, Scholarship, Humanity, and Service (L.I.O.N.S.) is woven throughout the application. These six core values form the foundation of the proposed school model. However, several aspects of the mission are not currently measurable. While the Applicant noted in their clarifying responses that rubrics will be developed to assess each value, the development of these tools is still in progress. The Committee to Form is diverse and includes individuals with past and present experience in education, including those who deliver professional development. Additionally, the application meets at least one statutory purpose.

The Targeted Plan subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application reflects a strong understanding of the community and students it aims to serve, and the identified target population appears to align with the demographic makeup of the specified zip codes. The proposed educational model is described in detail across this and other sections of the application. The model includes six key components: social-emotional learning (SEL), project-based learning (PBL), restorative justice practices, a comprehensive male-focused approach, and data-driven instruction. While these are all research-based strategies known to broadly support student engagement and achievement, the application does not clearly explain why these specific components were chosen to address the unique needs of this proposed community and the target student population.

The Parent and Community Involvement subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form includes members with local expertise and strong ties to the community and geographic area. The application describes a range of community engagement efforts, including focus groups, town halls, informal conversations, door-to-door outreach, and a community survey. The school also provided responses to several pieces of survey feedback. However, it is unclear whether the proposed school model was adapted based on that feedback. Instead, the application appears to align existing elements of the model to some of the survey responses, rather than demonstrating how the feedback directly shaped the design. Additionally, the application lacks concrete data to show that the community desires this specific school. While community participation is evident, it does not establish a clear link to projected enrollment. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did not provide specific strategies for recruiting the targeted population—African American and Hispanic males. Although the school is intended to serve all students, further clarification is needed on how it will intentionally engage and enroll those key groups. Finally, while the application lists several identified partners, most appear to be vendors rather than mission-aligned community organizations.

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 Approaches 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: Approaches 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Approaches 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>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>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Demographics:</b> Student groups that consistently underperform on the Nevada state assessments in Math and ELA (3rd-8th grade Smarter Balanced and 11th grade ACT) present a demographic need. Such student groups may benefit from the creation of high-quality charter school options so long as those new charter schools have credibly plans to meet their needs. Applicants meeting this need will propose a school that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, community input, and thorough research and analysis to intentionally enroll and serve the following student groups, each of which has been identified as historically underperforming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL)<sup>3</sup>;</li> <li>English Language Learners (ELLs);</li> <li>Students with disabilities (those with an Individualized Education Program, or IEP);</li> <li>Students in foster care;</li> <li>Students experiencing homelessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li> <p><b>Academic Need: Geographies with Consistently Underperforming Schools:</b> Zip codes with one or more consistently underperforming schools present an academic need. When a significant number of students are enrolled in schools that have a history of not meeting or partially meeting state performance standards, a community may benefit from the addition of high-quality charter school options so long as those new charter schools have both credibly plans to meet the needs of the student population and strong partnerships within the community. Applicants meeting this need will propose a school model that includes demonstrated capacity, credible plans, community input, 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 consistently underperforming schools, which are defines as schools that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Received a 1- or 2-star NSPF rating in the two most recent NSPF ratings.</li> </ul> </li> <li> <p><b>Academic Need: Students at Risk of Dropping Out of School:</b> Student groups that graduate from high school at lower rates (i.e. drop out at higher rates) than their peers present an academic need. Nearly one in five Nevada students do not</p> </li> </ol>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<sup>3</sup> Enrollment rates of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch is often used as a proxy measure for students in poverty.

graduate from high school in four years, with certain student groups consistently graduating at lower rates than their peers, including English Language Learners (ELLs), students with disabilities (those with Individualized Education Programs or IEPs), students that are homeless, students in foster care, and students identifying as American Indian/Alaskan Native, Black/African American, or Hispanic/Latino. Such students may benefit from the creation of high-quality charter school options so long as those new charter schools have credible plans to meet their needs.

*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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines a thoughtful plan to proactively engage parents, community members, and other neighborhood partners from the time that the school is approved and once the school is operating.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies key supporters, partners, or resources that are directly tied to the stated outcomes of the school, including community partners that are located in and/or serve the identified zip codes. Partnerships are evidenced by specific letters of commitment outlining the accountabilities of both parties and clear, measurable, time-specific deliverables from the partner which are clearly relevant to the needs of the identified population, and do not reflect a paid vendor relationship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3 ACADEMIC PLAN

---

#### 3.1 SECTION RATINGS

Academic Plan <sup>4</sup>	Approaches the Standard
Transformational Change	Does Not Meet the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Approaches the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Meets the Standard
Professional Development	Approaches the Standard
School Culture	Approaches the Standard
Student Discipline	Meets the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Approaches the Standard

#### 3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Academic Plan was rated as Approaches the Standard. Three of the nine subsections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Transformational Change subsection was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard the Standard. The application includes several SMART goals related to reading, math, and progress monitoring. However, it lacks sufficient detail on how the school plans to benchmark progress toward meeting state performance goals or achieving a 4- or 5-star rating. Both the reading and math growth goals aim for at least 70% of students to meet or exceed the 50th percentile. It remains unclear whether this is an appropriate or ambitious target—particularly in the early years, when many students are expected to enroll from 1- or 2-star schools. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did not clearly articulate how they would assess whether the various components of their educational model were being implemented with fidelity. While several members mentioned relying on student performance data, this alone does not demonstrate adherence to the instructional principles of each model component. As a result, the review team was left with significant questions regarding the use of student data, program implementation, and overall performance expectations. It remains unclear whether the proposed plan can be executed in a way that fully realizes the school’s mission.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. While the Applicant clarified some instructional material selections and their intended use during the capacity interview and in subsequent responses, the overall programmatic plan lacks coherence. The application lists numerous curricula, electives, instructional strategies, and program characteristics, but fails to clearly articulate how these elements fit together or align with the proposed model. For example, the inclusion of science, phonics, English Language Development, social emotional learning (SEL), HMH Social Studies, and intervention curricula appears more as a summary than a rationale, and their connection to the model remains unclear. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did not articulate how their chosen curricula and instructional models are tailored to meet the needs of the target population, instead asserting that the materials would work for anyone. It is also difficult to determine whether certain strategies and curricula—such as team teaching and ELAchieves—are intended for general education, special populations, or both. Teaching strategies, including references to co-teaching models, are limited and lack detail on implementation: what will be done, how, when, and for whom.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Purpose Leadership Academy proposal did not contemplate Distance Education or Dual Credit Partnerships. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application outlines promotion criteria that include key factors such as academic performance and attendance and align with grade-level expectations. It also describes several academic supports for overage students, including small group instruction, Response to Intervention (RTI), and mentoring programs. In the clarifying responses, the Committee to Form stated there will be no formal requirement for retention. Instead, a promotion and retention checklist will guide these decisions, with families notified if retention is deemed necessary.

The Driving for Results subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant has established SMART goals across multiple areas, including Math, English Language Arts (ELA), Science, Social Studies, Project-Based Learning, and social-emotional learning (SEL). The application also provides both schoolwide and subgroup-level approaches to data evaluation and analysis, demonstrating an awareness of key data thresholds necessary for monitoring progress toward strong academic performance. However, there are several gaps and areas that lack clarity. While specific goals exist for reading and math, additional detail is needed on how the school will support subgroup populations in meeting those goals. Although the Applicant identifies accountability triggers and academic planning processes, it remains unclear how the governing board will use school performance data to set or enforce corrective actions for the Chancellor based on the school's goals or strategic plan. Further, while the capacity interview clarified that multiple data systems would be integrated into a single data system, the rationale for using so many platforms remains unclear. The application mentions that staff training on the data systems will be addressed through professional development, but it lacks a concrete plan for how data from various sources will be synthesized and applied to drive instruction or improvement. The application also lacks goals aligned to the Organizational Performance Framework. Overall, while there are some strong components, the application lacks a cohesive and comprehensive plan showing how goals, data systems, accountability, and instructional strategies will work together to drive student success.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application presents a well-structured plan for supporting at-risk students, including clearly defined, implementation-ready RTI goals, a comprehensive definition of "at-risk," and a detailed RTI process that includes student groupings, progress monitoring, curriculum use, and designated staff responsibilities. The Applicant also details how communication with parents will occur to ensure families are informed and involved in intervention efforts. The plan includes identified intervention tiers with projected student numbers by grade level, supporting long-term goals across the charter term. While the tiered interventions focus primarily on math and English Language Arts (ELA), the plan does not address tiered supports in other subject areas or in relation to student behavior. Additionally, the application includes a comprehensive plan for serving students with disabilities—from identification through service delivery—along with professional development strategies to support both process and implementation. The Applicant also outlines specific strategies for supporting English Learners (ELs) and how those supports will be integrated into the broader curriculum.

The Professional Development subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application outlines a professional development approach centered on the Train, Coach, and Monitor model, including full-day Friday sessions, a three-week summer staff institute during the incubation year, and the use of Instruction Partners pillars. However, the plan lacks sufficient detail on the yearlong professional development scope. This raises concern about the timing of critical topics like RTI and school culture being introduced after school starts. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form stated that staff would be trained on various student data systems during professional development; however, the professional development plan included in the application only specifies training on LiFT Learning and lacks clear timelines for other platforms. Finally, the Committee to Form did increase the budget to cover the cost of personnel in the three-week summer institute, but the revenue source to cover these additional costs remains unidentified.

The School Culture subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application presents a clear set of core competencies, referred to as LIONS, which are consistently referenced throughout the application and support both the school's mission and academic goals. Strategies to build school culture include aligned school-wide routines, PAWS bucks, family and community pride circles, and a celebration of diversity and identity. While the Applicant includes well-defined goals with corresponding metrics, the timelines for monitoring progress and taking action remain unclear.

Additionally, the review team had lingering questions about the implementation of the four-day week, particularly regarding how it may affect the school’s culture and its alignment with the needs of the target student population.

The Student Discipline subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application presents a robust discipline plan that includes clear components such as consequences, incentives, roles and responsibilities, due process protections, and alignment with state standards. It incorporates restorative justice circles and conflict resolution strategies as key tools for promoting a positive school culture, and the Committee to Form expresses a strong commitment to reducing disproportionality in discipline, particularly for African American and Hispanic males, which aligns with the school’s mission. The inclusion of grant-funded security personnel reflects a thoughtful effort to avoid reinforcing traumatic student-security dynamics. However, while the application acknowledges the overrepresentation of African American and Hispanic male students in school discipline, it does not provide targeted strategies specifically designed to address this issue within the proposed model. Additionally, although FastBridge is identified as a behavior support tool, the application lacks any corresponding professional development to ensure effective implementation.

The School Calendar and Schedule subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application proposes a four-day instructional week with Fridays dedicated to teacher professional development. There is a 165-day calendar with 70, 125 minutes, which meets minimum instructional minute requirements. While this approach offers a unique and potentially flexible model that may support teacher development and retention, the plan lacks clarity and raises several concerns. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form were unable to clearly articulate the purpose and structure of Fridays beyond professional development, especially for students and families. The team appeared to base the decision of the four-day week on the success of similar models at other schools, rather than on data relevant to the specific student population they are aiming to serve. Additionally, the plan relies heavily on external individuals and partnerships to provide mentoring and tutoring on Fridays at no cost to families, yet these partnerships are not solidified and not reflected in the budget, raising concerns about sustainability. While the proposed schedules align for teachers and students, further detail is needed—especially regarding how the schedule will function for grades 6–8. The application also notes observance of holidays such as MLK Day and Mexican Independence Day, which may support cultural inclusivity for the anticipated student population.

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: Does Not Meet 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies curricula for all core academic subjects and demonstrates that they align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Includes a logical plan for delivering required courses including arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that instructional strategies are well suited to the identified student population and will enable effective differentiation.	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

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

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Structures are in place to support students at risk of dropping out, including those who are over age for their grade, those needing to access credit recovery options, and those performing significantly below grade level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If proposing a high school program, clearly articulates high school graduation requirements which align with Nevada Graduation Requirements and will ensure that students graduate college and career ready.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students and monitoring for disparities in academic performance between student groups.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The assessment plan is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate collection and analysis of individual student, student cohort, special populations, and school level data (interim, annual, year over year), including a clear process for setting and monitoring ambitious academic goals.	<input 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
Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA's Performance Frameworks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 3.3.5 At-Risk Students and Special Populations: Meets 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the methods according to which the school will remediate academically underperforming students, including the system according to which the school will track progress, facilitate teacher collaboration, and the research supporting the school's remediation strategy.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The school's Response to Intervention system differentiates planning for each student according to the significance of their need, providing a continuum of programs, strategies, and supports that corresponds with the needs identified for each student and is supported by research.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For students with disabilities <sup>5</sup> : <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For English language learners <sup>6</sup> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For intellectually gifted students, demonstrates that the school will extend their learning offerings such that those students have access to unique, tailored opportunities. The proposed staffing structure demonstrates sufficient staffing and teacher support to implement the plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For homeless/migrant students <sup>7</sup> : <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<sup>5</sup> Refer to [NRS 388.417](#) to [388.459](#) and [NAC 388.215](#) to [388.284](#) for statutes and regulations regarding serving students with disabilities.

<sup>6</sup> Refer to [NRS 388.406](#) and [NAC 388.525](#) and [NAC 388.655](#) for statutes and regulations regarding serving English language learners

<sup>7</sup> Refer to [NAC 392.205](#) to [392.225](#)

### 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate that will allow for fulfillment of the school's stated mission and vision, as well as the school's stated academic goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a concrete plan for norming social/cultural expectations at the start of each year as well as for students who enter mid-year.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Meets 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. <sup>8</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
A plan to ensure that certain student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies, including protection of the rights of students with disabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Goals for student behavior are clear and measurable. There is a plan, and designated personnel, for monitoring and reporting related to behavior goals as well as ongoing maintenance of discipline records.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### 3.3.9 School Calendar and Schedule: Approaches 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> <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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<sup>8</sup> [NRS 392.4655 to 392.472](#)

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents sound policies for student attendance and truancy including procedures for due process that comply with state laws and are customized to the charter school.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## 4 OPERATIONS PLAN

---

### 4.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

### 4.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Operations Plan was rated as Approaches the Standard. None of the eight subsections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Board Governance subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The proposed board demonstrates several strengths, including a diverse composition that reflects the school community, with representation from low-income households and alignment with the school’s demographic makeup. The board also has multiple committees intended to support the mission and vision of the school, and the Applicant provided a timeline for adding members with specific expertise to fill any gaps. However, several concerns emerged. While the intention to have four committees is noted, this may be overly ambitious for a new board, and there is no clear schedule for committee meetings. Responses about governance processes were generic, and the key performance indicators (KPIs) remain vague, with no clear explanation of how goals will be set or monitored—either for board-established targets or those shared with the Chancellor. Additionally, there appears to be no proposed board member with a background in education finance. Of particular concern is the proposed board structure. During the capacity interview, the current proposed members of the board indicated they would all serve only two-year terms, leading to complete turnover after two years and a loss of institutional knowledge. They spoke about a plan to have departing members form an ad-hoc, non-voting committee, which was not included in the written application. This plan lacked clarity and raised questions about how such a model would ensure continuity or effective governance.

The Leadership Team subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The proposed school leader has experience in schools and nonprofits across multiple roles, and the Committee to Form demonstrated a belief in the potential of all students to learn. The proposed school leader appears passionate and committed to the school’s mission; however, there are some areas of concern. The resume does not show experience working with special populations (including students with IEPs, English learners, and at-risk students), and no data is provided to demonstrate a record of high performance. There appears to be a strong dependence on the school leader by the Committee to Form, potentially limiting shared leadership and the effective execution of tasks during the incubation year. The application identifies coaching and development opportunities for the school leader at various stages and includes an annual comprehensive evaluation. However, the application lacks specific detail about the robust system of development and evaluation it claims to provide, and it does not clearly explain the proposed intensive leadership training. Although the leadership team was able to clarify some role discrepancies during the capacity interview, and mostly demonstrated understanding their respective roles, there is also concern that additional responsibilities will fall on the Chancellor during Year 0 and Year 1—despite the role already carrying a heavy workload—which may lead to operational inefficiencies. The Committee to Form’s experience with recruitment and hiring also remains unclear, which raises questions about their readiness to build out the school’s leadership and instructional teams.

The Staffing Plan subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant intends to hire educators who are committed to serving at-risk student populations, including African American and Hispanic male students and those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Teachers will be expected to integrate social emotional learning (SEL), provide enhanced student support, and deliver project-based instruction aligned with the LIONS competencies. While this vision is clear, the review team is concerned that the projected teacher salary, approximately \$45,220 in take home pay, may not be competitive enough to attract and retain the type of high-quality educators the Applicant seeks. There were some initial discrepancies in the written application and budget regarding the timing of staffing roles and student to teacher ratios; however, these were mostly clarified in the Applicant's written responses and during the capacity interview. Despite these clarifications, the number of planned support positions still appears low relative to the school's anticipated student population and the range of academic and whole child services the Applicant intends to offer.

The Human Resources subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application outlines a rigorous hiring process designed to identify teachers who align with the school's mission and culture. It includes strong qualifications and procedures for hiring, along with a teacher evaluation tool that integrates with the school's broader performance framework to ensure ongoing support and accountability. The proposed performance management system is structured to retain and promote high-performing staff, provide leadership development opportunities, and address underperformance through clear expectations, improvement plans, and necessary personnel actions. However, despite these strengths, there are concerns. The school seeks highly qualified and experienced teachers, but the significantly lower salary compared to the local school district and other charter schools may hinder recruitment. Additionally, while the recruitment and hiring processes appear well-designed on paper, there is no clear plan to attract a diverse teaching staff reflective of the targeted student population. Moreover, critical operational responsibilities such as background checks, payroll, and benefits lack clear ownership, raising concerns about implementation.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment subsection was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The written application presents enrollment projections supported by anecdotal evidence and community input. Over 50% of projected Year 1 enrollment is backed by demand letters; however, many of these students are in grade levels that the school will not serve in its first year. This raises concerns about the reliability of the demand data and whether there is a sufficient pool of eligible students. The application outlines several grassroots strategies designed to promote equitable access and inform families about the school. Parent meetings are noted as part of outreach efforts, but there are limited recruitment costs listed for Year 0 to support these efforts. While the narrative mentions general recruitment efforts within the community, it lacks specificity in addressing how the school plans to recruit and enroll African American and Hispanic male students.

The Incubation Year Development subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The incubation plan, as included in Attachment 17, is generally thorough and outlines multiple key activities. The written narrative also indicates that the proposed school leader will participate in fellowships and professional development opportunities for added support. If approved, the school also intends to pursue additional grant funding to enhance resources during the incubation year. While the plan includes timelines, they are broad, and more detailed benchmarks would help determine whether the proposed activities are feasible and can be executed as planned. Additionally, there were inconsistencies across the incubation planning table, narrative sections, and the budget. These were addressed in clarifying responses and during the capacity interview, where the Applicant confirmed that only the Director of Operations and Chancellor will be hired during the incubation year, both in part-time roles with shared responsibilities. However, the feasibility of this arrangement remains unclear, particularly if those individuals must also seek other employment and additional income during this period.

The Services subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The written application left the review team with several questions regarding the cost of the proposed services. In the clarifying responses, the Applicant did provide cost estimates for health service providers, facilities management, technology infrastructure, and community-based enrollment outreach. However, the Applicant did not provide a cost estimate for the implementation of Infinite Campus. The Committee to Form intends to prioritize vendors who are people of color as part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) process. While general monitoring guidelines for effectiveness are identified, the plan lacks specific goals or thresholds

that would allow for a meaningful evaluation of vendor or program performance. The application lists some components of the technology infrastructure but does not provide a timeline for implementation. As a result, it is difficult to assess whether the rollout is feasible or aligned with the school’s launch schedule. The application does not address transportation services for students with disabilities or students with 504 plans that require transportation, representing a significant oversight in ensuring equitable access to the school.

The Facilities subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The facility plan includes some promising partnerships and early planning efforts, but outstanding questions remain. The Applicant is working with a commercial real estate broker experienced with charter schools, as well as a charter school management corporation, to support facility planning. The plan involves beginning with a short-term lease, and the Applicant has identified cost estimates that appear aligned with typical rates for square footage. Additionally, during the capacity interview, the Applicant indicated that they are exploring a partnership in which a third party would purchase a facility and lease it to the school. Three potential properties have been identified, with one being preferred, but the purchase price was still unknown. As a result, the review team could not determine whether the proposed facility is financially viable within the school’s overall budget. Concerns remain about the low anticipated costs for facility upkeep, particularly given that the lease terms may not include landlord-covered maintenance or improvements, despite what was stated in the written narrative. Moreover, it is unclear how responsibilities will be coordinated between the facility development partner and the real estate broker. Maintenance and operational planning for the facility is limited, and additional detail is needed to ensure realistic implementation and long-term sustainability.

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

While most criteria were evaluated through both the written application and capacity interview, several criteria, as indicated with “\*” were evaluated after the capacity interview.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides evidence that the governing body fulfills (or describes reasonable and detailed plans to ensure that the governing body will fulfill) statutory requirements for board membership, including at minimum, one teacher or other person licensed pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS; one teacher or other person licensed pursuant to chapter 391 of NRS or a school administrator; one parent or legal guardian of a pupil enrolled in the charter school who is not a teacher or an administrator at the charter school; and two individuals with knowledge and expertise in one or more of the following areas: accounting, financial services, law, or human resources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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
<b>Capacity Interview Criteria:</b>	
The proposed governing board members demonstrate a deep understanding of the educational model, organization’s mission, and what mission achievement looks like. *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 the capacity interview. *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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: Approaches the Standard

While most criteria were evaluated through both the written application and capacity interview, several criteria, as indicated with “\*” were evaluated after the capacity interview.

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO are demonstrable with empirical data related to student performance, including students from diverse backgrounds and experiences, students with disabilities, English language learners, and other special populations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Capacity Interview Criteria:</b>	
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 supports 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
If members of the school leadership team have been identified, they demonstrate understanding of their role and the responsibilities they have to the community. This includes demonstrated evidence of engagement with and responsiveness to students, families, and the community. *	<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 that they believe that all students can achieve their full potential. *	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### 4.3.4 Human Resources: Approaches 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system is likely to retain and promote talented staff, allows for re-structuring and removal of staff as needed, creates opportunities for leadership development, and sets clear expectations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system identifies low-performing teacher or leader performance, provides plans, support, and training for improvement, and provides the steps the school leadership will take in instances of persistent low-performance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### 4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: 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 <a href="#">SPCSA’s Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment</a>.</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<sup>9</sup>.</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 <sup>10</sup> , application and enrollment timelines <sup>11</sup> , lotteries <sup>12</sup> , weighted lotteries <sup>13</sup> , enrollment preferences <sup>14</sup> , and backfilling vacant seats when students withdraw.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<sup>9</sup> [NRS 388A.417](#)

<sup>10</sup> [NRS 388A.450](#)

<sup>11</sup> [NRS 388A.453\(7\)](#)

<sup>12</sup> [NRS 388A.453\(5\)](#)

<sup>13</sup> [NAC 388A.536](#)

<sup>14</sup> [NRS 388A.456](#)

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrated interest from parents of students in the appropriate grade level to enroll in year 1 and originating in the identified communities or zip codes to be served (approximately 30% of year 1 enrollment). Demand should be demonstrated through meeting sign in sheets or intent to enroll forms that capture, at minimum, parent name, student grade levels, and zip code of residence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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: Approaches the Standard

While most criteria were evaluated through both the written application and capacity interview, several criteria, as indicated with “\*” were evaluated after the capacity interview.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If a third party (including an CMO/EMO) will implement portions of the Year 0 plan, these actions should align to the contract or additional documentation presented later in the application.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the function of any employees in Year 0, as well as the funding source for associated compensation. The staffing outlined for Year 0 will enable the school to reach its Year 0 milestones and goals.	<input 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
<b>Capacity Interview Criteria:</b>	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates they can work together to solve problems. *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates they are well versed in the incubation year plan and are committed to following through with the implementation. *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

#### 4.3.7 Services: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific non-academic services, including, but not limited to transportation, food service, facilities management, nursing, and purchasing processes, and school safety.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates a reasonable process and timeline for ensuring school will have information technology infrastructure, equipment, software, and policies to support the school operations and model, including plans for data security and privacy.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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> <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>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
If a facility (or permanent facility) has not yet been identified: <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

# 5 FINANCIAL PLAN

## 5.1 SECTION RATINGS

<b>Financial Plan</b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>
-----------------------	--------------------------------

## 5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The financial plan presented in the application lacks sufficient clarity and specificity to demonstrate full preparedness of the Committee to Form. While the Applicant plans to contract with a back-office provider through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process based on track record, pricing, and mission alignment, and to engage an independent auditing firm, it remains unclear how financial responsibilities will be divided between the provider, the administrative team, and the Chancellor—who already has a broad set of duties. The financial plan assumes maximum enrollment in every class, which does not provide conservative revenue estimates, and the school still only breaks even in Year 1, with minimal reserves built thereafter. Staff salaries are also notably low, with a teacher’s take-home pay calculated at approximately \$45,220. This is concerning given the school’s stated goal to recruit and retain highly effective teachers of color, dual-language educators, and licensed professionals with the cultural competency to serve a diverse student body. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form acknowledged the low salaries and expressed hope that other job perks would offset them, but the review team remains concerned about the sustainability of this approach. Additionally, contingency planning lacks sufficient detail about what specific costs might be cut or how revenue might be increased in the event of a shortfall, making it difficult to assess whether such adjustments would compromise the school’s mission. Further, inconsistencies were identified between the narrative and financial plan regarding hiring timelines, student-teacher ratios, professional development costs, and salary increases. Although some clarification was provided in the clarifying responses and the capacity interview, new concerns emerged when the Committee to Form described plans to offer mentoring and tutoring on Fridays at no cost to families—services not accounted for in the budget. Finally, updated cash flow projections show increased costs in July 2026 without a corresponding increase in revenue. Although the Applicant notes an intention to apply for the Charter School Program (CSP) grant, it is unclear whether those funds, if received, would ensure adequate startup cash flow. For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee and SPCSA staff rated the Financial Plan as Approaches the Standard.

## 5.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

### 5.3.1 Financial Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Projections are accurate, conservative, and legally compliant. This includes appropriate allocations for required expenditures such as sponsorship fee, Public Employee Retirement System contributions, etc.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 16, 2024 – Application Overview and Process
- January 8, 2025 – Application Cover Sheet, Meeting the Need, and Academic Plan
- January 21, 2025 – Operations Plan and Addendum
- February 6, 2025 – Financial Plan
- February 24, 2025 – Clarifying Questions and the Capacity Interview

Below are key dates related to the Purpose Leadership Academy charter school application.

- January 23, 2025 – Purpose Leadership Academy Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2025 – Purpose Leadership Academy Application is received
- May 13, 2025 – Memo sent to Clark County School District soliciting input<sup>15</sup>
- June 25, 2025 – Clarifying Questions sent to applicant; responses received within 4 business days
- July 15, 2025 – Purpose Leadership Academy Capacity Interview is conducted
- June 6, 2025 – Input provided by Clark County School District
- August 22, 2025 – 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 Purpose Leadership Academy was conducted on July 15, 2025 and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All but one member of the Committee to Form attended the interview. Two additional proposed board members also attended the interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

- Targeted Plan
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Transformational Change
- Curriculum and Instructional Design
- Driving for Results
- Professional Development
- Board Governance
- Leadership Team
- Staffing Plan
- Student Recruitment and Enrollment
- Incubation Year Development
- Facilities
- Financial Plan

---

<sup>15</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.

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that assessed the Committee to Form's ability to collaboratively develop a focused, strategic message—delivered by both the board and school leadership team—to address hypothetical community concerns about that proposed schedule that were contributing to the school falling short of its enrollment target.

## 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>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</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).