

New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

August 22, 2025



Pathways in Education – Las Vegas

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed School Name	Pathways in Education – Las Vegas
Proposed EMO/CMO	Pathways Management Group (CMO)
Proposed Mission and Vision	<p>Mission: Pathways in Education – Las Vegas (PIE-LV) is dedicated to providing an exemplary hybrid learning program that transforms the lives of high school students. We create supportive, equitable, educational environments where every student’s unique potential is recognized and nurtured, regardless of background or academic history.</p> <p>Vision: Pathways in Education – Las Vegas envisions a future where every student – regardless of background or circumstance – has access to a flexible, personalized education that empowers them to graduate prepared for lifelong success. Our students will thrive academically, socially, and emotionally, demonstrating resilience, confidence, and readiness to pursue college, career, or other post-secondary opportunities.</p>
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: 9-12 Full Scale: 9-12
Proposed Opening	August 2026
Proposed Location	89030, 89031, 89032
Proposed Zip Codes to be Served	89030, 89031, 89032

PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32
K						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9	38	53	52	53	52	56
10	38	60	62	64	68	71
11	72	93	93	96	100	101
12	77	94	103	107	105	102
Total	225	300	310	320	325	330

CONTENTS

1	Overview and Recommendation	4
2	Meeting the Need	7
3	Academic Plan	10
4	Operations Plan	17
5	Financial Plan	24
6	Addendum	26
7	Application Process Details	29
	Appendix A	31

1 OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

Application Section	Rating
Meeting the Need	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan	Approaches the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard
Addendum ²	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 Pathways in Education – Las Vegas charter school application.

1.2 PROPOSED MOTION

Proposed motion: *Deny the Pathways in Education – Las Vegas 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*

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

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

that will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school. Designate Director Mackedon to meet and confer with the applicant.

1.3 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION SECTION RATINGS

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

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

2 MEETING THE NEED

2.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Mission and Vision subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The Pathways in Education – Las Vegas outlines a clear vision describing success for students beyond graduation for lifelong post-secondary success regardless of background and circumstance. This is described as having access to a flexible, personalized education. The proposed alternative high school is focused on the measurable and clear purpose to increase high school graduation rates among at-risk and undeserved youth by providing flexible, individualized learning plans and comprehensive support services – ensuring 85% of enrolled students earn a high school diploma and demonstrate readiness for post-secondary education, vocational training, or meaningful employment. This mission and vision is reiterated and supported by the responses from the Committee to Form during the capacity interview.

The Targeted Plan subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant demonstrates the commitment to meeting the academic needs of the community with the proposed school by highlighting the significant need in North Las Vegas for alternative educational options that support student success in nontraditional settings. The demographic context for the area highlights that only 18% of residents aged 25 and older hold a bachelor’s degree or higher, and that the region has a high concentration of schools rated 1- or 2-stars under the state’s accountability system. This aligns with the SPCSA’s Demographic and Academic Needs Assessment. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form reiterates these challenges and offers solutions by offering a flexible, hybrid learning model that provides students with multiple pathways to graduation and post-secondary readiness. This innovative model is particularly suited to meet the needs of students who may struggle in traditional educational environments. The Applicant also notes that alternative high school options in North Las Vegas are currently limited. The proposed school is designed to expand access to high-quality, flexible education for students in need, while addressing all three priority areas outlined in the SPCSA’s Demographic and Academic Needs Assessment.

The Parent and Community Involvement subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant referenced receiving survey data and community feedback from in-person events. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form affirmed that students and parents had expressed interest in the Pathways in Education – Las Vegas model through discussions and feedback gathered at various events. The Committee to Form was not able to identify specific examples of how the feedback provided from the community shaped the proposal. The Applicant also provided several memorandums of understanding for proposed community partnership with Pathways in Education – Las Vegas. However, during the capacity interview it remained unclear as to how these partnerships would contribute to the goals of the school. Finally, the Applicant was unable to describe 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, and provide intentional and thoughtful strategies for engaging with community members, families, and parents who were representative of the community to be served.

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

2.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

2.3.1 Mission and Vision: Meets the Standard

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

2.3.2 Targeted Plan: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the community and students to be served, including the demographics and educational needs of the intended student population, as well as the current school options within the community.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed educational model is clearly described and addresses a need(s) related to student outcomes in the identified community that is either shown to exist with data or is in response to demonstrated demand for a particular school model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates a commitment to meeting at least one of, and preferably multiple, academic, or demographic needs identified in the SPCAS’s Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demographics: 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 credible 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL)³; English Language Learners (ELLs); Students with disabilities (those with an Individualized Education Program, or IEP); Students in foster care; Students experiencing homelessness. Academic Need: Geographies with Consistently Underperforming Schools: 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 credible 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received a 1- or 2-star NSPF rating in the two most recent NSPF ratings. Academic Need: Students at Risk of Dropping Out of School: 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 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

³ 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Identifies key supporters, partners, or resources that are directly tied to the stated outcomes of the school, including community partners that are located in and/or serve the identified zip codes. Partnerships are evidenced by specific letters of commitment outlining the accountabilities of both parties and clear, measurable, time-specific deliverables from the partner which are clearly relevant to the needs of the identified population, and do not reflect a paid vendor relationship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 SECTION RATINGS

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

3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The Transformational Change subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. In both the application and capacity interview, the Applicant described an academic program focused on serving at-risk students that is aligned with SPCSA’s strategic goals. However, the Applicant does not clearly articulate a clear theory of change or educational strategy. The Committee to Form does present a plan that addresses the SPCSA’s strategic goal to ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds in the form of a flexible learning environment geared to historically underserved student groups. While the Applicant provides data from other schools in the Pathways Education Portfolio that indicates positive achievement, it was unclear if that same performance would be replicated in the proposed Las Vegas school. When asked about comparative data during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form was unable to connect the previously provided data to support compelling evidence for success for the proposed targeted zip codes in Clark County.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Committee to Form identifies proposed curricula for all core academic subjects aligned to the Nevada Academic Content Standards by listing specific materials in the application. However, the Review Team raised concerns after noting that the proposed high school social studies curriculum, *McDougal Littell: Modern World History: Patterns of Interaction* (7th Edition, 2006), does not align with the 2017 Nevada Academic Content Standards for Social Studies. When asked about the alignment, the Committee to Form stated they were not aware of the discrepancy. This left the review team with questions regarding the process the Committee to Form underwent to ensure all curriculum was aligned to the Nevada Academic Content Standards. The Committee to Form also did not provide a clear plan for delivering courses, including arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education. Additionally, although the Applicant stated that the curriculum and instructional strategies would support students with disabilities and English Learners, it was unclear how these strategies would lead to academic success for these student groups. The Review Team remained concerned about their success, given the limited staffing available to provide wraparound services and the minimal training described.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant was able to articulate that promotion is based on credit accrual and demonstration of mastery of academic standards. In the application and during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form discussed that retention decisions are made using multiple measures but did not articulate a clear and concise retention policy. Similarly, the Applicant indicated providing

various multi-level supports for students, however the Committee to Form did not articulate the full plan of action for how the school will support students from dropping out.

The Driving for Results subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. A key concern for the review team was a lack of detail regarding how the school will consider the success of special populations during the review of baseline data. The Applicant identifies multiple academic goals and targets and indicated looking at subgroup data for trends when reviewing data. In the narrative and capacity interview, the Committee to Form responded with broad explanations of how data would be used to guide instruction for students but left the review team with outstanding questions regarding how it will set and monitor ambitious academic goals for students from special populations. This gap was especially concerning given the unique school model. The explanation of corrective actions that would be taken if the school failed to meet achievement outcomes at the classroom, cohort, special population and/or school wide level were broad and did not provide clarity for the review team.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. As previously mentioned, the review team had significant concerns regarding how the Committee to Form would remediate academically underperforming students and meet the needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Throughout the written application and responses during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did not provide clarity as to how the school will provide the required services to English Language Learners and students in special education and what specific instructional strategies would be used beyond the required 1-1 check ins. The Committee to Form identified two members with experience working with special populations, including involvement in an inclusive music education program and experience as a special education teacher and consultant. However, during the capacity interview, when the Review Team requested additional details about the Applicant's track record of success, the responses provided were broad and did not provide specific data and information.

The Professional Development subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The Applicant articulated an outline of professional development opportunities for offered during the incubation year to support the academic program provided by the Pathways in Education, the proposed CMO. Although the narrative outlines professional development topics and identifies the intended audience, particularly for topics related to special populations, it does not clearly explain how or if the training will help teachers meet the needs of these students. In addition, the Committee to Form articulated in the application and the capacity interview that teachers and staff will receive continued professional development as needed to meet their needs and growth. For example, the Applicant calls collaborative professional learning communities as a strategy to address specific needs.

The School Culture subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. As presented in the application, it is clear that the proposed school model has a vision for the school culture to serve the student population. The Applicant indicates the culture is embedded in daily actions, and staff are trained in implementing core values of the mission and vision. However, there is not a clearly articulated concrete plan of action for establishing culture or norming expectations beyond the initial start of each year, nor how to address students/staff that enter mid-year. During the capacity interview and follow up questions, the Applicant notes having school culture goals and the ability to assess feedback regarding the goals. Yet, these goals remained unspecified and undefined. Given the nature of the hybrid model of the school and the needs of the community being meet, the Applicant notes that students should dress "business-like" but upon questioning could not define the specifics of the dress code and whether it will create a barrier for students.

The Student Discipline subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application presented sound policies for expectations of students including procedures for due process aligning to Nevada law with the use of regular data decision making and analysis of discipline patterns to ensure subgroups are not disproportionately impacted. As part of the disciplinary process, the Applicant notes the use of restorative conversations but did not provide additional detail to demonstrate the proactive use of them. Even after follow-up questions during the capacity interview, the review team remained unclear about who is responsible for maintaining student records and discipline data on a day-to-day basis, given the lean staffing plan. In addition, though the disciplinary plan does designate the leadership team to monitor and

maintain student records, it lacks clear and measurable goals for students and clear outline of responsibilities for such a lean leadership team.

The School Calendar and Schedule subsection was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. In the narrative, the Applicant provided a breakdown of the hours that students will be expected to be on campus for 1-1 meetings and supported instructional time. However, during the capacity interview, when asked how the school model would ensure compliance with the minimum statutory and regulatory requirements for instructional hours, the Committee to Form's response left the review team concerned. The response suggested that the unique scheduling model does not clearly define instructional hours. It is also unclear how the nonelectronic lesson materials corresponded to instructional time. Additionally, it is unclear how the proposed calendar and schedule support the implementation of the academic program or ensure alignment between teachers and students.

The Dual Credit Partnerships subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant provided evidence of a planned agreement with the College of Southern Nevada to offer students dual credit. However, during the capacity interview, the review team found no clear details on how the program would be established and operated, nor on how students enrolled in dual credit courses would be monitored to ensure they receive adequate support and resources for success. It appeared that more work needed to be done to ensure a successful dual credit partnership could be established and successfully implemented within the school.

The Programs of Distance Education subsection was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The school model for Pathways in Education – Las Vegas heavily relies upon the use of distance learning to provide academic instruction. The narrative does mention discussions with the Nevada Department of Education regarding necessary approval for the distance education program. Yet, when asked during the capacity interview about the plan and timeline for approval, the Committee to Form did not appear to have a comprehensive understanding of the distance education review and approval process. The review team remained unsure whether the non-electronic course materials would meet the necessary requirements for tracking student instructional minutes. Additionally, the review team was concerned with the lack of detailed, justifiable approach for interaction between the pupil and teachers and the possible gaps in alignment with statutory requirements for instructional minutes and the administration of mandated assessments.

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

3.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

3.3.1 Transformational Change: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school's success.	<input 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"> • Provide families with 4- or 5-star school. • Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds - including those from historically underserved student groups. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates that the key features of the proposed school can be implemented together in a coherent and cohesive manner that will drive towards meeting the proposed mission and vision.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Distinguishing features of the proposed school are supported by compelling evidence of success in schools implementing similar programs while serving similar student populations or a demonstration of rationale for the feature that is supported by a logic model and plans to study effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.2 Curriculum and Instructional Design: Approaches the Standard

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

3.3.3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements: Approaches the Standard

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

3.3.4 Driving for Results: Approaches the Standard

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

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

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
At-Risk Students	
Provides a clear and research-based process for identifying at-risk students and their needs, including those with academic and behavioral needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the methods according to which the school will remediate academically underperforming students, including the system according to which the school will track progress, facilitate teacher collaboration, and the research supporting the school's remediation strategy.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The school's Response to Intervention system differentiates planning for each student according to the significance of their need, providing a continuum of programs, strategies, and supports that corresponds with the needs identified for each student and is supported by research.	<input 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
Special Populations	
Demonstrates the Committee to Form or CMO's track record of success serving a wide range of students with disabilities (mild, moderate, and severe), English language learners, homeless and migrant students, and intellectually gifted students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
For students with disabilities ⁴ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a logical plan to screen all students and to ensure that struggling students are evaluated for special education services early and accurately. Presents a plan for student evaluation and developing IEPs that contain rigorous goals and instructional plans that are suitable to meet those students' goals. Presents a monitoring plan that will enable relevant staff to track the progress of all students with IEPs towards the goals articulated in their respective plans. Demonstrates that the school will be able to provide all special education and related services needed either by the staff listed on their organization chart or identified external groups with whom they can contract to provide needed services. Specifies full Nevada licensure for all special education teachers/coordinators. Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. Articulates process for monitoring compliance with state and federal laws pertaining to serving students with disabilities. For middle and high schools, presents a logical and thorough plan for developing and implementing transition plans. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For English language learners ⁵ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes for identifying English language learners are well-defined, including administration of placement assessments and communications to parents and teachers. Indicates full Nevada licensure for all English language learners teachers/coordinators. Describes the specific services that will be provided for students within and outside the classroom, including curriculum and instruction and exposure to co-teaching. Articulates requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students who attain sufficient progress. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For intellectually gifted students, demonstrates that the school will extend their learning offerings such that those students have access to unique, tailored opportunities. The proposed staffing structure demonstrates sufficient staffing and teacher support to implement the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
For homeless/migrant students ⁶ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents a logical and systematic method according to which the school will identify homeless and/or migrant students. Clear plan to assess and meet the needs of students and identified as homeless and/or migrant. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

⁴ Refer to [NRS 388.417](#) to [388.459](#) and [NAC 388.215](#) to [388.284](#) for statutes and regulations regarding serving students with disabilities.

⁵ Refer to [NRS 388.406](#) and [NAC 388.525](#) and [NAC 388.655](#) for statutes and regulations regarding serving English language learners

⁶ Refer to [NAC 392.205](#) to [392.225](#)

3.3.6 Professional Development: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clearly describes professional development that will be offered during the incubation year to effectively support the academic program, including the topics to be covered and any specialized components of the educational model.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides a summary of professional development opportunities throughout the school year to effectively support the academic program, including topics and structures.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Explains teacher coaching plans that will effectively support teacher development, including responsible parties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates how professional development will support all teachers in meeting the needs of special populations including students with disabilities and English language learners.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.7 School Culture: Approaches the Standard

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

3.3.8 Student Discipline: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Presents sound policies for student discipline, suspension, and expulsion including procedures for due process which align to Nevada statutes and regulations. ⁷	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
A plan to ensure that certain student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies, including protection of the rights of students with disabilities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Goals for student behavior are clear and measurable. There is a plan, and designated personnel, for monitoring and reporting related to behavior goals as well as ongoing maintenance of discipline records.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.9 School Calendar and Schedule: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed Calendar and schedule meets or exceeds applicable statutory and regulatory requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 180 (or equivalent) days of instruction. • 43,200 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades k-2. • 54,000 minutes of classroom instruction/year for grades 3-6. • 59,400 minutes of classroom instruction /year for grades 7-12. • Minimum of 120 hours of instruction for High School courses. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

⁷ [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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Presents sound policies for student attendance and truancy including procedures for due process that comply with state laws and are customized to the charter school.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.10 Dual Credit Partnerships: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Detailed plan for establishing and running a program for dual credit to enable students to enroll in dual credit courses at a college or university ⁸ .	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Evidence of, at minimum, initial engagement with a college or university and clear steps and timelines for further engagement to ensure that the dual credit program will come to fruition.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Specific plans for monitoring students enrolled in the dual credit program to ensure they have sufficient supports and resources to successfully earn college credits.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed program for dual credit is shown to be both appropriate for high school students seeking advanced coursework as well as financially accessible to all students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

3.3.11 Programs of Distance Education: Does Not Meet the Standard

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

⁸ [NRS 389.310](#)

4 OPERATIONS PLAN

4.1 SECTION RATINGS

Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard
Leadership Team	Does Not Meet the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Approaches 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. Zero 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 Does Not Meet the Standard. Following the capacity interview, it became clear that the proposed Committee to Form members, who plan to transition into governing board roles, were not fully prepared to articulate how the board would effectively oversee the school's academic, financial, and organizational performance. Their responses also indicated a limited understanding of the responsibilities of a charter school governing board. It is unclear how the Committee to Form will ensure that the governing body remains representative of the identified community and maintains the necessary skill sets to be effective, particularly given the anticipated annual turnover of board members. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form, while clearly passionate about the proposed school model, did not demonstrate a strong understanding of the educational model, the school's mission, or what successful mission implementation would look like. Additionally, during the performance task, where full participation was expected, not all members actively engaged in the discussion. The conversation remained at a high level and did not reflect a solid understanding of the rules and regulations related to the Alternative Performance Framework, a core component of the proposed model. The review team also had concerns about the governing board's ability to effectively evaluate the CMO. While a four-point rubric was proposed for annual monitoring, it is unclear whether the board has the capacity to use it effectively.

The Leadership Team subsection was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The Applicant outlined a plan to hire a school leader by Fall 2025, with the CMO taking the lead in the recruitment process. In addition to the school leader, the role of Senior Director of District Relations is listed at 0.2 FTE as part of a two-person leadership team, which raised concerns for the review team. During the capacity interview, the need for this position and how its responsibilities would remain separate from those of the CMO remained unclear. Although the school would not hire this individual directly, it would be responsible for funding 0.2 of the salary. The fact that the position is not employed by either the school or the CMO left the review team uncertain about who holds the authority to appoint and oversee this role. The review team also had unresolved questions about the absence of an assistant principal on the leadership team. The Committee to Form explained that, because of the smaller student population and staggered in-person attendance, the position was deemed unnecessary. They further expressed a preference to allocate those funds to student-facing staff rather than additional administrative roles. However, this explanation did not seem to fully consider the unique challenges of the proposed model and student population, which may require additional administrative support.

The Staffing Plan subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant plans to model the staffing plan after Pathways in Education – Las Vegas and other schools in the CMO's portfolio, which share similar missions, visions, and academic programs. Although the school model notes that not all students will be on campus simultaneously, the

proposed student-to-teacher ratios (28:1 and 38:1 in Years 1–6) raise concerns. The review team remains uncertain whether the Committee to Form can ensure reasonable ratios overall, particularly for special education and English Language Learners. Consequently, it is unclear how the school will have the capacity to provide high-quality teacher support and development, student and family support, effective school operations, and compliance with all relevant policies. Additionally, during the capacity interview, discussions about recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers were vague and lacked specific strategies beyond appealing to the school’s mission and vision.

The Human Resources subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. Like the Staffing Plan section, the Applicant outlines general recruitment and hiring processes and strategies, but it is unclear if it will result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body. Of particular concern are the proposed salaries, which are significantly below competitive market rates. When asked about this, the Committee to Form expressed hope that a more flexible schedule would help attract staff. However, the review team remains concerned about the long-term sustainability of this approach. When asked during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did not clearly explain how the school’s performance management system would retain and promote talented staff or create opportunities for leadership development. This lack of clarity, combined with the proposed low starting salary and the ongoing teacher shortage throughout the state, raises concerns about the school’s ability to attract and retain qualified staff.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant outlines a plan to engage families who have already expressed interest in the school; however, it is unclear whether the plan reflects a strong understanding of the identified community or whether it will result in a representative student population. While the application includes evidence that enrollment projections are based on historical data, community needs assessments, and outreach efforts, it remains unclear why the projections nearly double the number of students in 11th and 12th grades. Although the Committee to Form provided sign-in sheets indicating family interest, the grade levels of the interested students were not specified. As a result, the review team questions whether there is sufficient evidence to support the likelihood of meeting the Year 1 enrollment target.

The Incubation Year Development subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The written application includes an incubation year plan that outlines responsibilities for the principal, governing board, CMO, and Director of District Relations, along with specific milestones and timelines. However, it is unclear whether these milestones will ensure completion of the tasks outlined in the SPCSA pre-opening checklist. Additionally, concerns remain about the Committee to Form’s current capacity to successfully launch the school. During the capacity interview and performance task, the Committee to Form did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the challenges involved in opening a new school, particularly the task of recruiting 225 students in Year 1. In the scenario-based activity, not all members actively participated, and the discussion remained at a high level, lacking depth and familiarity with the incubation year plan and the enrollment metrics required for qualification under the Alternative Performance Framework. These responses raised further concerns for the review team about the Committee to Form’s readiness and understanding of what is needed to successfully open the school.

The Services subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant explains how the school will comply with FERPA and outlines a process for establishing the necessary technology infrastructure; however, no timeline for implementation is provided. Given the hybrid nature of the school model, it is also unclear how the school will ensure students have access to the school site, as transportation will not be provided. Given the proposed needs of the student population, this is of particular concern. Finally, the application does not include clear metrics or a defined process for evaluating the effectiveness of the services offered.

The Facilities subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. In the application, the Committee to Form states that the CMO, which has experience with charter school facilities, will support the process of securing a facility for the school. The narrative specifies a space requirement of 7,000 to 10,000 square feet and outlines general space needs. However, the application lacks a detailed timeline for selecting and preparing a facility, ensuring compliance with applicable codes, laws, and regulations, and engaging with local jurisdictions and municipalities.

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: Does Not Meet 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Shows that the governing body is or describes specific strategies to ensure that the governing body will be representative of the identified community and describes plans for engaging with the community in order to ensure that community voice is meaningfully incorporated into the governing body’s decision-making.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members, charter holder board members and staff, or charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity nor any supervisory or business relationships.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Proposed conflict of interest policy, ethics policy, and bylaws are reasonable and compliant. Bylaws contemplate a mechanism for removal of governing body members if needed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Provides plans for meaningful, appropriate training for board members on a regular basis. Governance training is provided by experienced, third parties and addresses on-boarding for new members, or when the composition of the board changes. Board training costs are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Capacity Interview Criteria:	
The proposed governing board members demonstrate a deep understanding of the educational model, organization’s mission, and what mission achievement looks like. *	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed governing body members demonstrate ownership and a commitment to ensuring the school’s success through active engagement in the development of the charter proposal and the capacity interview. *	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The proposed governing body demonstrates the ability to work together to solve problems. *	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

4.3.2 Leadership Team: Does Not Meet 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If identified, school leader demonstrates a range of experience serving all students (students with disabilities, English language learners, students in need of remediation, and students above or below grade level) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leadership role at a high-performing and/or high growth school, • experience establishing a high-performing culture with students and staff, and • responsibility for significant student achievement gains with demographics similar to the proposed school. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comprehensive plan for coaching, support, and evaluation of school leadership. The board articulates a clear, ambitious, data-driven set of standards and criteria that the school leader must satisfy to keep the school on track to achieve its vision.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Capacity Interview Criteria:	
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system is likely to retain and promote talented staff, allows for re-structuring and removal of staff as needed, creates opportunities for leadership development, and sets clear expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
School performance management system identifies low-performing teacher or leader performance, provides plans, support, and training for improvement, and provides the steps the school leadership will take in instances of persistent low-performance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverages proactive, grassroots strategies such as door-to-door visits, open houses, and forums, and community conversations over the internet, social media, or other passive tactics which disproportionately benefit more advantaged populations. Includes specific plans to ensure equal access to interested families including families in poverty, students zoned to attend 1- and 2-star schools, students with disabilities, EL students, and other at-risk students as defined in the SPCSA's Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment. Demonstrates an understanding of the identified community. Is likely to allow the school to enroll a representative student population based on surrounding zoned schools or a mission-specific educationally disadvantaged population. 	<input 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 year⁹.</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 ¹⁰ , application and enrollment timelines ¹¹ , lotteries ¹² , weighted lotteries ¹³ , enrollment preferences ¹⁴ , and backfilling vacant seats when students withdraw.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The recruitment and enrollment plan as well as planned enrollment numbers for year 1 and subsequent years are aligned with the staffing plan and budget, including projected recruitment expenses.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrated interest from parents of students in the appropriate grade level to enroll in year 1 and originating in the identified communities or zip codes to be served (approximately 30% of year 1 enrollment). Demand should be demonstrated through meeting sign in sheets or intent to enroll forms that capture, at minimum, parent name, student grade levels, and zip code of residence.	<input 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"> Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that any program-specific components will be ready to begin on the first day of school. Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure the school will be operationally ready to open. Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that the SPCSA Pre-Opening Requirements will be met. <i>Note it is not necessary to duplicate every SPCSA pre-opening requirement into your incubation year plan. Instead, focus on the activities that will ensure success and the major milestones that must be met.</i> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

⁹ [NRS 388A.417](#)

¹⁰ [NRS 388A.450](#)

¹¹ [NRS 388A.453\(7\)](#)

¹² [NRS 388A.453\(5\)](#)

¹³ [NAC 388A.536](#)

¹⁴ [NRS 388A.456](#)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identifies the individuals responsible for leading year 0 initiatives and meeting year 0 milestones. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
If a third party (including an CMO/EMO) will implement portions of the Year 0 plan, these actions should align to the contract or additional documentation presented later in the application.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Outlines the function of any employees in Year 0, as well as the funding source for associated compensation. The staffing outlined for Year 0 will enable the school to reach its Year 0 milestones and goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Capacity Interview Criteria:	
The Committee to Form demonstrates that they understand the challenges of opening a school and articulate a commitment and understanding of what it will take to ensure a successful launch of the school. *	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates they can work together to solve problems. *	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The Committee to Form demonstrates that they are actively engaged throughout the application process and plan to maintain active engagement through the incubation year. *	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Costs of services are realistic and align with budget.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

4.3.8 Facilities: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Facility plans in the short and long-term are reasonable and meet the needs of the projected student population and proposed program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If a facility (including a temporary facility) has been identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. Projected costs associated with the proposed facility, including purchase price, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance, as applicable, are reasonable and supported by evidence. A sound plan for construction, renovations, or tenant improvements including sufficient funds and a realistic timeline for completion. A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. Evidence that the applicant has engaged with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. Assurance that the proposed facility will comply with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school. 	<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"> Description of anticipated facilities needs that will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. Inclusion of costs associated with the anticipated facilities needs in the budget including renovation, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to indicate that facilities-related budget assumptions are realistic based on anticipated location, size, etc. • A realistic, timebound plan for selecting and preparing a facility that will meet the programmatic needs and budgetary constraints. • A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. • A clear, time bound plan to engage with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. • Assurance that the proposed location will be in compliance with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school. 	
<p>Demonstrated capacity to manage facility selection, leasing, acquisition, development, renovation, and management, as applicable. If Committee to Form or CMO has identified a facility development partner, Committee to Form or CMO has thorough plans for managing the partner relationship and ensuring that the partner meets expectations.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

5 FINANCIAL PLAN

5.1 SECTION RATINGS

Financial Plan	Approaches the Standard
-----------------------	--------------------------------

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Financial Plan section was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant presents a financial plan that includes several strengths, including a clearly outlined contingency plan to protect mission-critical expenses in the event of lower-than-anticipated revenues. The Year 1 cash flow projections indicate that the school will maintain positive monthly cash flow, and the debt-to-asset ratio remains within a reasonable range from Years 0 through 6. The budget identifies a single funding source for the incubation year: a \$1.5 million bridge loan from the CMO at a 3.44% interest rate, which is supported by a letter of commitment.

However, there are multiple areas of concern that impact the overall strength of the financial plan. While the Applicant notes that the CMO will provide financial services, the application lacks evidence of the CMO’s financial expertise, appropriate segregation of duties, and adequate internal control systems. The CMO fee, listed at 10% of per-pupil revenue in Year 1 and 15% each year after, is relatively high and raises concerns about the cost-effectiveness of the partnership. Additionally, it is unclear what specific services are included in this fee to justify the above-market rate. As previously mentioned, the proposed salaries are also significantly below market value. The Committee to Form did not provide a clear justification for the high CMO fee in relation to the lower staff salaries.

For these reasons, as well as those detailed within the rubric criteria below, the review committee 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities, as applicable.	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Current ratio based on proposed budget of at least 1.1 on a monthly basis is either 1.1 or better or is between 1.0 and 1.1 and trending positive from the immediately prior year.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

The debt-to-asset ratio based on proposed budget is less than 0.9.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
All funds from external sources that are included in the budget are guaranteed with cash in hand or letter of award and grant terms.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
There is no evidence that the school ever will become insolvent or lack access to the necessary amount of liquidity.	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

6 ADDENDUM

6.1 SECTION RATINGS

Addendum	Approaches the Standard
Past Performance	Approaches the Standard
Scale Strategy	Approaches the Standard
Network Capacity	Approaches the Standard
School Management Contract	Approaches the Standard

6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Pursuant to [NRS 388A.249\(2\)](#), the SPCSA is required to consider the academic, financial and organizational performance of any charter schools that currently hold a contract with the proposed CMO or EMO. Information gathered through the Addendum Section examines the past performance of affiliated charter schools, as well as readiness of the CMO or EMO to expand and the specific services that are to be provided to the proposed school.

Overall, the Addendum section was rated as Approaches the Standard. Zero of the four subsections were determined to Meet the Standard as articulated in the new charter application evaluation rubric.

The Past Performance subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The academic performance data for schools affiliated with the CMO do not reflect outcomes equivalent to a 4- or 5-star rating on the NSPF, largely due to the alternative nature of the schools. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form referenced data showing growth over time and improved graduation rates to address the mixed academic results within the Pathways in Education’s portfolio. Financial and organizational performance data for CMO-affiliated schools appear to fall within the “Approaches Standard” range on their respective performance frameworks.

The Scale Strategy subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant indicates that the CMO currently operates 11 schools across four states and plans to expand into Missouri and Nevada over the next five years. However, the application lacks a clear and compelling set of criteria the CMO uses to determine readiness for expansion, and it does not offer sufficient evidence of the success of previous scale-up efforts. While the Applicant notes that the CMO will support principal recruitment, there is no detailed plan for sourcing or training school leaders to ensure strong campus-level leadership. Additionally, although some general criteria for expansion were mentioned, the rationale for selecting Nevada, specifically Clark County, as a target for growth is not fully developed. The application broadly cites low graduation rates, a need for alternative school models, and the presence of authorizers with more flexible performance frameworks but does not provide a thoughtful or data-informed explanation for why this region aligns with the CMO’s mission and capacity. Finally, the response regarding how the Pathways in Education CMO will support the successful launch of schools in new states while maintaining quality in existing schools is vague and lacks specificity. While the Applicant notes that support will vary by state and identifies Nevada as a priority, the response lacks sufficient detail to provide clear confidence in the CMO’s capacity to manage both growth and sustainability effectively.

The Network Capacity subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant outlines the roles and responsibilities of the CMO leadership team, and the organizational charts include both the CMO and school-level structures. However, the reporting structure and lines of authority between the CMO and individual schools are unclear, making it difficult to understand how accountability and oversight will function across the network. While the CMO appears to have a robust leadership team, the application does not clearly demonstrate whether the organization has the infrastructure and staff capacity necessary to effectively support the proposed growth and strategic initiatives.

The School Management Contract subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The Applicant provides a clear explanation of how and why they selected the CMO and outlines the respective roles and responsibilities of both the CMO and the school. While the proposed management contract appears generally reasonable, it includes provisions that

may not align with state regulations, including an automatic renewal clause for additional five-year terms, which may limit future flexibility and oversight. Additionally, because the school plans to use the CMO’s full educational program along with other services, it is unclear whether the school would be viable without the CMO. This raises concerns about the school's autonomy and long-term sustainability. The proposed management fee, which is 10% of per-pupil revenue in Year 1 and 15% in subsequent years, is relatively high and requires further justification based on the scope of services to be provided.

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

6.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

6.3.1 Past Performance: Approaches the Standard

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

6.3.2 Scale Strategy: Approaches the Standard

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

6.3.3 Network Capacity: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
----------	---------------------

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

6.3.4 School Management Contract: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
If applicable, clear rationale for selection of the CMO/EMO.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Clear, appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities between the management organization and the school. The functions table presented in this section should align to the contract.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Demonstrates capacity and commitment of the governing board to oversee the CMO/EMO effectively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for board to monitor/evaluate the CMO/EMO's performance. Appropriate internal controls guide the relationship. Describes how the governing board will ensure fulfillment of performance expectations. There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives) nor any supervisory or business relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives)¹⁵. Any real or perceived conflict is disclosed and adequately addressed. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Clearly outlines the roles/responsibilities of the CMO/EMO in the year prior to the school's opening. Services and supports during year 0 are documentation in the management contract or another agreement to ensure that governing board can hold CMO/EMO accountable for delivery of services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If the administrative head of the charter school or any key personnel of the charter school are directly employed by the CMO/EMO, there are provisions to ensure board approval of the individual(s) selected for this/these roles ¹⁶ . Structures are in place to ensure that the governing board can hold the administrative head and any key personnel employed by the CMO/EMO accountable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Clearly defined contract terms ¹⁷ including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The duration of the proposed contract, A clear description of the fees to be paid to the proposed CMO/EMO and a clear description of the services that the proposed CMO/EMO will be providing to the proposed charter school, A description of the roles and responsibilities of the proposed governing body of the charter school, the employees of the proposed charter school, and the proposed CMO/EMO, A clear description of the oversight responsibilities of the proposed governing body over the proposed CMO/EMO and how the proposed governing body will evaluate the performance of the proposed CMO/EMO, and Any renewal or termination provisions. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Costs for services are justified, reasonable, and commensurate with the services provided. The management contract does not authorize the payment of fees to the CMO/EMO which are not attributable to the actual services provided ¹⁸ .	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Complies with Nevada laws and regulations ¹⁹ regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors, including EMOs and CMOs, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract with CMO/EMO is subordinate to the charter contract, Initial contract term is no more than two years, Contract with CMO/EMO does not give the CMO/EMO direct control of educational services, financial decisions, the appointment of members of the governing body, or the hiring and dismissal of an administrator or financial officer of the charter school or proposed charter school, and Contract with CMO/EMO does not include any automatic renewal terms. The contract does not allow for any form of leverage – including but not limited to severance fees and facilities ownership – by which the CMO/EMO can ensure renewal of their contract. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

¹⁵ [NAC 388A.525\(2\)](#)

¹⁶ [NAC 388A.580\(4\)](#). Though permissible, this arrangement is unusual.

¹⁷ [NRS 388A.246\(36\)](#)

¹⁸ [NRS 388A.393](#)

¹⁹ [NRS 388A.393](#) and [NAC 388A.580](#)

7 APPLICATION PROCESS DETAILS

7.1 TIMELINE

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

- December 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 Pathways in Education – Las Vegas charter school application.

- January 30, 2025 – Pathways in Education – Las Vegas Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2025 – Pathways in Education – Las Vegas Application is received
- May 13, 2025 – Memo sent to Clark County School District soliciting input²⁰
- June 25, 2025 – Clarifying Questions sent to applicant; responses received within 4 business days
- July 15, 2025 – Pathways in Education – Las Vegas Capacity Interview is conducted
- June 6, 2025 – Input provided by Clark County School District
- August 22, 2025 – Recommendation is presented

7.2 CAPACITY INTERVIEW

Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the review committee conducted a capacity interview of the applicant to assess the capacity to execute the application's overall plan. The capacity interview for Pathways in Education – Las Vegas was conducted on July 15, 2025, and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form and proposed board attended the capacity interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

- Targeted Plan
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Curriculum and Instructional Design
- Driving for Results
- At-Risk Students and Special Populations
- School Calendar and Schedule
- Board Governance
- Leadership Team
- School Management Contracts

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.

²⁰ 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."

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that probed the Committee to Form’s capacity to respond to a situation responding to the possibility of not meeting the enrollment requirements to qualify for Nevada’s Alternative Performance Framework. This exercise asked the Committee to Form to consider how the board, school leaders, and the CMO would shift enrollment and recruitment efforts to ensure the school was eligible to apply for the Alternative Performance Framework.

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.²¹

²¹ Although the following list is not all-inclusive, among the required contents of a new charter school application are the following:

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

COMPLETENESS CHECK

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

WITHDRAWAL OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

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

THE SPCSA’S REVIEW OF A NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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