

New Charter School Application Report and Recommendation

August 27, 2026



Pathways In Education – Las Vegas

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed School Name	Pathways in Education – Las Vegas
Proposed EMO/CMO	Pathways Management Group
Proposed Mission and Vision	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. Vision: Pathways In Education- Las Vegas (PIE-LV) 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.
Proposed Grade Configuration	Opening: 9-12 Full Scale: 9-12
Proposed Opening	August 2027
Proposed Location	Clark County; 2106 W Craig Rd, North Las Vegas 89031
Proposed Zip Codes to be Served	89030, 89031, 89032, 89081, 89130, 89115

PLANNED ENROLLMENT

	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33
9	30	38	51	56	56	56
10	38	48	65	71	71	71
11	53	69	92	101	101	101
12	54	70	92	102	102	102
Total	175	225	300	330	330	330

CONTENTS

1	Overview and Recommendation	3
2	Meeting the Need	5
3	Academic Plan	8
4	Operations Plan	14
5	Financial Plan	21
6	Addendum	23
7	Application Process Details	27
	Appendix A	29

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 two 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	Meets 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 2026 Application Cycle based on a finding that the applicant has failed to satisfy the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3) in that the applicant has failed to demonstrate competence in accordance with the criteria for approval prescribed by the SPCSA that will likely result in a successful opening and operation of the charter school. Designate Director Mackedon to meet and confer with the applicant.

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.

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	Meets the Standard
Academic Plan	Meets the Standard
Transformational Change	Meets the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Meets the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Approaches the Standard
Professional Development	Meets the Standard
School Culture	Meets the Standard
Student Discipline	Meets the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Meets the Standard
Programs of Distance Education	Meets the Standard
Operations Plan	Approaches the Standard
Board Governance	Does Not Meet the Standard
Leadership Team	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Meets the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Meets the Standard
Facilities	Meets 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	Meets the Standard
Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly	Meets 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	Meets the Standard

2.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Meeting the Need section was rated as Meets the Standard. Three 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 application presents a clear mission to provide a hybrid learning program for high school students who may need a flexible, individualized pathway to graduation. The mission and vision describe a program focused on personalized training, student support, high expectations, graduation, and readiness for college, career, vocational training, or meaningful employment. The application also identifies a measurable goal that at least 85% of enrolled students will earn a high school diploma and demonstrate readiness for postsecondary education, vocational training, or employment.

The Targeted Plan subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application identifies North Las Vegas as the community to be served and describes the intended student population as students who are credit-deficient, at risk of dropping out, or in need of a more flexible and supportive learning environment. The application also describes demographic and educational needs in North Las Vegas, which includes lower educational attainment, a 70.5% graduation rate, and a limited alternative high school option for students who benefit from nontraditional settings.

The Parent and Community Involvement subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application describes outreach conducted by the applicant team, which includes meetings with community members and attendance at community events to gather feedback, share information about the school, and identify potential partners. The application also explains how community feedback informed the proposed model, its flexible scheduling, individualized instruction, remediation, and smaller learning environments.

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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Vision describes success (beyond graduation) for students if the school fulfills its mission.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
School's plan, in alignment with the mission and vision, satisfies at least one statutory purpose:	☒ Yes

- 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.	☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Clear, comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.	☒ Yes ☐ 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: 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: - 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 defined as schools that: - 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 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

2.3.3 Parent and Community Involvement: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Demonstrates ties to and/or knowledge of the identified community and explains how the proposed school will build upon community assets.	☒ Yes ☐ No

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

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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Adheres to state laws regarding parent and family volunteers, ensuring that there are no volunteering requirements as a condition of enrollment.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3 ACADEMIC PLAN

3.1 SECTION RATINGS

Academic Plan	Meets the Standard
Transformational Change	Meets the Standard
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Meets the Standard
Promotion and Graduation Requirements	Meets the Standard
Driving for Results	Approaches the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Approaches the Standard
Professional Development	Meets the Standard
School Culture	Meets the Standard
Student Discipline	Meets the Standard
School Calendar and Schedule	Meets the Standard
Dual Credit Partnerships	Meets the Standard
Programs of Distance Education	Meets the Standard

3.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Academic Plan was rated as Meets the Standard. Nine 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 Meets the Standard. The application describes a hybrid, individualized high school model intended to re-engage students who are credit-deficient, at risk of dropping out, or in need of a more flexible educational setting. The proposed model includes individualized learning plans (ILPs), required in-person appointments, small group instruction, credit recovery, and supports aligned to the school's mission of increasing high school graduation rates among at-risk and underserved youth.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application and clarifying responses describe an instructional model that uses Edmentum, Student Activity Workbooks, and small group and individualized instruction teachers to provide personalized, mastery-based instruction. The applicant also clarified that curriculum materials are reviewed for alignment with Nevada Academic Content Standards, course descriptions, graduation requirements, and authorizer expectations.

The Promotion and Graduation Requirements subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application provided an explanation on how students will be tracked by cohort year and how previously earned credits will be reviewed upon enrollment to determine each student's academic standing and individualized graduation timeline. The applicant also described the use of a Graduation Calculator and Learning Period progress to support students in understanding their pathway to graduation and to allow staff to make timely interventions and adjustments.

The Driving for Results subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application and clarifying responses describe multiple systems for monitoring academic performance. The application also states that assessment data will be used to identify skill gaps, update ILPs, adjust pacing, provide targeted intervention, and inform instructional and programmatic adjustments. However, during the capacity interview, the review team identified concerns that the applicant did not consistently describe the specific process, benchmarks, or criteria that would be used to determine when adaptations to student schedules, additional small group instruction, synchronous instruction, or other corrective actions would be required. The applicant generally identified the types of actions that could be taken but was less able to articulate the specific data thresholds that would trigger those actions, who would be responsible for making the decisions, and how the school would monitor whether the interventions were effective. The response met the criteria in several aspects but lacked sufficient detail to demonstrate a clearly defined and consistently applied process for using

student performance data to drive timely instructional and programmatic decisions when students are not making expected progress.

The At-Risk Students and Special Populations subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application and clarifying responses describe several supports for at-risk students and special populations, including individualized learning plans, progress monitoring, remediation, restorative practices, review of student records, McKinney-Vento enrollment safeguards, English Learner processes, and supports for students with disabilities. However, the review team identified concerns regarding the applicant's demonstrated understanding of how the proposed school would identify and serve at-risk students within Nevada's alternative performance framework. During the capacity interview, the applicant did not consistently demonstrate a clear understanding of requirements related to the Alternative Performance Framework that the applicant intends to be rated on. The review team also noted that, while the applicant emphasized flexibility and individualized support, the capacity interview did not fully demonstrate clear decision-making criteria for when students would receive more intensive supports, such as schedule adaptations, additional small group instruction, or synchronous instruction. Overall, the applicant described a range of potentially appropriate supports but did not consistently demonstrate how student data and identified needs would be used to determine when, why, and how those supports would be intensified or adjusted.

The Professional Development subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application describes professional development intended to support the school's hybrid, individualized, and trauma-informed instructional model. Professional development topics include small group instruction, student engagement across hybrid, virtual, and in-person settings, trauma-informed practices, restorative justice, relationship-building, consistent routines, and inclusive supports for diverse learners. The application also identifies Pathways Management Group (PMG) instructional support staff and possible outside consultants or local partners as providers of professional development.

The School Culture subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application describes a relationship-centered, trauma-informed school culture focused on safety, trust, respect, and positive interactions. The applicant describes layered supports for students who may have experienced trauma. These include restorative conversations, clear expectations, community partner involvement, and coping strategies. The application also describes staff preparation before opening to support consistent implementation of school culture expectations.

The Student Discipline subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application and clarifying responses describe a discipline approach that includes restorative practices, positive supports, attention to trauma-informed strategies, and protections for students with disabilities. The applicant clarified that the team would review data, prior interventions, disability-related needs, and parent input, when making disciplinary-related decisions. The team will also consider behavior plan supports, follow IDEA discipline protections or convene IEP or Section 504 team meetings when needed.

The School Calendar and Schedule subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application and clarifying response explain how PIE-LV will structure instructional time through Learning Periods, in-person appointments, independent coursework, small group instruction, and ongoing progress monitoring. The applicant also discussed how attendance, work completion, and course participation will be tracked.

The Dual Credit Partnerships subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application states that PIE-LV has met with the College of Southern Nevada regarding a cooperative agreement to offer dual credit courses and was able to obtain a letter of support expressing CSN's interest in partnership upon approval.

The Programs of Distance Education subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application and clarifying responses describe expectations for distance education participation, including required in-person appointments, access to coursework, on-campus assessments, minimum weekly engagement expectations, family orientation, technology support, and re-engagement procedures when students do not meet expectations.

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

3.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

3.3.1 Transformational Change: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Compelling, well-articulated theory of change and clear educational strategy aligned to the mission and critical to the school’s success.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Ambitious, yet achievable plan to further the SPCSA’s strategic goals: • Provide families with 4- or 5-star school. • Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds - including those from historically underserved student groups.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Provides a specific description of how the proposal will be implemented to ensure fidelity to the model.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Distinguishing features of the proposed school are supported by compelling evidence of success in schools implementing similar programs while serving similar student populations.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.2 Curriculum and Instructional Design: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes instructional model and learning environment that align to the proposed mission and vision, academic program, and instructional strategies. Instructional model and learning environment will engage students in ways that are culturally responsive and relevant.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Identifies curricula for all core academic subjects and demonstrates that they align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Includes a logical plan for delivering required courses including arts, computer education and technology, health, and physical education.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Demonstrates that instructional strategies are well suited to the identified student population and will enable effective differentiation.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

3.3.3 Promotion and Graduation Requirements: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes promotion and retention policies for all grades to be served, demonstrating high expectations for all students.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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. • 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No

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.	
Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students and monitoring for disparities in academic performance between student groups.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Logical plan for using assessment data to drive key decisions aimed at improving academic outcomes.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Organizational and financial goals are aligned to the SPCSA's Performance Frameworks.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Presents a reasonable plan and identifies the parties responsible for communicating with parents regarding remediation needs.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Clear demonstration and understanding of Nevada and federal laws and regulations governing services for special populations.	☐ Yes ☒ No
For students with disabilities ⁴ : - 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
For English language learners ⁵	☒ Yes

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

- 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.	☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
For homeless/migrant students ⁶ : - 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.6 Professional Development: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Clearly describes professional development that will be offered during the incubation year to effectively support the academic program, including the topics to be covered and any specialized components of the educational model.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Provides a summary of professional development opportunities throughout the school year to effectively support the academic program, including topics and structures.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Explains teacher coaching plans that will effectively support teacher development, including responsible parties.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Demonstrates how professional development will support all teachers in meeting the needs of special populations including students with disabilities and English language learners.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Cost of any third party provided professional development is reflected in the budget.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.7 School Culture: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate that will allow for fulfillment of the school's stated mission and vision, as well as the school's stated academic goals.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Provides plans to establish a culture of high expectations with students/families and teachers/staff and promote a positive school culture.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Presents well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Presents research-based and age-appropriate strategies to support students' social and emotional needs.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.8 Student Discipline: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Presents sound policies for student discipline, suspension, and expulsion including procedures for due process which align to Nevada statutes and regulations. ⁷	☒ Yes ☐ No
Describes the proactive use of restorative justice practices, including prior to suspensions or expulsions.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Clear designation of staff responsible for implementing the discipline plan, including maintenance of student records and data.	☒ Yes ☐ No

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

⁷ [NRS 392.4655 to 392.472](#)

A plan to ensure that certain student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies, including protection of the rights of students with disabilities.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.9 School Calendar and Schedule: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Proposed Calendar and schedule meets or exceeds applicable statutory and regulatory requirements: - 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Calendar and schedule support implementation of the academic program.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Alignment between teacher and student schedules.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and intervene to prevent students from becoming chronically absent.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.10 Dual Credit Partnerships: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Detailed plan for establishing and running a program for dual credit to enable students to enroll in dual credit courses at a college or university ⁸ .	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3.11 Programs of Distance Education: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Describes plan and timeline to garner necessary approvals from the Nevada Department of Education for the distance education program and courses. For courses that are already approved, documentation is provided.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Detailed, justifiable plan regarding student attendance which meets minimum state requirements.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Detailed plan for ongoing communication with parents.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Comprehensive set of criteria for enrolling students that corresponds with a clear, logical, and accessible enrollment plan.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Presents a logical and research-based plan to serve homeless and/or migrant students in a distance education setting.	☒ Yes ☐ 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	Approaches the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Meets the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Does Not Meet the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Meets the Standard
Facilities	Meets the Standard

4.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, the Operations Plan was rated as Approaches the Standard. Three 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. The proposed governing board members demonstrated general support for PIE-LV's mission and intended student population. However, the capacity interview did not provide sufficient evidence that the Board had the depth of understanding needed to effectively govern the proposed school, monitor implementation of the model, or hold the CMO accountable. During the interview, board responses were often broad and focused on general concepts such as reviewing data, maintaining adequate staffing, and keeping the mission in mind, but did not clearly identify specific indicators or oversight practices the Board would use to determine whether the school was successfully meeting its mission. The Board also did not consistently demonstrate an understanding of the academic model, enrollment benchmarks, or the specific information it would need to review to assess whether the school was implementing the model as intended and achieving expected outcomes. There were also concerns about the Board's limited size and underdeveloped recruitment plan, along with questions about whether the Board had sufficient capacity and defined processes to provide appropriate oversight of the CMO, identify and address areas of concern, and ensure accountability for school performance. Taken together, these concerns limited the review team's ability to determine that the Board was prepared to fulfill its governance responsibilities and provide effective oversight of the proposed school.

The Leadership Team subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The identified leadership team demonstrated general knowledge of PIE-LV's proposed model and mission, which includes individualized learning, relationship-based supports, small-group instruction, academic intervention, and flexible pathways to graduation. PMG representatives provided additional detail regarding network supports, professional development, operations, startup activities, and leadership development. The capacity interview did not fully demonstrate consistency in readiness across the full leadership team. Some key responses related to implementation, enrollment, scheduling, contingency planning, and leadership succession required additional clarification or were more fully addressed by the PMG representatives rather than proposed local leadership. Overall, the capacity interview provided less consistent evidence of the local leadership team's readiness to implement and manage key aspects of the school model.

The Staffing Plan subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The applicant team identified student-facing positions needed to implement the proposed model and provided some explanation of how staffing could be adjusted based on student needs and enrollment levels. However, the review team identified concerns regarding whether the staffing plan was sufficiently aligned to the budget assumptions and projected enrollment levels in a way that would support successful Year 1 implementation. During the capacity interview, responses generally emphasized flexibility and protecting student-facing positions, but the applicant did not consistently identify clear staffing thresholds, timelines, or

decision points for when additional staff, reduced staff, or adjusted staffing allocations would be needed if enrollment or student needs differed from projections. The applicant also did not consistently demonstrate how staffing adjustments would be evaluated against available funding and other operational requirements to ensure that changes in staffing would remain financially sustainable and would not adversely affect the school's ability to provide necessary student and staff supports. As a result, the review team found that the plan met the criteria in several respects but lacked sufficient detail to demonstrate how staffing decisions would be made in relation to enrollment, budget, student/family support, teacher support, school operations, and compliance needs.

The Human Resources subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application describes recruitment, hiring, compensation, evaluation, and staff development processes intended to support the proposed academic model and staffing plan. The applicant also described professional development and support structures for staff, including training in the Pathways model, small group instruction, student engagement across hybrid and in-person settings, trauma-informed practices, relationship building, and inclusive supports for diverse learners. Based on the written application and supporting materials, the Human Resources section provided sufficient information regarding how the school intends to recruit, support, evaluate, and retain staff.

The Student Recruitment and Enrollment subsection was rated as Does Not Meet the Standard. The applicant described several recruitment strategies, including digital marketing, community partnerships, outreach to local schools and counselors, open houses, virtual informational sessions, and outreach to organizations serving at-risk student populations. However, the capacity interview raised significant concerns regarding whether the applicant had a sufficiently developed plan to meet its Year 1 enrollment target. When asked about specific monthly enrollment benchmarks, the team did not provide clear hard-number targets by month and instead described incremental progress and regular check-ins. Reviewers also identified concerns that the team could not describe a backward plan or clear enrollment goals to determine readiness to open. The applicant also did not articulate specific actions, decision points, or contingency plans that would be implemented if enrollment fell behind projections. As a result, the review team could not determine if there was an established process for monitoring enrollment progress, identifying enrollment risk early, and making timely adjustments to recruitment efforts or other startup plans to support successful Year 1 enrollment.

The Incubation Year Development subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The applicant identified important incubation year activities, which include facility work, vendor identification, enrollment monitoring, professional development, and PMG support. While the written application included an incubation year plan, the capacity interview did not demonstrate a strong understanding of the plan among the team, particularly with respect to key benchmarks, ownership, deadlines, and contingency triggers. This raised concerns about the team's ability to effectively implement and monitor the plan. Several responses relied on general assurances that the team would monitor progress, adjust as needed, or bring recommendations to the Board, but did not consistently provide specific decision points for when corrective action would occur. Overall, the review team found that the plan identified many of the necessary activities but did not provide sufficient evidence that the team had established the specific structures, responsibilities, and decision-making processes needed to monitor implementation during the incubation year.

The Services subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application describes operational and non-academic services needed to support the school model, which includes technology, student records, contracted services, compliance supports, and other operational systems. During the capacity interview, PMG representatives described support for vendor identification, facilities, purchasing, technology, maintenance, and internal quality assurance.

The Facilities subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The applicant provided a general facility plan and described work with a commercial real estate advisor to identify a facility within the target North Las Vegas zip codes. The capacity interview provided additional information regarding the intended timeline, including the need to have a lease signed no later than the end of November to allow time for architectural work, permitting, buildout, and opening readiness.

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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
The board puts into place a structure that enables it to collect the information it needs to evaluate the performance of the school.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.).	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Describes a reasonable process for resolving student/parent objections.	☒ Yes ☐ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ No
The proposed governing body demonstrates the ability to work together to solve problems. *	☒ Yes ☐ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

4.3.2 Leadership Team: Approaches the Standard

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

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The organizational chart clearly indicates all positions, delineating board and leadership roles and lines of authority.	☐ Yes

	☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
The qualifications of the Committee to Form/CMO include experience with recruitment, hiring, and development of a highly effective staff.	☒ Yes ☐ 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: • 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ 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. *	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ 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. *	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

4.3.3 Staffing Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Aligns to the mission, vision, and proposed academic program.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Matches the proposed budget and is explicitly aligned to both budget narrative assumptions and to budget calculations.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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).	☒ Yes ☐ No

4.3.4 Human Resources: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Articulates recruitment and hiring processes and strategies likely to result in the hiring of high-quality teachers, leaders, and staff reflective of the student body.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Describes a feasible compensation structure and rewards/incentives that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

4.3.5 Student Recruitment and Enrollment: Does Not Meet the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Recruitment and enrollment plan for year 1 and subsequent years - 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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>	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
The planned enrollment numbers for years 1 through 6, including annual growth, is reasonable and supported by a clear rationale.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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: - Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that any program-specific components will be ready to begin on the first day of school. - Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure the school will be operationally ready to open. - Includes necessary activities/milestones to ensure that the SPCSA Pre-Opening Requirements will be met. <i>Note it is not necessary to duplicate every SPCSA pre-opening requirement into your incubation year plan. Instead, focus on the activities that will ensure success and the major milestones that must be met.</i> - Clearly identifies the individuals responsible for leading year 0 initiatives and meeting year 0 milestones.	☐ Yes ☒ No
If a third party (including an CMO/EMO) will implement portions of the Year 0 plan, these actions should align to the contract or additional documentation presented later in the application.	☒ Yes ☐ 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](#)

	☐ N/A
Outlines comprehensive leadership development plans that include training aligned with incubation year goals as well as stated academic goals.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Startup expenses are reflected in the budget narrative assumptions and the budget calculations.	☒ Yes ☐ 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. *	☐ Yes ☒ No
The Committee to Form demonstrates they can work together to solve problems. *	☒ Yes ☐ No
The Committee to Form demonstrates they are well versed in the incubation year plan and are committed to following through with the implementation. *	☐ Yes ☒ 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. *	☒ Yes ☐ No

4.3.7 Services: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific non-academic services, including, but not limited to transportation, food service, facilities management, nursing, and purchasing processes, and school safety.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Costs of services are realistic and align with budget.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Articulates metrics and processes for evaluating effectiveness of services.	☒ Yes ☐ No

4.3.8 Facilities: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
Facility plans in the short and long-term are reasonable and meet the needs of the projected student population and proposed program.	☒ Yes ☐ No
If a facility (including a temporary facility) has been identified: - Evidence that facility will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. - Projected costs associated with the proposed facility, including purchase price, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance, as applicable, are reasonable and supported by evidence. - A sound plan for construction, renovations, or tenant improvements including sufficient funds and a realistic timeline for completion. - A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school. - Evidence that the applicant has engaged with local jurisdiction(s) and municipalities, specifically the applicable planning department/division and traffic department/division. - Assurance that the proposed facility will comply with applicable building codes, health and safety laws, and with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Charter schools must demonstrate that a facility has been inspected and meets requirements of any applicable building codes, codes for the prevention of fire, and codes pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation 30 days before the first day of school.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
If a facility (or permanent facility) has not yet been identified: - Description of anticipated facilities needs that will be appropriate for the educational program of the school and adequate for the projected student enrollment. - Inclusion of costs associated with the anticipated facilities needs in the budget including renovation, rent, utilities, insurance, and maintenance. - Evidence to indicate that facilities-related budget assumptions are realistic based on anticipated location, size, etc. - A realistic, timebound plan for selecting and preparing a facility that will meet the programmatic needs and budgetary constraints. - A sound plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the local permitting requirements and processes, for ensuring that the facility will have proper permitting to operate as a school.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

• 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.	
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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Plans for facility maintenance will ensure that the facility provides a safe and clean learning environment for students.	☒ Yes ☐ 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 application and clarifying responses included a proposed budget, financial assumptions, a startup loan, back-office support, and clarification of certain required expenditures. During the capacity interview, the applicant team also identified some mission-critical expenses and services it would seek to protect if enrollment were lower than projected, including student-facing supports, special education, English Learner programming, socio-emotional supports, McKinney-Vento supports, and staffing needed to support students. However, the review identified remaining concerns because the budget relies heavily on meeting the Year 1 enrollment target, which is particularly concerning given the applicant's limited ability to articulate specific enrollment benchmarks, a backward enrollment plan, or clear decision points for responding if enrollment falls behind projections. The applicant therefore did not fully demonstrate how the school would maintain fiscal viability, monthly cash flow, and the core components of the proposed model if enrollment fell below projections. The review team had concerns about whether the proposed budget provided sufficient flexibility to absorb lower-than-expected enrollment while maintaining adequate cash flow throughout the year. The review team also raised concerns regarding the Board's understanding of the CMO fee, the services provided for that fee, and how the Board would evaluate the reasonableness and cost-effectiveness of those costs. During the capacity interview, the proposed board members did not consistently demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of services included in the CMO fee or the information it would use to assess whether the fee represented an appropriate use of school resources. This raised questions about the proposed board's readiness to provide effective financial oversight of a significant contractual expense and to ensure that CMO-related costs remain aligned with the school's financial capacity and operational needs.

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

5.3 RUBRIC CRITERIA

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

5.3.1 Financial Plan: Approaches the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The financial manager has the appropriate expertise to provide accurate and timely financial information to decision-makers.	☒ Yes ☐ 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).	☐ Yes ☒ No
There is appropriate segregation of financial duties which align to organizational charts, leadership roles and responsibilities, and vendor responsibilities, as applicable.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Control systems ensure that only allowable expenses will be made and that all expenses will be coded appropriately.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Sufficient detail and specificity of assumptions for all budget line items to allow for the assessment of fiscal viability.	☒ Yes

	☐ No
Clear understanding of monthly cash flow that demonstrates viability of the school.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Sufficient cash reserves to cover operations.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
There is no evidence that the school ever will become insolvent or lack access to the necessary amount of liquidity.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Assumptions about facilities in all financial statements correspond to a conservative facility plan and account for possible contingencies.	☒ Yes ☐ 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	Meets the Standard
Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly	Meets 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. Two of the five 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 applicant provided evidence of PMG's experience operating Pathways schools in other states and described the intent to replicate the Pathways model in Nevada. However, the review team identified concerns that past performance across affiliated campuses was varied and did not consistently demonstrate strong outcomes across states. The applicant's submitted materials reported high retention rates across the network, but also showed variation in academic progress, graduation rates, and dropout outcomes by state and campus. For example, the applicant reported 2024–25 academic progress ranging from 45% to 85%, graduation outcomes ranging from 70.00% to 100%, and dropout outcomes ranging from 3% to 18% across identified Pathways campuses. In addition, the application disclosed that Pathways in Education–Arizona was placed on a three-year probation after missing the deadline to apply for the alternative accountability framework and receiving a failing performance rating, although the applicant stated that the school later improved to a C and then a B after corrective actions were implemented. While the applicant described PMG's experience and some corrective practices, the review team found that the application and capacity interview did not fully demonstrate how lessons learned from varied campus outcomes and prior portfolio challenges would be applied to ensure strong implementation and consistent performance for PIE-LV.

The Scale Strategy subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The applicant described a plan to expand the Pathways model to Nevada and identified PMG supports intended to assist with school launch, leadership development, and model implementation. However, the capacity interview and reviewer notes raised concerns regarding whether the scale strategy was sufficiently specific and fully developed at the school level. The review team noted that the team did not provide a clear leadership succession plan and that the applicant could not clearly describe a backwards plan or data-driven enrollment plan to ensure adequate funding, both of which are important indicators of readiness to scale the model successfully in Nevada. Additionally, the local team did not demonstrate that it was sufficiently prepared to assume increasing responsibility for incubation from the CMO, raising questions about the team's readiness to sustain the model with greater local autonomy.

The Network Capacity subsection was rated as Approaches the Standard. The application and interview described PMG supports in areas such as school operations, facilities, professional development, compliance, technology, and school launch. However, reviewers noted concerns regarding whether PMG had sufficiently demonstrated the infrastructure and staffing capacity needed to support PIE-LV while also supporting expansion in other states. Reviewers also identified

concerns during the scenario-based question regarding the role of the CMO in budgetary decisions, whether the local board would have sufficient control over the budget, and whether the local board had sufficient expertise to oversee both the budget and the CMO relationship.

The School Management Contract subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The contract materials and related application responses provided sufficient information regarding the proposed relationship between PIE-LV and PMG, including the services to be provided, the management fee, the roles and responsibilities of the school, governing board, and CMO, and key contract terms. The rubric criteria for this subsection focus on whether the agreement clearly delineates roles and responsibilities, identifies Year 0 services, includes clear contract terms, addresses fees and services, and complies with Nevada requirements for contracts between charter schools and CMOs. Although broader concerns remained regarding the Board's capacity to evaluate PMG's performance and cost-effectiveness, those concerns are addressed in the Board Governance, Financial Plan, and Network Capacity sections.

The Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly subsection was rated as Meets the Standard. The application states that the governance model for PIE-LV does not require a waiver from Nevada charter school governance provisions and that the PIE-LV board will adhere to NRS 388A.320. The application also describes PMG's commitment to maintaining fidelity to the Pathways model while relying on local governing board made up of Clark County residents with knowledge of the Las Vegas community. In addition, the application states that the PIE-LV board will operate as an independent governing body, with no formal governance relationship between the PIE-LV Board and the PMG board.

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.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
The CMO/EMO and affiliated schools have no significant audit findings within the last three years.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Any legal issues, including contract terminations, are satisfactorily explained.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No

Meaningful focus on expansion in Nevada and commitment of organizational resources to support quality school openings and operations.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
The plan to scale the model to Nevada is thorough, realistic, and adequately resourced at both the CMO/EMO and school levels.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Plans for sourcing and training potential school leaders, including qualifications and competencies, is aligned with the mission and programs.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Previous scale-up endeavors are shown to have been successful with student performance data and organizational financial data (if applicable).	☒ Yes ☐ No
Includes plan to infuse Nevada school(s) with the essential elements of CMO/EMO model.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Organization charts clearly indicate lines of authority between the board, CMO/EMO, and schools.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Clearly describes the roles and responsibilities of the CMO/EMO leadership team.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Sufficient evidence is provided that the staffing plan for the CMO/EMO can support the proposed scale strategy.	☐ Yes ☒ No

6.3.4 School Management Contract: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
If applicable, clear rationale for selection of the CMO/EMO.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Demonstrates capacity and commitment of the governing board to oversee the CMO/EMO effectively: - Plan for board to monitor/evaluate the CMO/EMO's performance. - Appropriate internal controls guide the relationship. - Describes how the governing board will ensure fulfillment of performance expectations. - There are no prohibited familial relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives) nor any supervisory or business relationships between charter holder board members and CMO/EMO employees (including relatives)¹⁵. Any real or perceived conflict is disclosed and adequately addressed.	☐ Yes ☒ 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.	☒ Yes ☐ 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
Clearly defined contract terms ¹⁷ including the following: - The duration of the proposed contract, - A clear description of the fees to be paid to the proposed CMO/EMO and a clear description of the services that the proposed CMO/EMO will be providing to the proposed charter school, - A description of the roles and responsibilities of the proposed governing body of the charter school, the employees of the proposed charter school, and the proposed CMO/EMO,	☒ Yes ☐ No

¹⁵ [NAC 388A.525\(2\)](#)

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

¹⁷ [NRS 388A.246\(36\)](#)

• 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.	
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 .	☐ Yes ☒ No
Complies with Nevada laws and regulations ¹⁹ regarding contracts between charter schools and contractors, including EMOs and CMOs, including but not limited to: • Contract with CMO/EMO is subordinate to the charter contract, • Initial contract term is no more than two years, • Contract with CMO/EMO does not give the CMO/EMO direct control of educational services, financial decisions, the appointment of members of the governing body, or the hiring and dismissal of an administrator or financial officer of the charter school or proposed charter school, and • Contract with CMO/EMO does not include any automatic renewal terms. • The contract does not allow for any form of leverage – including but not limited to severance fees and facilities ownership – by which the CMO/EMO can ensure renewal of their contract.	☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3.5 Charter Management Organizations Applying for Sponsorship Directly: Meets the Standard

Criteria	Meets the Standard?
The application clearly and logically explains the extent to which the governance model of the Charter Management Organization requires a waiver from the governance provisions of the charter school law pursuant to NRS 388A.243 .	☒ Yes ☐ No
If the Charter Management Organization is from another state, the application provides a comprehensive, actionable plan to ensure that the board will balance fidelity to its mission with appropriate input and oversight from Nevada residents.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
If the non-profit's current board will govern the charter school, the application outlines clear, logical, and comprehensive steps to transform its board membership to meet statutory requirements in NRS 388A.320 , mission, and bylaws to assume its new duties.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
If a new board has been formed, the application clearly delineates the new board's relationship to the existing non-profit board and the governance responsibilities of both entities as it relates to the proposed school.	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

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.

- January 6, 2026 – Application Overview and Process
- January 20, 2026 – Application Cover Sheet, Meeting the Need, and Academic Plan
- February 4, 2026 – Operations Plan and Addendum
- February 18, 2026 – Clarifying Questions and the Capacity Interview
- March 9, 2026 – Financial Plan

Below are key dates related to the Pathways In Education - Las Vegas charter school application.

- January 29, 2026 – Pathways In Education - Las Vegas Notice of Intent is received
- April 30, 2026 – Pathways In Education - Las Vegas Application is received
- May 14, 2026 – Memo sent to Clark County School District soliciting input²⁰
- June 29, 2026 – Clarifying Questions sent to applicant; responses received within 4 business days
- July 15, 2026 – Pathways In Education - Las Vegas Capacity Interview is conducted
- July 23, 2026 – Input provided by Clark County School District
- August 27, 2026 – 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 25, 2026, and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All but one member of the CMO board attended the interview. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

- Curriculum and Instructional Design
- Driving for Results
- At-Risk Students and Special Populations
- Student Discipline
- School Calendar and Schedule
- Board Governance
- Staffing Plan
- Student Recruitment and Enrollment
- Services
- Facilities
- Financial Plan
- Scale Strategy
- Network Capacity

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."

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

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that probed the Committee to Form's capacity to respond to an enrollment and financial challenge, including the Board's role in overseeing key decisions, the school leader's operational responsibilities, and the appropriate role of the CMO in providing support while ensuring the local team could effectively lead the school.

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 the successful 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 from 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).