AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I.   Public Education Commission Meeting Date: January 13, 2017

II.   Item Title: Discussion And Possible Action on New Application
       Evaluation Rubric and Criteria

III.   Executive Summary and Proposed Motions:

On August 1, 2016, the National Association of Charter School
Authorizers presented an Authorizer Evaluation Report on the PEC's
authorizing practices. In that report, NACSA specifically addressed the
PEC's application decision making processes. The report sections are
excerpted in today's materials. Those findings include:

- The PEC's application evaluation rubric sets a bar for approval that
  is too low and that contains ambiguous language.
- The four-tiered application evaluation rubric uses subjective
  language rather than concrete descriptors of quality, which results
  in inconsistent reviews across years and discrepancies between the
  staff analyses/recommendations and the PEC's decisions.
- Furthermore, the rubric sets a standard for approval that allows
  underqualified applicants to receive a charter.
- For example, based only on the rubric language, a school with
  incomplete or partially inaccurate budgets, operations, and
  education plans would meet the standard for approval.

The NACSA report made the following recommendations, and others:

- Revise the application toolkit and embedded evaluation rubric to
  establish a clearer and higher bar for approval.
- Develop language to define the PEC's threshold for approval and ensure
  only applications that demonstrate a high likelihood of success are
  approved.
- For each application question, remove ambiguous language and replace
  such language with concrete descriptors of quality, which will improve
  the consistency of application evaluations and help ensure that only
  high-quality applications are approved.
- Revise the rubric to require applicants to fully align the proposed budget
  with the education plan and organizational plan.

- Establish a more transparent set of expectations for the community-input hearing, outlining how the results will be used to evaluate the application and applicant capacity.
- Develop and adopt an applications policy that defines the PEC's threshold for approval to ensure that only applications that demonstrate a high likelihood of success are approved.
- Work with the CSD to further develop the underlying evaluation rubric and corresponding evaluation report form to ensure that the PEC and the CSD are using the same criteria to evaluate charter school applications.

In the attached materials, CSD had provided draft proposals for how to take action on the NACSA recommendations.

1. APPLICATION DECISION-MAKING

Does the authorizer approve applicants based on applicants' demonstrated preparation and capacity to open and operate a quality charter school?

ESTABLISHED: ◑ Partially Developed   **APPLIED:** ◑ Partially Developed

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

The PEC's application evaluation rubric sets a bar for approval that is too low and that contains ambiguous language. The four-tiered application evaluation rubric uses subjective language rather than concrete descriptors of quality, which results in inconsistent reviews across years and discrepancies between the staff analyses/recommendations and the PEC's decisions. For example, for many questions, the difference between exceeds and meets expectations in the four-leveled rubric is determined by the amount of detail, with "adequate" being used to describe meets and "clearly" to describe exceeds. The difference between clear and adequate is not further explained in the rubric or application toolkit.

Furthermore, the rubric sets a standard for approval that allows underqualified applicants to receive a charter. For example, based only on the rubric language, a school with incomplete or partially inaccurate budgets, operations, and education plans would meet the standard for approval. Lastly, while four of the most recent six applications resulted in decision alignment between the CSD and the PEC, two applications that the CSD recommended for denial were ultimately approved by the PEC. Currently, there is not consensus between the PEC and the CSD staff about what constitutes the standard for approval.

The CSD of the PED, under the guidance of the PEC used NACSA's principles of authorizing to create its application toolkit that encompasses the elements necessary to run a well-structured application process. The toolkit includes a timeline; questions on the school's proposed educational plan, finance, and operations; an embedded rubric; questions for a capacity interview with a scoring guide; and a separate community-input hearing. The toolkit is publicly available on the website, along with previous applications, accompanied by staff recommendations, analyses, and board decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Revise the application toolkit and embedded evaluation rubric to establish a clearer and higher bar for approval. Develop language to define the PEC's threshold for approval and ensure only applications that demonstrate a high likelihood of success are approved.

For each application question, remove ambiguous language and replace such language with concrete descriptors of quality, which will improve the consistency of application evaluations and help ensure that only high-quality applications are approved.

Conduct an application review training session each year for all application review team members to ensure consistency between years and among reviewers.

1.1 APPLICATION MATERIALS & PROCESS

The authorizer provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application materials and submission requirements and runs a clear and well-structured application process with realistic timelines.

ESTABLISHED: ◑ Partially Developed   **APPLIED:** ◑ Partially Developed

ANALYSIS | ESTABLISHED

As established, the PEC has partially developed policies and practices for application materials and process. While the application timeline and content are strong, the application rubric needs strengthening to ensure consistent and objective decisions. Also, the application review team lacks sufficient training and issue-area expertise. Potential applicants can access a variety of information through the PEC's website including: submission guidelines; previous charter school applications, and corresponding staff analysis and CSD recommendations; minutes from community-input hearings; and PEC final decisions. The application toolkit is comprehensive, containing: a timeline for the decision-making process; an application that embeds the approval language from the rubric for each question; questions for the in-person capacity interview conducted by PED staff; and guidance for the community-input hearing conducted by the PEC. Letters of intent are due in January and completed applications are due in June. Every applicant undergoes a capacity interview and a community-input meeting near the school's proposed location. PEC decisions are made by September, one year prior to opening.

While the application content is strong, the application rubric is insufficiently designed to ensure that evaluation teams make objective decisions. As further detailed throughout Section 1, application rubric language is ambiguous, using the words "clear, comprehensive, and cohesive" rather than concrete descriptors of quality for each question. Furthermore, for many questions, the difference between exceeds and meets expectations in the four-leveled rubric is determined by the amount of detail, with "adequate" being used to describe meets and "clearly" to describe exceeds. The difference between clear and adequate is not further explained in the rubric or application toolkit. The same lack of clarity exists between "partially" and "meets," making the rubric ineffective in providing a consistent threshold to measure application quality year over year and between review teams.

The application does not have a high bar for approval at "meets" the standard for approval. For example, responses that address *most*, but *not all*, elements of a question are often considered to meet the standard for approval, which can prove problematic when, for example, a budget that includes errors or curricula that are not fully aligned to applicable state standards are considered to meet the standard. Sections 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 include specific examples to further illustrate this pervasive issue.

Existing applicant review teams are insufficient for providing thorough reviews of complex applications because they lack training and do not have the necessary expertise. Specifically, reviews were done by CSD staff who, while knowledgeable, are not experts in special education, English Language Learning, and finance. This can be easily rectified as PED has experts in special education, English Language Learning, and finance who could serve as part of a review team.

ANALYSIS | APPLIED

As applied, the PEC is partially developed in its application review process. The PEC implements its established application process with fidelity, but the threshold for application approval has varied as well as the consistency of application reviews. School leaders noted that the applicant trainings provided by the CSD and the wealth of information available on PEC's website were helpful in developing their applications but some school leaders also reported not having a clear understanding of the threshold for approval. The PEC follows the established application review timeline, which includes time for CSD staff to conduct and publish a thorough analysis prior to the community-input hearing and a well-supported staff recommendation prior to the PEC vote. However, while the staff recommendations published on the PEC website demonstrate that the applicant review team is using the established rubric to evaluate the applications, the review team evaluations lack consistency from year to year. Furthermore, for the last application cycle, applicants were held to an "exceeds expectation" threshold, which resulted in no applications receiving enough points to be recommended for approval. While this standard

of excellence is consistent with NACSA's best practice, the application rubric sets a lower threshold, as described above. This is particularly evident in the case of the SAHQ (Student Athlete Headquarters) school, which was recommended for approval in 2014 (though ultimately denied by the PEC) and recommended for denial in 2015; reviews of essentially the same application conducted in different years resulted in different staff recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For each application question, remove ambiguous language and replace such language with concrete descriptors of quality, which will improve the consistency of application evaluations and help ensure that only high-quality applications are approved.

Revise the application toolkit and embedded evaluation rubric to establish a clear and higher bar for approval.

Conduct an application review training session each year for all application review team members to ensure consistency between years and among reviewers.

Expand application review teams to include members of PED with extensive knowledge of special education, English Language Learning, and finances.

1.2 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The authorizer has thorough requirements and rigorous evaluation criteria for the proposed educational program including the vision and mission statements; educational philosophy; curriculum and instruction; teaching skills and experience; calendar and daily schedule; target population and enrollment; and plans for educating students with special needs.

ESTABLISHED: ◗ Approaching Well-Developed   **APPLIED:** ◗ Partially Developed

ANALYSIS | ESTABLISHED

As established, the application's educational program section is approaching well-developed because the relevant questions are comprehensive, requiring more than superficial or check-the-box responses. The application asks each applicant to describe its proposed curriculum and how it will align to state standards, fulfill the school's mission, and further the academic learning of the school's intended population. It also requires the applicant to establish a mission statement and develop at least two mission-critical goals.

While the application contains questions about the curriculum, instructional strategies, and calendar, the guidance embedded in the rubric is limited to providing "clear, comprehensive, and cohesive" narrative without expectation of the level of concrete standards of excellence. For example, while the application requires the applicant to produce a detailed plan for its curriculum development, it does not provide concrete criteria to determine what a "detailed plan" must include and what the completed curriculum must look like. In addition, the applicant must create SMART goals to measure its educational program, but the application materials do not provide sufficient guidance as to whether these goals will ultimately be used to measure a school's success in light of the state's A-F school grading accountability system. As described in Section 1.1, the rubric allows for applicants to meet the standard of approval by responding to most, but not all, of a question, without detailing whether the most critical components are addressed. In this section, applicants must only respond to *most* of the key elements in the goals and governance sections; *mostly* align their curriculum to the common core and state standards; and the school's day and year must meet *most* of the state's requirements.

ANALYSIS | APPLIED

As applied, the authorizer's assessment of the educational program in application reviews is partially developed. Staff conducts comprehensive and thorough reviews of proposed educational programs but these reviews lack consistency. Each review of a proposed educational program includes detailed summaries and supporting evidence of the application's strengths and weaknesses for each question. The evidence is pulled directly from the application and is tied back to the rubric criteria. However, each year, the amount of points that an applicant can earn per section varies. For example, SAHQ applied both in 2014 and in 2015. In 2014, staff recommended approval and awarded 70 percent of the possible points (76 of 108) for the education plan and in its analysis found that it met the standard of approval for its goals, alignment to standards, its graduation requirements, its instruction of English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities (SWDs). Yet the PEC denied the application. In 2015, staff recommended denial of virtually the same application but the PEC approved it. These same sections, one year later, collectively earned 44 percent of the possible points (44 of 100) and reviewers found it to not meet the standard for approval for the same sections outlined above. While the applicant revised the application's narrative between years in order to address the deficiencies highlighted in the original analysis, the substance and essential elements stayed the same. Both reviews cited evidence from the application and provided analysis. The difference was in the interpretation of the rubric and the difference between partially meets and meets among reviewers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Revise the rubric to set a clear standard for approval of the education plan that can be applied each year.

Provide training for CSD staff to use the rubric consistently each year and across years.

1.3 ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

The authorizer has thorough requirements and rigorous evaluation criteria for the proposed organizational plan including effective governance, and management structures and systems (including staffing); founding team members demonstrating diverse and necessary capabilities; and understanding of legal requirements related to opening and operating a charter school.

ESTABLISHED: Partially Developed   **APPLIED:** Minimally Developed

ANALYSIS | ESTABLISHED

The authorizer's established expectations for the organizational plan of the application is partially developed. The application contains some, but not all, of the key components in assessing an applicant's proposed organizational plan and the evaluation rubric provides too low a threshold for approval in this area. The application contains questions about governance, the management structure, choosing and evaluating a school leader, and self-evaluating the governing board. The application promotes strong governance at the school level as each board member must attend governance training, including financial training, which is required by the state.

However, the application is insufficient in assessing whether the school leader will have the right tools in place to run a quality charter school. While the application provides opportunities for the applicant to explain its process for hiring and evaluating the school's leadership, it does not reference the qualities that the leader(s) should have, such as experience with running a not-for-profit or handling a large budget, leading a school or working in education, and experience with or passion about the school's mission and education philosophy.

In addition, the rubric sets too low a threshold for overall approval in this area. For example, an applicant could "meet" the standard and not have a plan for selection of a quality school leader, which is paramount to overseeing a successful school and should be required of all successful applicants. Additionally, the evaluation rubric is insufficient in ensuring that the school is set up for operational success, as it does not require the organizational plan to be fully supported by the budget. This allows for applicants to be approved without having the tools necessary to execute the plan. Furthermore, the staffing plan needs to only "generally appear" to align with the budget; for example, the professional development needs to be mostly supported by the budget.

ANALYSIS | APPLIED

As applied, the PEC is minimally developed in analyzing the application's organizational plan because schools that received low scores in this section are approved by the PEC. In 2015, both approved applicants, Six Directions Indigenous School and SAHQ Academy, received less than half of the points possible for this section of the application. Staff identified specific concerns with regard to the applicants' ability to properly finance and operate the school in their recommendations to the PEC but the PEC approved the applications despite these concerns.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Revise the rubric to require a higher standard for hiring and evaluating the school's leader and ensuring that the budget will sustain the school's operation.

Ensure only those applicants with strong organizational plans are approved by setting and implementing an appropriate threshold for approval; ensure that both staff and board adhere to this approval in their recommendations and final decisions.

1.4 BUSINESS/FINANCIAL PLAN

The authorizer has thorough requirements and rigorous evaluation criteria for the proposed business plan including financial viability of the plan demonstrated through budget projections that are aligned with the proposed educational program.

ESTABLISHED: ◑ Approaching Well-Developed   **APPLIED:** ◑ Partially Developed

ANALYSIS | **ESTABLISHED**

The authorizer's established expectations for the business and financial plan of the application is approaching well-developed because the application requires a comprehensive budget information and allows the authorizer to get an understanding of whether the applicant can budget appropriately. The application requires a five-year budget, a one-year budget, insurance coverage, and a master facility plan. Importantly, it also requires alignment between the education plan and the proposed budget although not the organizational plan, as referenced in Section 1.3.

However, similar to other sections of the application, the standard for approval is too low to ensure that the school will be able to run without extensive support and oversight. For example, the budgets may contain errors of any type, the five-year budget must just "appear" to support the school's mission, and the applicant must only demonstrate a "general" understanding of budgeting.

ANALYSIS | **APPLIED**

As applied, the PEC is partially developed in its evaluation of a school's proposed business and financial plan, as evidenced by the review of the SAHQ application. SAHQ applied two consecutive years for a charter. In the first year, it received 44 percent (23 of 52) of the possible points for the business plan/financial framework section and the second year earned 60 percent (31 of 52). However, the opening statements of the staff analysis are strikingly different. In year one, the analysis states: the application is "generally adequate" with concerns about "capacity." In year two, the analysis states: the responses are "complete but inaccurate." Interestingly, the "inaccurate" responses received a higher overall score than the "generally adequate" ones. Meanwhile, the substance of the analysis shows different standards being applied but both uncovering important deficiencies, such as lack of a complete salary schedule, insufficient experience, and inaccurate budgeting for special education. It should be noted that in both years, this section was flagged as problematic. However, in the first year, that did not stop the applicant from being recommended for approval while in the second, that did not stop the PEC from granting approval.

In addition, the financial plan is reviewed by CSD staff, who do not have the requisite expertise. Members of the PED or other reviewers that have extensive understanding of procurement, contracting, and finance should be included as reviewers, in addition to school business managers. Financial experts will add credibility to the review and additional context for discussion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Include members of the PED finance bureau and/or external reviewers with financial expertise in the application review team.

Train all reviewers on consistent application of the rubric.

Revise the rubric to require applicants to *fully* align the proposed budget with the education plan and organizational plan.

1.5 CAPACITY

The authorizer has thorough requirements and rigorous criteria for evaluating the applicants' capacity to implement the school plan effectively, including but not limited to a substantive in-person capacity interview with all qualified applicants.

ESTABLISHED: Partially Developed   **APPLIED:** Partially Developed

ANALYSIS | ESTABLISHED

As established, the application is partially developed in its assessment of the applicant's capacity. The PEC has developed some strong practices in assessing applicant capacity, including an in-person capacity interview and a community-input hearing, but could further strengthen its established practices in this area. While the application requires the applicant to include biographies of its founding group members and disclose conflicts of interest, the founding group does not undergo background checks, resulting in the application being ultimately insufficient in vetting founding groups who can successfully run a quality charter school.

Publishing the questions for the capacity interview, while laudable, leads to prepared answers from the applicant and limits CSD's ability to evaluate the applicant's capacity. Specifically, using a set of pre-determined questions does not allow for probing questions or specificity in questioning that is necessary to fully vet an applicant. The published questions require the applicant to speak to each section of the application without allocating more time to weaker sections or requiring the interviewee to clarify confusing responses. Lastly, as established, there is no guidance on how the PEC will conduct community-input hearings, other than that they are held in the vicinity of the proposed school to allow for authentic community engagement.

ANALYSIS | APPLIED

As applied, the PEC is partially developed in evaluating applicant capacity. For the most recent application cycle, the capacity interview results were not incorporated in the staff analysis and recommendation. However, the PEC appropriately uses the community input hearings as a means for assessing applicant capacity. During the hearings, PEC members informally comment on the merits of the application and engage in a dialogue with the applicant and local community members. Transcripts from these hearings reflect discussions about specific aspects of an application, such as the choice of curriculum, the intended target population, or the school day and year. Commissioners cite specific sections and drill into areas of concern or ambiguity, and the applicant has an opportunity to defend their application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Rather than being limited by a set of pre-determined questions, structure the capacity interview so that CSD staff can focus on weak sections of the application and develop their own probing questions to more fully assess applicant capacity.

Incorporate findings from the capacity interview in the staff recommendation for approval or denial to the PEC.

Establish a more transparent set of expectations for the community-input hearing, outlining how the results will be used to evaluate the application and applicant capacity.

1.6 SPECIALIAZED APPLICANT TYPES AND EXISTING OPERATORS

The authorizer's application includes requirements that specialized applicant types (i.e. charter network applicants, virtual school applicants, or applicants planning to contract with an education service provider) provide additional relevant information. The authorizer conducts independent due diligence of existing operators' portfolio performance and requires them to provide evidence of past performance and capacity to expand.

ESTABLISHED: ⬤ Undeveloped   **APPLIED:** ⬤ Undeveloped

ANALYSIS | ESTABLISHED

As established, the application guidelines are undeveloped in evaluating specialized applicant types and existing operators because the PEC does not have any established practices for evaluating these applicant types. Most notably, the application toolkit is insufficient for identifying and vetting an experienced operator as the application does not ask for programmatic or financial outcomes of existing schools nor does it require disclosure of whether founding group members are affiliated with existing schools. The PEC has one application toolkit that does not differentiate for types of applicants (e.g., those with experience operating schools, charter management organizations, conversion schools, virtual or blended programs, or startup operators). Furthermore, while the mission and student-population questions focus on the types of students and educational program that the school will offer, there is no specific request for previous performance or mention of a due diligence process through which the PEC can review the performance of existing schools operated by or affiliated with the applicant.

In addition, while the state has a separate accountability system for designated "alternative" schools known as the supplemental accountability model (SAM) and eight alternative schools in its portfolio, the application toolkit does not provide separate questions or considerations for alternative education programs nor does the application include specific questions for blended learning schools, despite having 20 blended learning program schools in its portfolio.

ANALYSIS | APPLIED

As applied, the PEC is undeveloped in evaluating applications from specialized applicants. The decision-making process incorporates a standard practice across all schools that does not adequately probe into an existing school operator's academic, financial, or organizational track record. The transcript from a PEC meeting discussing the applicant, Six Directions Indigenous School, which is part of the NACA network, notes that commission members had "heard" that existing affiliated schools were high performing but no actual data or other evidence was referenced or produced to warrant approval based on performance of the existing schools.

Furthermore, for schools that may be classified as SAM schools, the PEC misses an opportunity to probe this issue by not asking specific questions about whether and why a school believes it would qualify as a SAM school and how this will impact its performance when measured on the state grading system. The PEC made no distinction in its consideration and did not ask questions related to alternative state accountability or expectations, which would help in the decision-making process for such applicants.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Include specific questions in the application toolkit for special circumstances such as:
- Applicants whose school may qualify for SAM status and why,
- Applicants proposing a blended or virtual educational model and how it will implement this model effectively,
- Applicants that operate or are affiliated with any existing or previously closed schools; in such cases, require applicants to provide information regarding the past academic and financial performance of the identified schools.

Develop a due-diligence process to examine the track record of experienced operators and incorporate this information into staff recommendations.

1.7 DECISION ALIGNMENT

The authorizer makes application decisions that are informed by and align with documented evidence including the extent to which the plan satisfies approval criteria, and applicants demonstrate strong preparation and capacity to establish and operate a quality charter school.

ESTABLISHED: Partially Developed   **APPLIED:** Partially Developed

ANALYSIS | **ESTABLISHED**

As established, the PEC's decision alignment practices are partially developed because the PEC has not adopted any policies that set a threshold for application approval or guide the PEC's application decisions to ensure that only applications with a high likelihood of success are approved. The application evaluation rubric includes a standard for approval but, as described in earlier sections, this standard is low and is further complicated by ambiguous language included in the rubric. Despite these shortcomings, the application approval process requires the CSD to submit a recommendation, based on the rubric score and staff analysis, to the PEC. This recommendation is also posted on the PEC website prior to the final vote on the decision. In addition, through the community-input hearing, PEC members have the opportunity to vet applicants and ask additional questions. Finally the applicant is given an opportunity to respond to CSD's recommendation prior to the PEC's vote.

ANALYSIS | **APPLIED**

As applied, the PEC's decision alignment is partially developed. While four of the most recent six applications resulted in decision alignment between the CSD and the PEC, two applications that the CSD recommended for denial were ultimately approved by the PEC. In all instances, some commissioners referenced staff analyses in their decisions. However, when asked about why decisions varied, some commissioners commented that the current CSD used "different criteria" when evaluating the schools and felt that they needed to conduct their own analyses to determine whether the application met the standard for approval. Some commission members were unaware that the application rubric had been approved by the PEC or that it was currently being used by the CSD.

This lack of consensus between the PEC and the CSD staff about what constitutes the standard for approval is evident in the cases in which the PEC voted against the staff recommendation. In these cases, the commissioners determined that sections noted as not meeting expectations in the staff recommendation did meet expectations, according to their interpretation of the standard for approval. Meanwhile, the publicly available rubric score shows that, according to the reviewer, only half the points in some sections were earned.

In particular, some commissioners shared their frustration with how one application had been recommended for approval by staff the year before but was ultimately denied by the PEC, only to have the applicant re-apply and then be recommended for denial. Even though the CSD and the PEC did not always align, when the PEC voted against staff recommendation, it requested that the applicant address "all of the deficiencies" outlined in the staff analysis and any additional deficiencies mentioned by PEC members, recognizing the value of CSD analysis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Develop and adopt an applications policy that defines the PEC's threshold for approval to ensure that only applications that demonstrate a high likelihood of success are approved.

Work with the CSD to further develop the underlying evaluation rubric and corresponding evaluation report form to ensure that the PEC and the CSD are using the same criteria to evaluate charter school applications.

Current Application Rubrics

Academics

A. School size. State the projected enrollment, grade levels to be served and student/teacher ratio.

	Included	Meets—3	Partially Meets - 2	Not included
A. School Size	The applicant provides all of the required information.			The application does not provide the required information.
	← Satisfied		Not Satisfied →	

B. Mission.

	Exceeds—8	Meets—6	Partially Meets - 2	Does Not Meet—1
B. School Mission	The mission statement incorporates **all** three questions above and therefore **meets or exceeds** the expectation by providing a **clear, cohesive, comprehensive, reasonable, and innovative** purpose for the school.	The mission statement answers most of the three questions above and therefore **meets** the expectation at an appropriate level by providing a **clear and reasonable** purpose for the school.	The mission statement does not adequately address the three questions above and therefore **partially meets** expectations.	The mission statement is **inadequate or incomplete.** --OR-- The application **does not respond** to this prompt.

C. Indicators/Goal(s) Related to the School's Mission.

	Ranking			
	← Satisfied		Not Satisfied →	
	Exceeds—12	Meets—9	Partially Meets - 2	Does Not Meet- 1
C.(1) Goal(s) Related to the School's Mission	The applicant includes **all key elements** in the indicators/goals provided. As such, the indicators/goals reflect the implementation of the school's mission, are in SMART format, and include measures and metrics for assessing the	The applicant includes **most of the key elements** in the indicators/goals provided. As such, the indicators/goals may somewhat reflect the implementation of the school's mission, contain most elements of the SMART format, and attempt to include measures and metrics	The applicant includes **some or a limited amount of the key elements** in the indicators/goals. As such, what is provided may not reflect implementation of the school's mission, may not be written in SMART format, and/or the measures and metrics provided are unclear.	The applicant's response to the indicators/goals are **inadequate or incomplete.** --OR-- The applicant **does not state** indicators/goals.

progress toward achievement of each goal/indicator.	for assessing the progress toward achievement of each goal/indicator.		

D. Curriculum, Instructional Program, Student Performance Standards.

	Ranking			
	◄————————— Satisfied	Not Satisfied —————————►		
	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	Partially Meets - 2	Does Not Meet—1
D.(1) Academic Program & Curriculum	The description provided has the potential to raise the achievement of the intended student population. What is provided **is research-based, clear, comprehensive, cohesive, reasonable, and innovative, and clearly** aligns with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission. **--OR--** If not fully developed, the applicant has provided and described a **clear, comprehensive, and reasonable timeline and plan** for its development, including identification of responsible staff and deadlines and assurances and plans for aligning with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission.	The description provided is **clear and reasonable** and mostly aligns with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission. **--OR—** If not fully developed, the applicant has provided a **clear timeline and plan** for its development, including identification of responsible staff and deadlines and assurances and plans for aligning with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission.	The description provided is **limited** and **does not** support **or partially** supports CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission. **--OR—** If not fully developed, the applicant has provided a **limited timeline and plan** for its development, including **limited identification** of responsible staff and deadlines and assurances and plans for aligning with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission.	The description OR the timeline provided is **incomplete or inadequate**. --OR-- The application **does not respond** to this prompt.

E. Graduation Requirements.

	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	Partially Meets - 2	Does Not Meet—1
E.(1) (2) Graduation Requirements /Graduation Waiver If Necessary – *High Schools Only*	*Only applicable for high school proposals* High school graduation requirements are clearly articulated and meet state requirements. Any change proposed by the school that vary from state minimum requirement are clearly explained.			*Only applicable for high school proposals* The application does not address graduation requirements.

F. Instruction.

	Ranking			
	← Satisfied	Not Satisfied →		
	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	Partially Meets - 2	Does Not Meet—1
F(1) Strategies/Methods	The school provides a **clear, comprehensive, and cohesive** overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that **clearly** support and align with the school's mission, curriculum, instructional program, and performance standards.	The school provides a **clear** overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that **adequately** support and align with the school's mission, curriculum, instructional program, and performance standards.	The school provides a **limited** overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that **partially or do not** support and align with the school's mission, curriculum, instructional program, and performance standards.	The school's overview of instructional strategies and methods is **incomplete or inadequate.** --OR-- The application **does not address** instructional strategies.

	Ranking			
	← Satisfied	Not Satisfied →		
	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	Partially Meets - 2	Does Not Meet—1

D.(5) School Day/Year	The school provides a calendar and schedule that **completely comply** with **all** state requirements and ensure **effective, successful** implementation of the educational program/curriculum. The school provides a **detailed description** of how the calendar optimally supports high achieving outcomes for the target student population.	The school provides a calendar and schedule that comply with **most** state requirements and are sufficient to ensure **successful** implementation of the educational program/ curriculum. The school provides **some detail** regarding how the calendar supports high achieving outcomes for the target student population.	The school provides a calendar and schedule that comply with **some** state requirements. The school provides **few details** regarding how the calendar supports the target student population.	The school provides an **incomplete or inadequate** calendar and schedule that may or may not comply with state requirements. --OR-- The application **does not address** a school calendar and schedule.

Proposed Revisions to Current Rubrics

Academics

A. School size. State the projected enrollment, grade levels to be served and student/teacher ratio.

	Meets—3 ~~Included~~	~~Meets—3~~	~~Partially Meets—2~~	Does Not Meet - 2 ~~Not included~~
A. School Size	The applicant provides all of the required information and the information is consistent with the remaining sections of the application.			The application ~~does not~~ provides some, but not all of the required information. OR The information is not consistent with all of the remaining sections of the application.
		← Satisfied	Not Satisfied →	

B. Mission.

	Exceeds—8	Meets—6	~~Partially Meets~~Does Not Meet - 2	~~Does Not Meet~~Falls Far Below—1
B. School Mission	~~The mission statement incorporates **all** three questions above and therefore **meets or exceeds** the expectation by providing a **clear, cohesive, comprehensive, reasonable, and innovative** purpose for the school.~~ The response identifies what the school will accomplish and reasonably explains how it will achieve that goal. The response also explicitly addresses what is innovative or unique about the school. Further, the	The response identifies what the school will accomplish and reasonably explains how it will achieve that goal. The response also explicitly addresses what is innovative or unique about the school. ~~The mission statement answers most of the three questions above and therefore **meets** the expectation at an appropriate level by providing a **clear and reasonable** purpose for the school.~~	~~The mission statement does not adequately address the three questions above and therefore **partially meets** expectations~~The response identifies what the school will accomplish and reasonably explains how it will achieve that goal, but it does not explicitly address what is innovative or unique.	~~The mission statement is **inadequate or incomplete.**~~ ~~--OR--~~ ~~The application **does not respond** to this prompt.~~The response is not consistent with all of the remaining sections of the application. OR The mission statement is contrary to the law. OR The response is inconsistent in that the goal cannot reasonably be achieved through the program proposed.

mission and proposed program is directly aligned to specific identified educational needs established by the PEC and/or the PED.			

C. Indicators/Goal(s) Related to the School's Mission.

	Ranking			
	Satisfied		Not Satisfied	
	Exceeds—12	Meets—9	~~Partially Meets~~Does Not Meet - 2	~~Does Not Meet~~Falls Far Below- 1
C.(1) Goal(s) Related to the School's Mission	The goals proposed measure specific outcomes aligned to what the applicant proposes the school will achieve in its mission. AND The goals meet each element of the SMART criteria. (e.g., the response provides evidence to demonstrate the rigor of the proposed targets). AND The goals identify the specific targets for each rating of "Exceeds", "Meets", "Does Not Meet" and "Falls Far Below" AND The goals are aligned to research based outcomes that are proven to align with improved student achievement. ~~The applicant includes **all key elements** in the indicators/goals~~	The goals proposed measure specific outcomes aligned to what the applicant proposes the school will achieve in its mission. AND The goals meet each element of the SMART criteria. (e.g., the response provides evidence to demonstrate the rigor of the proposed targets). AND The goals identify the specific targets for each rating of "Exceeds", "Meets", "Does Not Meet" and "Falls Far Below".~~The applicant includes **most of the key elements** in the indicators/goals provided. As such, the indicators/goals may somewhat reflect the implementation of the school's mission, contain most elements of the SMART format, and attempt to include~~	~~The applicant includes **some or a limited amount of the key elements** in the indicators/goals. As such, what is provided may not reflect implementation of the school's mission, may not be written in SMART format, and/or the measures and metrics provided are unclear.~~ The goals proposed measure specific outcomes aligned to what the applicant proposes the school will achieve in its mission. However, the goals do not meet each element of the SMART criteria. (e.g., the response does not provide evidence to demonstrate the rigor of the proposed targets) AND/OR The goals do not identify the specific targets for each rating of "Exceeds", "Meets", "Does Not Meet" and "Falls Far	The goals proposed do not measure specific outcome aligned to what the applicant proposes the school will achieve in its mission. AND/OR The goals proposed include only math and reading short cycle goals. ~~The applicant's response to the indicators/goals are **inadequate or incomplete.**~~ ~~--OR--~~ ~~The applicant **does not state** indicators/goals.~~

19

provided. As such, the indicators/goals reflect the implementation of the school's mission, are in SMART format, and include measures and metrics for assessing the progress toward achievement of each goal/indicator.	measures and metrics for assessing the progress toward achievement of each goal/indicator.	Below".	

D. Curriculum, Instructional Program, Student Performance Standards.

	Ranking			
	Satisfied ◄————————	Not Satisfied ————————►		
	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	Partially MeetsDoes Not Meet - 2	Does Not MeetFalls Far Below—1
D.(1) Academic Program & Curriculum	The description provided has the potential to raise the achievement of the intended student population. What is provided is research-based, clear, comprehensive, cohesive, reasonable, and innovative, and clearly aligns with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission. —OR— If not fully developed, the applicant has provided and described a clear, comprehensive, and reasonable timeline and plan for its development, including identification of responsible staff and deadlines and assurances and plans for aligning with CCSS, NM Content	The response describes a curriculum that is explicitly aligned to the New Mexico Common Core State Standards and New Mexico Content Standards. AND The response describes a curriculum that is explicitly aligned to the school's mission. AND The response provides peer reviewed research to support the effectiveness of the proposed curriculum or provides a detailed description of prior experience demonstrating success with the curriculum. AND The response provides a plan for the development of the entire curriculum that	The description provided is limited and does not support or partially supports CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission. —OR— If not fully developed, the applicant has provided a limited timeline and plan for its development, including limited identification of responsible staff and deadlines and assurances and plans for aligning with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission. The response describes a curriculum that is explicitly aligned to the New Mexico Common Core State Standards and	The description OR the timeline provided is incomplete or inadequate. --OR-- The application does not respond to this prompt.The response describes a curriculum that is not explicitly aligned to the New Mexico Common Core State Standards and New Mexico Content Standards. AND/OR The response describes a curriculum that is not explicitly aligned to the school's mission. AND/OR The response references either no research or in order to support the effectiveness of the

Formatted: Left

Standards, and the school's mission. The response describes a curriculum that is explicitly aligned to the New Mexico Common Core State Standards and New Mexico Content Standards. AND The response describes a curriculum that is explicitly aligned to the school's mission. AND The response provides peer reviewed research to support the effectiveness of the proposed curriculum. AND The response provides a plan for the development of the entire curriculum that contains specific actions steps, identifies responsible parties, and identifies deadlines that will result in the curriculum being fully developed prior to the start of the first year of school and includes processes for refining and evaluating the curriculum throughout each school year.	contains specific actions steps, identifies responsible parties, and identifies deadlines that will result in the curriculum being fully developed prior to the start of the semester in which it is to be implemented. ~~The description provided is **clear and reasonable** and mostly aligns with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission.~~ **—OR—** ~~If not fully developed, the applicant has provided a **clear timeline and plan** for its development, including identification of responsible staff and deadlines and assurances and plans for aligning with CCSS, NM Content Standards, and the school's mission.~~	New Mexico Content Standards. AND The response describes a curriculum that is explicitly aligned to the school's mission. AND The response provides peer reviewed research to support the effectiveness of the proposed curriculum or provides a detailed description of prior experience demonstrating success with the curriculum. However, the response provides a plan for the development of the entire curriculum that either does not contain specific actions steps, or does not identify responsible parties, or does not identify deadlines that will result in the curriculum being fully developed prior to the start of the semester in which it is to be implemented.	curriculum the response references research provided by a specific vendor to support their off the shelf curriculum.

E. Graduation Requirements. *Only applicable for high school proposals*

	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	~~Partially Meets~~Does Not Meet - 2	~~Does Not Meet~~Falls Far Below—1

E.(1) (2) Graduation Requirements /Graduation Waiver If Necessary – High Schools Only			
Only applicable for high school proposals High school graduation requirements are clearly articulated and meet state requirements. Any change proposed by the school that vary from state minimum requirement are clearly explained. The response Identifies graduation requirements for the school that meet State requirements; describes with detail a viable and adequate process and criteria for awarding course credit, ensures consistency with the curriculum described in the prior response, and provide a menu of course offerings which include course titles and brief descriptions of classes consistent with State requirements and demonstrated alignment to the Program of Instruction, and aligns with the Business Plan as presented in the application package. The response includes additional requirements that vary from state minimum requirement, which are clearly explained and meaningfully enhance the rigor of the education program and the college and career readiness of the student.	The response Identifies graduation requirements for the school that meet State requirements; describes with detail a viable and adequate process and criteria for awarding course credit, ensures consistency with the curriculum described in the prior response, and provide a menu of course offerings which include course titles and brief descriptions of classes consistent with State requirements and demonstrated alignment to the Program of Instruction, and aligns with the Business Plan as presented in the application package.	The response Identifies graduation requirements for the school that meet State requirements; ensures consistency with the curriculum described in the prior response, and provide a menu of course offerings which include course titles and brief descriptions of classes consistent with State requirements and demonstrated alignment to the Program of Instruction, and aligns with the Business Plan as presented in the application package. However, the response does not describe with detail a viable and adequate process and criteria for awarding course credit AND/OR does not provide demonstrated alignment to the Program of Instruction and/or the Business Plan as presented in the application Package,	*The response does not comply with state requirements.* *Only applicable for high school proposals* The application does not address graduation requirements.

Formatted Table

F. Instruction.

	Ranking			
	Satisfied		Not Satisfied	
	Exceeds—4	Meets—3	~~Partially Meets~~Does Not Meet - 2	~~Does Not Meet~~Falls Far Below—1
F(1) Strategies/Methods	The response provides a detailed description of the school's philosophical approach to improving pupil achievement in the target population, incorporates methods, principles or concepts fundamental to the school's proposed program of instruction, presents a rationale for the selected approach for the target population, including research and/or experience, and ensures the Mission Statement is consistent with the narrative. The response is aligned to specific identified educational needs established by the PEC and/or the PED. ~~The school provides a **clear, comprehensive, and cohesive** overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that **clearly** support and align with the school's mission, curriculum, instructional program, and performance standards.~~	The response provides a detailed description of the school's philosophical approach to improving pupil achievement in the target population, incorporates methods, principles or concepts fundamental to the school's proposed program of instruction, presents a rationale for the selected approach for the target population, including research and/or experience, and ensures the Mission Statement is consistent with the narrative.~~The school provides a **clear** overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that **adequately** support and align with the school's mission, curriculum, instructional program, and performance standards.~~	The response provides a detailed description of the school's philosophical approach to improving pupil achievement in the target population, incorporates methods, principles or concepts fundamental to the school's proposed program of instruction, presents a rationale for the selected approach for the target population, and ensures the Mission Statement is consistent with the narrative. However, the response does not reference or include research and/or successful prior experience, ~~The school provides a **limited** overview of the instructional strategies and methods to be implemented that **partially or do not** support and align with the school's mission, curriculum, instructional program, and performance standards.~~	~~The school's overview of instructional strategies and methods is **incomplete or inadequate.** OR The application **does not address** instructional strategies.~~The response is not consistent with the Mission Statement, goals, curriculum, or other sections of the application. OR The response does not reasonably address how the approach will improve pupil achievement in the target population.

Application	2015

Ranking			
Satisfied		Not Satisfied	
Exceeds—4	Meets—3	~~Partially Meets~~Does Not Meet - 2	~~Does Not Meet~~Falls Far Below—1

Formatted Table

| D.(5) School Day/Year | The response demonstrates compliance with hours/minutes of instruction for each grade level served for the proposed school calendar (standard, alternative, or extended); aligns with the proposed mission, curriculum, and educational philosophy, provides a reasonable rationale for the weekly schedule that supports improving pupil achievement in the target population, Identifies professional development opportunities consistent with the information provided in the remainder of the application, and (If an Alternative Calendar was identified on the Target Population Page) demonstrates the various ways instructional minutes may be met. Additionally, the schedule thoughtfully expands learning opportunities by extending the instructional time and access for students. ~~The school provides a calendar and schedule that **completely comply** with **all** state requirements and ensure **effective, successful** implementation of the educational program/curriculum. The school provides a **detailed description** of how the calendar optimally supports high achieving outcomes for the target student population.~~ | The response demonstrates compliance with hours/minutes of instruction for each grade level served for the proposed school calendar (standard, alternative, or extended); aligns with the proposed mission, curriculum, and educational philosophy, provides a reasonable rationale for the weekly schedule that supports improving pupil achievement in the target population, Identifies professional development opportunities consistent with the information provided in the remainder of the application, and (If an Alternative Calendar was identified on the Target Population Page) demonstrates the various ways instructional minutes may be met. ~~The school provides a calendar and schedule that comply with **most** state requirements and are sufficient to ensure **successful** implementation of the educational program/ curriculum. The school provides **some detail** regarding how the calendar supports high achieving outcomes for the target student population.~~ | The response demonstrates compliance with hours/minutes of instruction for each grade level served for the proposed school calendar (standard, alternative, or extended); aligns with the proposed mission, curriculum, and educational philosophy, and (If an Alternative Calendar was identified on the Target Population Page) demonstrates the various ways instructional minutes may be met. However, the response does not provide a reasonable rationale for the weekly schedule that supports improving pupil achievement in the target population, and or does not Identify professional development opportunities consistent with the information provided in the remainder of the application, ~~The school provides a calendar and schedule that comply with **some** state requirements. The school provides **few details**~~ | The response does not clearly demonstrate compliance with hours/minutes of instruction for each grade level served for the proposed school calendar (standard, alternative, or extended)~~The school provides an **incomplete or inadequate** calendar and schedule that may or may not comply with state requirements.~~ --OR-- ~~The application **does not address** a school calendar and schedule.~~ |

Application	2015

Proposed Restructuring of Rubrics

Meets the Criteria **100% of total points**	• All required elements present • Sufficient detail to demonstrate capacity • Consistent with other sections, including budget • Coherent and easily understood
Approaches the Criteria **50% of total points**	• Some, but not all required elements present • Insufficient detail to fully understand proposal • Slightly inconsistent with other sections • Does not clearly meet criteria
Falls Far Below the Criteria **0 points**	• Criteria not addressed • None of the required elements present • Contradicts other sections, or substantially inconsistent with other sections • Insufficient detail to evaluate • Demonstrates lack of capacity (e.g, violates/conflicts with law, is incoherent or cannot be understood, is patently unreasonable)

Minimum Scoring Expectations –
- No response may be evaluated as Falls Far Below; and
- No more than one response in each Framework (Academic, Organizational, Financial, Evidence of Support) may be evaluated as Approaching; and
- 95% of the responses in each Framework must be evaluated as Meets.

III. Financial Framework

A. (1)	Provide, and attach as Appendix F, a completed 910B5 State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) Computation Revenue Estimate Worksheet using appropriate values and computations for each year of the 5-year budget plan (use current unit value and for Special Education, please budget the state average of 15%). Ensure that your worksheet clearly demonstrates your understanding of, and your capacity to implement New Mexico public school funding.	A complete response must: • Include a complete 910B5 Worksheet in Appendix F • Use appropriate values and computations in each year • Use current unit value • Budget 15% for Special Education • Demonstrate an understanding of, and capacity to implement New Mexico public school funding
A.(2)	Provide, and attach as Appendix G, a proposed five-year budget plan based on the 910B5 SEG Revenue Worksheet, that clearly supports the proposed school's mission and aligns with the proposed school's five- year growth plan, including staffing, facilities, educational program, and services. Ensure that your draft budget clearly demonstrates the financial capacity and long-term sustainability of the proposed school (consider your growth plan, including staffing, facilities, educational program, mission etc.).	A complete response must: • Include a five-year budget plan in Appendix G that is based on the 910B5 SEG Revenue Worksheet from Appendix F • Support the proposed school's mission • Align with the proposed school's five- year growth plan • Budget 15% for Special Education • Demonstrate financial capacity • Demonstrate long-term sustainability of the proposed school
A.(3)	Provide a clear, comprehensive, cohesive, and reasonable budget narrative that explains basic assumptions, how those were determined based on reliable sources, and identifies all priorities that are consistent with the proposed school's mission, educational program, staffing, and facility. The budget narrative demonstrates the proposed school's thorough understanding of the budget and of budgeting.	A complete response must: • Explain basic assumptions • Identify reliable sources for each assumption • Include priorities consistent with the proposed school's mission • Include priorities consistent with the proposed school's educational program

		• Include priorities consistent with the proposed school's staffing
		• Include priorities consistent with the proposed school's facility
		• Demonstrate a thorough understanding of the budget and of budgeting
A. (4)	Provide a clear and meaningful description of what budget adjustments will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges. Ensure that your explanations provide clear evidence that the adjustments are viable and realistic. The suggested budget control strategies demonstrate capacity to manage the budget successfully. Provide a narrative description of how the proposed school will modify the budget when there are students with special education needs currently attending the proposed school, but under the funding formula the proposed school will only receive additional funding during the next school year. Provide a narrative description of how the proposed school will address the budget in the event that the proposed school has budgeted for more students, based on early enrollment, than actually enroll in the proposed school at the beginning of the proposed school year.	A complete response must: • Describe budget control strategies **as well as** budget adjustments that will be made to meet financial budget and cash-flow challenges • Include explanations that are viable and realistic • Demonstrate capacity to manage the budget successfully • Address how special education students will receive services ***before*** special education funding is provided based on accurate 40 day counts • Address how gaps between budgeted students and actual enrollment will be addressed

B.(1)	Provide a description of the internal control procedures the proposed school will utilize to safeguard assets, segregate its payroll and other check disbursement duties, provide reliable financial information, promote operational efficiency and ensure compliance with all applicable federal and state statues, regulations,	A complete response must:
		
		• Describe internal control procedures the proposed school will utilize to:
		    o safeguard assets,
		    o segregate its payroll
		    o segregate check disbursement duties,

	and rules relative to the proposed school's procedures	o provide reliable financial information, o promote operational efficiency and o ensure compliance with all applicable federal and state statues, regulations, and rules
B. (2)	Identify the appropriate staff to perform financial tasks, and ensure that the staff positions are completely supported in the organizational structure/chart and in the budget. Clearly provide the qualifications and responsibilities for those positions. Include evidence of a clear plan (i.e., job search process, timelines etc.) to hire and evaluate highly- qualified staff no later than two weeks prior to the start of the proposed school year.	A complete response must: • Identify the appropriate staff to perform each financial task identified in the response to B(1) and all other required financial tasks • Align completely with the organizational chart from response to D(1) in the Organizational Framework • Align completely with the budget in A(1) and A(2) responses in Financial Framework • Describe appropriate qualifications and responsibilities for each of the identified positions • Include a plan that will result in the recruitment, identification, and evaluation of candidates and the hiring of highly- qualified staff for each of the identified positions no later than two weeks prior to the start of the proposed school year

B.(3)	Provide a clear, comprehensive, and cohesive plan for how the Governing Body will provide proper legal and fiscal oversight, include the responsibilities of the state-required audit and finance committees, and explain how these committees will operate in the proposed school's overall governance and management.	A complete response must:
		
		• Describe how the Governing Body audit and finance committees will be formed and how they will:
		
		   o Function generally
		
		   o Ensure proper legal oversight
		
		   o Ensure proper financial oversight
		
		• Describe how the proposed school's audit and finance committees will interact with the school's management
		
		• Describe how the audit and finance committees will interact with the full Governing Body