

APPENDIX A

- 1. Recommendation Report**
- 2. Scoring Rubric**

ARIZONA STATE BOARD FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS

CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION RECOMMENDATION REPORT 2019

NOVEMBER 4, 2019

New Charter Application for

C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence

Submitted by

C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence, Inc.

Report Summary

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Recommendation: Deny | | | | | |
| Applicant Name: | | C.O.R.E Academy of Excellence, Inc. | | | |
| Proposed School Name: | | C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence | | | |
| Grades Served Year 1: | 9-12 | Grades Served Year 2: | 9-12 | Grades Served Year 3: | 9-12 |
| Location: | Near North Silverbell Road and North Continental Reserve Loop, in Marana, Pima County, Arizona. | | | | |
| Mission Statement: | <p>C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence is established to provide successful outcomes throughout life by providing a solid foundation. The mission statement reads: The CORE mission is to challenge and develop each scholar to reach his or her full intellectual, creative and physical potential through an integrated Classical curriculum.</p> <p>The CORE mission is to teach and challenge the whole student through a rigorous education, rooted in the time-tested teachings passed down through history.</p> <p>The CORE mission is to model and instruct scholars to build strong character-based values needed to contribute wisdom, courage, and leadership to society.</p> | | | | |

Section Scores

A substantively complete application package meets the following scoring requirements:

- No evaluation criteria receive a score of falls below the expectations; and
- No more than one evaluation area in each section is scored as approaching; and
- 95 percent of the evaluation areas in each plan (educational, operational, business) score at the meets level.

| | <u>Preliminary TRP Scores</u> | | <u>Revised TRP Scores</u> | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Any falls below the expectations ratings? | Yes | | No | |
| More than one evaluation area in each section scored approaches? | Yes | | Yes | |
| | | Section Score | | Section Score |
| Educational Plan Score \geq 95%? | No | 49.61% | No | 64.33% |
| Operational Plan Score \geq 95%? | No | 60.71% | No | 92.86% |
| Business Plan Score \geq 95%? | No | 59.09% | No | 94.55% |

In-Person Interview Summary

The Applicant team present for the interview included:

- Joseph Higgins, CEO of the C.O.R.E Academy of Excellence, Inc. corporate board
- Dr. Dan Ranieri, Chairperson of the C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence governing body
- Paul De Weerd, the identified principal of the school
- David Towne, the identified curriculum, data, and professional development specialist for the school

Prior to the interview, the TRP identified two major areas of concern to be addressed by the

Applicant. The first was the lack of a complete Academic Systems Plan. The second was the challenge of locating and recruiting staff qualified for instruction in a Classical Education model while also qualified to coach in a competitive athletic program. Without an Academic Systems Plan the Applicant had no process for ensuring that the educational model would be implemented with fidelity or effectively. Further, the TRP was aware that the Charter Board staff relies upon the Academic Systems Plan during site visits to identify specific processes and documentation that should be available from the school to demonstrate that the school is implementing the program of instruction described in the charter holder's contract. Without an ASP, school leadership will lack a plan to guide essential educational operations of the school. Given the rigorous and structured nature of a classical education model, TRP members were aware that significant training would likely be required for newly hired staff. Based on the staffing plan, it appeared that classroom teachers would also likely be coaching an after school sport. This led to concerns regarding the ability to locate staff capable of implementing the classical education model and also talented in coaching in what was described as a competitive athletic program.

Academic Systems Plan

In order for the TRP to have confidence that the Applicant team has capacity to implement their proposed school model, the Applicant team must be able to provide a detailed Academic Systems Plan. In the initial evaluation, the TRP provided the Applicant with technical assistance comments clearly stating "No action steps were provided" for multiple areas of Part A.5 Academic Systems Plan. Upon reviewing the revised application, the TRP was surprised to see that the ASP still lacked action steps for multiple areas. In order to determine the Applicant's capacity to create and implement a detailed Academic Systems Plan, the TRP began the interview with several questions related to the ASP (Capacity Interview 9:41; 13:27; 16:15). The Applicant provided broad and general descriptions of processes and activities that school administrators would be expected to implement (Capacity Interview 10:43; 14:20; 16:15). Unfortunately, the Applicant's responses did not provide the TRP with action steps, leaving the TRP with no clear understanding of the specific action steps the Applicant plans to follow regarding the implementation of its educational model. Further, Paul De Weerd, who has been identified as the school principal has no experience in a classical education model (Capacity Interview 37:15).

In an attempt to understand why the Applicant was unable to use the information in the technical assistance comments provided by the TRP to adequately revise the Academic Systems Plan, the TRP asked the Applicant if they had attended any training provided by the Charter Board staff or the Arizona Charter Schools Association. The Applicant stated that it had received support from the Arizona Charter School Association (Capacity Interview 30:55). The TRP is concerned that the Applicant did not seek assistance from Charter Board Staff. The capacity of the Applicant to successfully implement its plan is questionable when it does not utilize resources available to it, particularly when receiving an evaluation that indicates an application that was significantly far from meeting the Board's criteria, and fails to meet that criteria on its own.

Without an Academic Systems Plan to provide the framework and accountability mechanism for the implementation of the educational plan, and a school principal that has no experience leading a classical education school, the TRP has strong concerns regarding the Applicant's ability to successfully implement its educational plan.

Staffing Plan

The organizational chart (B.3 Management & Operations page 1) indicates that coaches are a stipend funded position. Section C.3 Personnel provides a staffing plan (page 1) that also identifies coaches as a stipend funded position, but also indicates that in year one there will be eight coaching positions. The narrative goes on to state that “C.O.R.E Academy of Excellence may have 50% to 38% of its full-time teachers also serving a head coach” (C.3 Personnel page 12). Based on a large percentage of the teachers also coaching in a program with “a strong emphasis on quality athletics” (C.3 Personnel page 12), the TRP had concerns about the Applicant’s ability to locate, recruit, and hire sufficient staff that meet these qualifications. During the interview the TRP asked the Applicant where it was going to find teachers that met these qualifications (Capacity Interview 33:00). The Applicant stated that there are only a few colleges that produce great classical educators, and they are not located in Arizona. Their plan is to take people that have a heart for kids and are coachable, and train them (Capacity Interview 33:45). There will be a three day pre-service training provided before the start of the school year, and additional training and coaching will occur throughout the school year. The Applicant is aware that recruitment of teachers is a challenge across the state (Capacity Interview 38:11). The Applicant intends to create an appealing culture at the school that will draw teachers to it (Capacity Interview 39:03). As for the athletic coaches, the Applicant stated that “there are a ton of really good coaches” (Capacity Interview 41:30) and that most of the schools in the area do not keep those coaches. The Applicant feels confident that it will be able to recruit several high quality, experienced coaches from the area. The Applicant also anticipates recruiting coaches from club sports teams and that those coaches will bring some of their athletes with them to the school (Capacity Interview 42:15). The Applicant also clarified that not all coaches will be teachers, and not all teachers will be coaching. The clarification that the Applicant provided addressed the TRP’s concerns.

TRP Qualitative Analysis Summary

The TRP recommends that the application for C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence be denied because the Applicant failed to demonstrate capacity to effectively implement the educational plan due to the lack of a clearly articulated Academic Systems Plan.

The educational plan did not meet the Board’s criteria. The educational plan provided clear descriptions of the educational philosophy and program of instruction. Although several members of the Applicant team have experience in a classical education environment, the identified school leader has no experience and limited knowledge of a classical education model for high school. Additionally, the teaching staff will likely lack experience in this particular educational model. With so much training focusing on the core elements of classical education, there is greater need for a clear plan with detailed action steps to guide teachers and administrators in their areas of responsibility. Without the structure of a complete Academic Systems Plan to guide academic operations, the TRP does not see the capacity of the Applicant to effectively implement the classical education model described in the application.

The operational plan did not meet the Board’s criteria. The issues identified by the TRP were sufficiently addressed and clarified during the interview. The Applicant has a clear understanding of the staffing and management needs of a school. The plan, as indicated in the enrollment goals (C.2 Marketing and Enrollment) is to start as a school serving only 9th and 10th grade in its initial year,

and add one grade level each subsequent year. The facility plans mirror this with a three phase plan for growth to ensure the facilities align with the needs of the school. This prevents incurring costs for unused space in the first years of operation.

The business plan did not meet the Board’s criteria. The TRP had concerns regarding staffing. The Applicant addressed the TRP’s concerns regarding the need for classically trained teachers as well as coaches. The TRP did express concern that no custodial services are provided during the start-up period. The Applicant stated that existing staff will provide custodial services, and that this method has worked for them in the past. The TRP still remains concerned about the cleanliness of the facility without contracted custodial staff to maintain the facility used by the Applicant team and staff during the lengthy start-up period.

Educational Plan

| | Preliminary TRP Scores | Revised TRP Scores |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| Educational Plan Score ≥ 95%? | No | No |
| Number of “Falls Below” ratings | 0 | 0 |
| Number of “Approaches” ratings | 44 | 31 |

Plan Summary

The Applicant intends to provide a classical education for high school students in the northern suburbs of Marana within the greater metro area of Tucson. According to the Applicant this area was “ranked as the third fastest growing market in Arizona for 2019 by Census’s American Community Survey” (A.2 Target Population page 1). The composition of the population in Marana is 82% White, 23% Hispanic, 5% Asian, 2% Black, and .5% Native American (A.2 page 4). The Applicant describes this area as being “severely underserved by high school charter school options” (A.2 Target Population page 1). Three community feeder schools were identified - Legacy Traditional, Leman Academy Marana, and Leman Academy Oro Valley (A.2 page 5).

In its first year of operation, the school will serve 9th and 10th grade. 11th grade will be added in the second year of operation, with 12th grade following in the third year of operation (C.2 Marketing and Enrollment Page 1). There are limited choices for students in this area as there are no public high schools offering a classical education model at this time (A.2 Target Population page 1).

C.O.R.E Academy of Excellence will offer a character-based high school with a classical education model. The school day will begin at 7:30 am and end at 3:14 pm (A.4 page 1). The school will operate on a 180 day calendar running from August to May (A.4 pp 4-6).

Instruction will be based on thematic units of study focusing on historical time periods. In addition to focusing on the great works of classical literature, students will also receive Latin language instruction. The Saxon Math program will be used due to its alignment with the school’s philosophical approach (A.3 pp 1-2).

Student mastery of concepts will be assessed with NWEA Map benchmark assessments, assessments within the Saxon Math program, and teacher based exams in every course (A.3 pp 5-7).

Analysis

The educational plan approaches the criteria for approval because the Applicant failed to provide a complete Academic Systems Plan. The Applicant did sufficiently address nearly all other components of the educational plan, which demonstrates an understanding of the key components of a high school. Although the Applicant was able to demonstrate an understanding of the operations and functions of a school, both in the application and during the interview, the TRP recognizes that there is a significant difference between being able to describe the general processes within a school and being able to create a detailed and comprehensive action plan that identifies measurable action steps, specific time frames for task completion, and describes concrete documentation that would serve as evidence to demonstrate implementation of all components of an action step. As described in the In-Person Interview Summary above, the TRP has concerns regarding the Applicant's capacity to effectively implement the proposed educational plan without a complete Academic Systems Plan.

Operational Plan

| | Preliminary TRP Scores | Revised TRP Scores |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Operational Plan Score \geq 95%? | No | No |
| Number of "Falls Below" ratings | 0 | 0 |
| Number of "Approaches" ratings | 8 | 1 |

Plan Summary

The corporate board of directors and school governing body will be one and the same. The bylaws state that the corporate board of directors shall include at least three members (B.1 Applicant Entity p. 21). Four members of the governing body are identified in the application:

- Christopher Collins
- Daniel Ranieri
- Mark Morris
- Ray Schneider

Brief biographies for each are provided in the application package describing their experiences and involvement in the local community (B.1 Applicant Entity, pp. 1-3).

The governing body will hire a Chief Executive Officer to provide oversight of the school (B.2 School Governing Board page 1). The CEO identified in the application is Joe Higgins. Biographical information for Mr. Higgins clearly identifies relevant experience providing oversight of a charter school (B.1 Applicant Entity, p 3).

In year two, a school advisory council will be created. This advisory council will include members from the school community and advise the governing body.

The organization chart (B.3 Management and Operations, page 1) indicates that the school principal reports to the Chief Executive Officer, who in turn reports to the school governing body. The CEO will provide oversight of contracted business services, while the Principal will provide oversight of contracted education services.

The Applicant identified contracted education services for curriculum, professional development,

assessment, and special education services.

In addition, the applicant intends to contract services for:

- Payroll
- Marketing
- Legal
- CPA Audit
- IT & computer systems
- Landscaping services

Qualifications and quotes from specific vendors were provided in the application (B.3.2 Contracted Services, pp. 4-6).

Analysis

The operational plan approaches the criteria for approval. The TRP identified one area that approached the criteria and the operational plan was below 95%. The TRP had questions regarding the organizational chart and reporting structure provided in the application. The Applicant was able to provide clarification that addressed the TRPs questions (Capacity Interview 52:20).

The Applicant described critical skills and experience for essential positions that demonstrate a clear understanding of the fundamental functions of a school. The areas of responsibility include essential functions for the day-to-day operations of a school.

The TRP did have concerns that no custodial services are provided during the start-up period of operation. The Applicant stated that this is how they operated for the start-up of previous schools, and that there were no issues.

Business Plan

| | <u>Preliminary TRP Scores</u> | <u>Revised TRP Scores</u> |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Business Plan Score \geq 95%?</u> | No | No |
| <u>Number of "Falls Below" ratings</u> | 2 | 0 |
| <u>Number of "Approaches" ratings</u> | 13 | 2 |

Plan Summary

Proposed

Location:

Near North Silverbell Road and North Continental Reserve Loop, in Marana, Pima County, Arizona. The Applicant is working with Schoolhouse Development, LLC through a Build to Suit Lease and Purchase Option on a newly built school facility.

Facilities

Requirements:

The facility will go through two phases within the first three years. In Phase One the school will open with 24 classrooms and one gymnasium. 19 classrooms will be full-sized classrooms with the remaining classrooms being small rooms located next to and within the gymnasium. In Phase Two an additional 10 classrooms and second gym will be added.

Budget Summary

| | Startup Period | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Projected Enrollment: | N/A | 400 | 600 | 775 |
| Total Revenue: | \$350,000 | \$3,836,976 | \$4,217,691 | \$5,447,849 |
| Total Expenditures: | \$350,000 | \$3,372,351.32 | \$4,455,963 | \$5,276,194.98 |
| Ending Balance: | \$0 | \$464,624.68 | \$226,352.36 | \$398,006.37 |

The Applicant is working with Schoolhouse Development, LLC through a Build to Suit Lease and Purchase option. Schoolhouse Development provides financing for facility development and start-up costs. The budget includes a lease rate of 8.5% of total development costs (C.1 Facilities Acquisition, p. 1).

If approved, construction is planned to start in February 2020. There is a three phase plan for construction. The phases align with projected enrollment. Phase One will be sufficient for the projected enrollment in the first two years of operation (C.1 Facilities Acquisition, pages 6-7). Phase Two will be complete for year three when the school has expanded to grades 9-12, and anticipates an enrollment of 775 students (C.2 Marketing and Student Enrollment, page 1).

The marketing and advertising plan includes print, online, and broadcast media. The Applicant has identified multiple targeted groups for advertising and describes specific marketing tactics for each group (C.2 Marketing & Student Enrollment, page 3). A timeline for advertising was also provided. This plan includes specific enrollment goals beginning in March 2020. These goals increase monthly and reach the projected enrollment for year one in July 2020.

The Applicant has already identified a school principal. His contract will begin in May 2020. Recruitment for positions will begin in January 2020, but interviewing of teachers will not begin until May 2020, with employment agreements executed in June 2020. The Applicant states that the marketing program for teacher recruitment has been used by this leadership team in this local market in the past (C.3 Personnel, page 8).

Teachers will participate in orientation and in-service every July. The Applicant provided a list of topics addressed during orientation that cover key elements of the school's philosophical approach and key components of instruction and assessment. Ongoing professional development is also provided throughout the school year (C.3 Personnel, pages 10-11).

The budget spreadsheet completed by the applicant indicates a percentage of the maximum enrollment, which will not be reached until year 5. The amounts identified in the budget are:

Year 1 - 400 students
Year 2 - 600 students
Year 3 - 775 students

These amounts align with the enrollment goals on page 1 of C.2 Marketing & Student Enrollment. The Three Year Budget is based on 100% of projected enrollment each year and not the percentages indicated. There is a significant budget balance at the end of each year of operation as identified in the Budget Summary Table above.

Analysis

The business plan approaches the criteria for approval because the applicant failed to include the Student Services Director's salary described in the budget assumptions narrative into the three year operational budget spreadsheet. This oversight combined with one other area scored as "Approaches" put the business plan below the 95% criteria.

There is sufficient budget balance in each year to fully fund this position. During the interview the Applicant addressed the TRP's other area of concern. Based on the information contained in the business plan and discussed during the interview, the TRP has no concerns about the Applicant's business plan.

Evidence of Capacity

Applicant Summary

| Name | Role | Attended Interview? |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|
| Joseph Higgins | Corporate Board CEO | Yes |
| Paul De Weerd | School Principal | Yes |
| David Towne | Curriculum - Data - Professional Development | Yes |
| Daniel Ranieri | Governing Body Chairperson | Yes |
| Ray Schneider | Governing Body Secretary and Treasurer | No |
| Christopher Collins | Governing Body Vice President | No |
| Mark Morris | Governing Body Member | No |

Analysis

The TRP has determined that the Applicant has not demonstrated the capacity to successfully open and operate a classical education high school. The Applicant team has significant experience in the operation of schools. Relevant experience related to the operation of the Leman charter schools was shared with the TRP during the interview. However, the school principal's lack of experience in a classical education model and the lack of an Academic Systems Plan demonstrate a fundamental challenge.

Although the school principal has many years of experience operating a high school, he lacks experience in the classical education model. Without a clearly defined plan in the form of an Academic Systems Plan, the TRP has concerns that the educational model will not be implemented effectively or with fidelity.

The members of the Applicant team with experience in classical education bring to the team experience in a K-8 model. A high school model is significantly different from a K-8 model. Without a detailed action plan, in the form of a complete Academic Systems Plan, the TRP cannot be confident that the team will be successful in the operation of a new high school.

In failing to provide a complete Academic Systems Plan, it will not be possible for Board staff to monitor and evaluate the extent to which the Applicant is implementing its educational plan. Further, the fact that the Applicant did not attend training provided by Board staff or seek guidance from

Board staff regarding the deficiencies identified by the TRP in its initial application is of concern to the TRP. The TRP recommends the Board strongly consider that this team chose to move forward in a process based solely on their past track record and experience, despite significant deficiencies identified in their initial application, and did not seek out available assistance from Board staff.

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Applicant: | C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence Inc. |
| Proposed School Name: | C.O.R.E. Academy of Excellence |

Requirements for Substantive

Completeness:
 No evaluation area receives a score of Falls Below the Criteria Met

No more than one evaluation area in each section is scored as Approaches the Criteria Not Met

95% of the evaluation areas in each Plan (Educational Plan, Operational Plan, and Business Plan) score at the "Meets" level Not Met

The Application is Substantively Incomplete

PART A: Educational Plan (A.1-A.6)

Points for A.1-A.4: **27.0**

Points for A.5: **2.0**

Points for A.6: **9.6**

Total Score: **38.6**

Percentage: **64.33%**

PART B: Operational Plan (B.1-B.3)

Total Score: **26.0**

Percentage: **92.86%**

PART C: Business Plan (C.1-C-5)

Total Score: **52**

Percentage: **94.55%**

| | |
|---|------------|
| Total Possible Points for A.1-A.4 | 30 |
| Total Possible Points for A.5 | 20 |
| Total Possible Points for A.6 K-2 | N/A |
| Total Possible Points for A.6 3-5 | N/A |
| Total Possible Points for A.6 6-8 | N/A |
| Total Possible Points for A.6 9-12 | 20 |
| Total Possible Points for B.1-B.3 | 28 |
| Total Possible Points for C.1-C.5 | 55 |

REVISED APPLICATION RATINGS

| Part A | Educational Plan | | | |
|--------|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| A.1 | Educational Philosophy | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| A.1a | Provide a clear and comprehensive overview of the school's philosophical approach, describing how students will learn and what the teacher's role in that learning will be. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.1b | Incorporate the elements fundamental to the school's program of instruction. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.1c | Include a mission statement that is clear, cohesive, comprehensive and has a focus on outcomes rather than inputs. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.1d | Articulate how the school's educational philosophy is aligned with the mission statement of the proposed school. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.1e | Present a rationale that clearly supports how the selected approach improves pupil achievement in the target population, including research and/or experience. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.1f | Ensure the Mission Statement on the Target Population Page is consistent with the narrative. | Meets | | Meets the Criteria |
| | A.1 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | A.1 Total-Approaches | 0 | 8 | |
| | A.1 Total-Meets | 6 | | |
| | | | | |
| A.2 | Target Population | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |

| | | | | |
|------|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| A.2a | Identify the target population the response should demonstrate a clear understanding of the students and community the school intends to serve, including current levels of academic performance of the surrounding schools. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.2b | Present an explanation of how the implementation of the program of instruction described in Section A.3 meets the identified needs of the target population including improving pupil achievement and providing educational choice. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.2c | Describe the class size and teacher-student ratios and clearly explain how these address the identified needs of the target population for improved pupil achievement and educational choice. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.2d | Ensure the target population provided on the Target Population page in the online application wizard is consistent with the narrative in this section. | Meets | | |
| | A.2 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | A.2 Total-Approaches | 0 | 6 | |
| | A.2 Total-Meets | 4 | | |
| A.3 | Program of Instruction | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| A.3a | Describe the curriculum for the core academic content areas, which clearly demonstrates alignment to the Educational Philosophy and Arizona State Standards. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.3b | Demonstrate a clear understanding of methods of instruction key to the program of instruction, including formative assessment strategies, which clearly demonstrate alignment to the curriculum, assessments, and Educational Philosophy. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |

| | | | | |
|--------|--|------------|---------------------|--|
| A.3c | Present a rationale for the selected curriculum, methods of instruction and assessment that support improving pupil achievement in the target population. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.3d | Explain how the Program of Instruction will result in achieving the outcomes described in the school's mission. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.3e | Ensure the Program of Instruction is consistent with the Academic Systems Plan. | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but: Due to the lack of action steps in the Academic Systems Plan evaluators were unable to crosswalk it with the Program of Instruction narrative to determine whether it is consistent. |
| | A.3 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | A.3 Total-Approaches | 1 | 6 | |
| | A.3 Total-Meets | 4 | | |
| A.3.1 | Mastery and Promotion | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| A.3.1a | Present clear criteria and conditions for promotion from one level to the next, to include the level of proficiency that students must obtain to demonstrate mastery of academic core content. (1 point) | N/A | | Not Applicable |
| A.3.1b | Describe a comprehensive viable and adequate process the school will use to determine grade level promotion and retention consistent with A.R.S. §15-701. (1 point) | N/A | | Not Applicable |
| A.3.1c | Present a rationale for the selected criteria and conditions that guide the grade level promotion decisions. (1 point) | N/A | | Not Applicable |
| A.3.1d | Describe the process for student retention. (1 point) | N/A | | Not Applicable |
| A.3.1e | Ensure consistency with Area II of the Academic Systems Plan. | N/A | | Not Applicable |

| | | | | |
|---------|---|------------|---------------------|--|
| | A.3.1 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | | |
| | A.3.1 Total-Approaches | 0 | | |
| | A.3.1 Total-Meets | 0 | | |
| A.3.2 | Course Offerings and Graduation Requirements | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance/ Comments |
| A.3.2a | Identify graduation requirements for the school that will meet A.R.S. §15-701.01. (1 point) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Identifying graduation requirements that will meet State statute. Specifically requirements in addition to course credits. |
| A.3.2b | Describe a comprehensive viable and adequate process that includes clear criteria and conditions for awarding course credit. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.3.2c | Provide a rationale for the selected criteria and conditions for awarding course credit and how they represent student capacity to pass the end of course State assessments. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.3.2.d | Provide a menu of course offerings which include course titles and brief descriptions of classes consistent with State requirements and that clearly demonstrate alignment to the Program of Instruction. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.3.2.e | Ensure consistency with the program of instruction and alignment with the Business Plan as presented in the application package. | Meets | | Meets the Criteria |
| | A.3.2 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | A.3.2 Total-Approaches | 1 | 3 | |
| | A.3.2 Total-Meets | 4 | | |

| A.4 | School Calendar and Weekly Schedule | Rating | | Technical Assistance / Comments |
|------|--|------------|---------------------|--|
| A.4a | Provide the length of the school day (approximate start and dismissal times) and how many minutes per day will be designated for each core academic subject that clearly demonstrate compliance with hours/minutes of instruction for each grade level served, for the proposed school calendar (standard or extended) pursuant to A.R.S. §15-901. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.4b | Ensure the weekly schedule demonstrates compliance with A.R.S. §15-118 and current Move on When Reading Requirements, as defined by the Arizona Department of Education. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.4c | Include a school calendar with the total number of days the proposed school will be in session, early-release days, scheduled holidays, teacher work-days/professional development, and additional days off. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.4d | School calendar clearly demonstrates compliance with A.R.S. §15-341.01. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.4e | Provide a rationale for the selected weekly schedule that clearly supports improving pupil achievement in the target population. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.4f | Identify professional development opportunities consistent with the information provided in Area IV of the Academic Systems Plan. | Approaches | | Addresses criteria, but: Due to the lack of action steps in the Academic Systems Plan evaluators were unable to crosswalk it with the narrative to determine whether it is consistent with the professional development opportunities described in the narrative. |
| | A.4 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | A.4 Total-Approaches | 1 | 4.0 | |
| | A.4 Total-Meets | 5 | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------|-------------|---|
| Overall Consistency of Education Plan | Consistency among all components of the Educational Plan (Sections A.1-A.6) See page 18 of the Application Instructions for more information. (2 points) | Approaches | 0 | Due to the lack of action steps in the Academic Systems Plan evaluators were unable to crosswalk it with the narratives provided in the Educational Plan to determine whether they were consistent. |
| | | | | |
| | Part A: Education Plan Total-Falls Far Below | | 0 | |
| | Part A: Education Plan Total-Approaches | | 3 | |
| | Part A: Education Plan Total-Meets | | 23 | |
| | Education Plan A.1-A.4 Total Score | | 27.0 | |

REVISED APPLICATION RATINGS

| Part A.5 | Academic Systems Plan | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|---------|---|
| A.5 | Academic Systems Plan | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| A.5a | Provide predicted target figures for Percent Passing in Mathematics and Reading aligned with target population information provided in Section A.2 (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| A.5b | Provide a clear description of the basis for setting baseline figures that aligns with Section A.2. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| | | Score for A.5 a and A.5 b: | 2.00 | |
| A.5 Academic System Area I: Curriculum | Provide sufficiently detailed and implementable action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive curriculum system (Area I): The curriculum area of the ASP is worth 4 points. | Approaches | | Addressess criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Providing action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive curriculum system of (Area I, elements i, ii, iii, iv and/or v): See details of deficiencies within each element below. |
| A.5c-I(i) | Provide sufficiently detailed and implementable action steps that address: i. Adoption of curriculum aligned to Arizona State Standards; • adopting new and supplemental curriculum, • gathering curriculum options, • evaluating proposed curriculum programs and materials, and • verifying the curriculum is aligned to Arizona State Standards. | Approaches | 0 | Provides narrative to represent one action step. The information provided lacks the structure of an action step and evaluators could not locate sufficient detail regarding the implementation of the adoption of curriculum aligned to Arizona State Standards in the following element/s (areas): • adopting new and supplemental curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and/or Science. • gathering curriculum options in Reading, Writing, Math, and/or Science. • evaluating proposed curriculum programs and materials in Reading, Writing, Math, and/or Science. • verifying the curriculum is aligned to Arizona State Standards in Reading, Writing, Math, and /or Science. A narrative was provided to describe the process, however this narrative did not align with the information presented as an Action Step. |
| A.5c-I(ii) | Provide sufficiently detailed and implementable action steps that address: ii. Implementation of curriculum to include • integrating curriculum into instruction consistently, and • implementing the curriculum with fidelity to the design of the curriculum and program of instruction. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for the implementation of curriculum in the following element/s (areas): • integrating curriculum into instruction consistently • implementing the curriculum with fidelity to the design of the curriculum and/or program of instruction |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| A.5c-I(iii) | iii. Evaluation of curriculum to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> determining if curriculum is effective based on criteria set by the school, ensuring that the curriculum allows students to meet the standards, verifying whether curriculum is aligned to student needs, and identifying if a curricular gap is preventing the students from mastering a standard. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for the evaluation of curriculum. Specifically a clear process and plan was not found for the following element/s (areas): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> determining if curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science is effective based on criteria set by the school. ensuring that the curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science allows students to meet the standards. verifying whether curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science is aligned to student needs. identifying if a curricular gap in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science is preventing the students from mastering a standard. |
| A.5c-I(iv) | iv. Revision of curriculum to include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> making revisions to existing curriculum, and replacing/supplementing existing curriculum through adoption of new curriculum. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for implementing the revision of existing curriculum to include the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> making revisions to existing curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. replacing/supplementing existing curriculum through adoption of new curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. |
| A.5c-I(v) | v. Adaptation to address the curriculum needs of subgroup populations by; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring that implemented curriculum and supplemental curriculum meet the identified needs of students in subgroups. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for implementing the adaptation to address the curriculum needs of subgroup populations in the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring that implemented curriculum and supplemental curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math and Science meets the identified needs of students in subgroups. (Address the lack of the identified need of the student subgroup, i.e. free-reduced lunch, etc.) |
| | | Score for Curriculum Area: | 0.00 | |
| A.5 Academic System Area II: Assessment | Provide sufficiently detailed and implementable action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive assessment system to assess student performance (Area II): The assessment area of the ASP is worth 4 points. | Approaches | | Addressess criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Providing action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive assessment system of (Area II, elements i, ii, iii, and/or iv: See details of deficiencies within each element below. |
| A.5a-II(i) | i. Developing the assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> creating a data collection system that involves both formative and summative assessments, ensuring the assessment system is aligned to the curriculum, and the instructional methodology/program. | Approaches | 0 | Provides narrative to represent one action step. The information provided lacks the structure of an action step and evaluators could not locate sufficient detail regarding implementing and developing the assessment system in the following element/s; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> creating a data collection system that involves both formative and summative assessments in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. ensuring the assessment system is aligned to the curriculum in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. the instructional methodology/program. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| A.5a-II(ii) | <p>ii. Analyzing assessment data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students are performing, • whether instructional methodology and curriculum are meeting the needs of all students, and • what adjustments are made when methodology and/or curriculum are not meeting student needs. | Approaches | 0 | <p>No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for analyzing assessment data in the following element/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how students are performing in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. • whether instructional methodology and curriculum are meeting the needs of all students. • what adjustments are made when methodology and/or curriculum are not meeting student needs. |
| A.5c-II(iii) | <p>iii. Adapted to meet the needs of subgroups;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluating the instruction delivered to each separate subgroup to ensure that necessary adjustments are made regularly for each group | Approaches | 0 | <p>No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for implementation of adapting to meet the needs of subgroups in the following element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specifically evaluating the instruction delivered to each separate subgroup to ensure that necessary adjustments are made regularly for each group in Reading, Writing, Math and Science. |
| A.5d-II(iv) | <p>iv. Year to Year comparison;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determine what data will be collected to allow for valid and reliable comparisons of student growth and proficiency • determine the analysis completed during the year to allow for valid and reliable comparisons from year to year. | Approaches | 0 | <p>No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for implementation of the year to year comparison in the following element/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determining what data will be collected to allow for valid and reliable comparisons of student growth and proficiency in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. • determining the analysis completed during the year to allow for valid and reliable comparisons from year to year in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science. |
| | | Score for Assessment Area: | 0.00 | |
| A.5 Academic System Area III: Monitoring Instruction | Provide sufficiently detailed and implementable action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive system for monitoring instruction (Area III): The monitoring instruction area of the ASP is worth 4 points. | Approaches | | Addressess criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Providing action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive system for monitoring instruction (Area III, elements i, ii, iii, iv, and/or v): See details of deficiencies within each element below. |
| A.5e-III(i) | <p>i. Monitoring instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gathering evidence to ensure that the classroom instruction is aligned with standards, • identifying if the instruction is taking place in the manner prescribed by curriculum planning documents, • verifying if the instruction allows students to effectively master state standards, and • ensuring that adjustments are made to the curriculum for students in subgroup populations. | Approaches | 0 | <p>Provides narrative to represent one action step. The information provided lacks the structure of an action step and evaluators could not locate sufficient detail regarding monitoring instruction in the following element/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gathering evidence to ensure that the classroom instruction is aligned with standards, • identifying if the instruction is taking place in the manner prescribed by curriculum planning documents, • verifying if the instruction allows students to effectively master state standards, and • ensuring that adjustments are made to the curriculum for students in subgroup |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------|---|
| A.5e-III(ii) | ii. Evaluating instructional practices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integrating curriculum into instruction consistently, and • implementing the curriculum with fidelity to the design of the curriculum and program of instruction, • gathering evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices for all instructional staff, • using criteria to clearly measure instructional quality, and • disaggregating teacher evaluation data to identify strengths, weaknesses and needs of individual teachers. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for evaluating instructional practices in the following element/s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integrating curriculum into instruction consistently, • implementing the curriculum with fidelity to the design of the curriculum and/or program of instruction, • gathering evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices for all instructional staff, • using criteria to clearly measure instructional quality, and • disaggregating teacher evaluation data to identify strengths, weaknesses, and needs of individual teachers. |
| A.5e-III(iii) | iii. Adapted to meet the needs of subgroups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluating the instruction delivered to each separate subgroup to ensure that necessary adjustments are made regularly for each group. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for adapting to meet the needs of subgroups in the following element: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluating the instruction delivered to each separate subgroup to ensure that necessary adjustments are made regularly for each group. |
| A.5e-III(iv) | iv. Providing feedback that develops the quality of teaching and standards integration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analyzing the information gathered in the teacher evaluation process in order to provide feedback specific to each individual staff member on their quality of teaching and standards integration. | Approaches | 0 | No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for providing feedback that develops the quality of teaching and standards integration in the following element: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analyzing the information gathered in the teacher evaluation process in order to provide feedback specific to each individual staff member on their quality of teaching and standards integration. |
| | | Score for Monitoring Instruction Area: | 0.00 | |
| A.5 Academic System Area IV: Professional Development | Provide sufficiently detailed and implementable action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive professional development system (Area IV): The professional development area of the ASP is worth 3 points. | Approaches | | Addressess criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Providing action steps that address each of the following elements of a comprehensive professional development system (Area IV, elements i, ii, iii, and/or iv): See details of deficiencies within each element below. |
| A.5f-IV(i) | i. Developing the professional development plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determining what PD topics will be covered throughout the year and • deciding what data and analysis will be used to make those decisions. | Approaches | 0 | Provides narrative to represent one action step. The information provided lacks the structure of an action step and evaluators could not locate sufficient detail regarding the professional development plan in the following element/s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determining what PD topics will be covered throughout the year • deciding what data and analysis will be used to make those decisions. |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|---|-------------|--|
| A.5f-IV(ii) | <p>ii. Supporting high quality implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting high quality implementation of PD strategies by providing support and • allocating resources such as time, space, and the necessary material items required for implementation. | Approaches | 0 | <p>No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for supporting high quality implementation in the following element/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting high quality implementation of PD strategies by providing support • allocating resources such as time, space and the necessary material items required for implementation. |
| A.5f-IV(iii) | <p>iii. Monitoring implementation and follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • monitoring that the strategies learned in professional development are implemented, and • following up with instructional staff regarding levels of implementation. | Approaches | 0 | <p>No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for monitoring implementation and follow-up in the following element/s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • monitoring that the strategies learned in professional development are implemented • following up with instructional staff regarding levels of implementation. |
| A.5f-IV(iv) | <p>iv. Adapted to meet the needs of subgroups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determining what topics are addressed during PD to meet the needs of subgroups | Approaches | 0 | <p>No Action Steps were provided. A narrative was provided. Without action steps to provide a defined structure for the information provided in the narrative evaluators were unable to identify a clear process for adapting to meet the needs of subgroups in the following element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determining what topics are addressed during PD to meet the needs of subgroups. |
| | | Score for Professional Development Area: | 0.00 | |
| A.5g | Identify the frequency and/or timing sufficient for the timely completion of the action steps as part of a comprehensive system in each Area. (1 point) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Identifying intervals sufficient for the timely completion of action steps as part of a comprehensive system in all areas due to a lack of action steps addressing all elements. |
| A.5h | Identify concrete documentation that will serve as evidence to demonstrate implementation of all components of each action step. (1 point) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Identifying concrete documentation that will serve as evidence to demonstrate completion of all components of each action step in all Areas due to a lack of action steps addressing all elements. |
| A.5i | Provide adequate personnel resources responsible for completing action steps that support the Areas. Identify the title/role/positions of the individual(s). (1 point) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Providing adequate personnel resources responsible for completing action steps that support all Areas due to a lack of action steps addressing all elements. Identifying the title/role/positions of the individuals in all Areas due to a lack of action steps addressing all elements. |
| A.5j | Be consistent with all sections of the application package. | Approaches | | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Ensuring consistency with all sections of the application package due to a lack of action steps addressing all elements. |
| | | Score for A.5g through A.5i: | 0.00 | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|--|
| | A.5 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | | |
| | A.5 Total-Approaches | 25 | | |
| | A.5 Total-Meets | 2 | | |
| | | Total Score for ASP: | 2.0 | |

| REVISED APPLICATION RATINGS | | | | | REVISED COMMENTS AND ANALYSIS |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------|---|--|
| Part A.6.9-12 | Instructional Analysis | | | | |
| A.6.9-12 | 9-12 Grade Span Instructional Analysis | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments | Comments/Notes/Possible Interview Questions: |
| A.6.9-12a | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 1. Learning Target: Identify the objectives students must know that align with the Required Standard and can be assessed to demonstrate mastery of the Required Standard. (.5 points) | | | Meets the Criteria in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Identifying what students must know and be able to do to demonstrate mastery of the Required Standard in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and/or Science. Specifically, the components of the Required Standard addressed by the provided learning targets. Ensuring consistency and alignment with the application. | |
| | Score for Reading | Meets | .5 | | |
| | Score for Writing | Meets | .5 | | |
| | Score for Mathematics | Meets | .5 | | |
| | Score for Science | Meets | .5 | | |
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12a | 2.00 | | |
| A.6.9-12b | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 2. Prior Knowledge: List the knowledge/skills that are required prior to meeting learning targets. Describe how prior knowledge will be used to introduce the learning targets. (.25 points) | | | Meets the Criteria in Science. Addresses the criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Describing how prior knowledge will be used to introduce the learning target in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. Specifically no description of a process for connecting prior knowledge to the learning targets was found for Reading, Writing, and Mathematics | |
| | Score for Reading | Approaches | 0 | | Ken - M, Amy - M, Steve - A See Science |
| | Score for Writing | Approaches | 0 | | Ken - M, Amy - M, Steve - A |
| | Score for Mathematics | Approaches | 0 | | Ken - A, Amy - M, Steve - A |
| | Score for Science | Meets | .25 | | Ken - M, Amy- M, Steve -A |
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12b | 0.25 | | |
| A.6.9-12c | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 3. Instructional Plan: Describe the process for presenting new information, necessary for students to meet the learning targets. Describe the instructional strategies used to lead students to meet each of the learning targets identified. (1 point) | | | Meets the Criteria in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. | |
| | Score for Reading | Meets | 1 | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---|----------------------------|------|---|--|
| | Score for Writing | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Mathematics | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Science | Meets | 1 | | |
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12c | 4.00 | | |
| A.6.9-12d | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 4. Instruction: Describe the activity/tasks students will complete to meet the learning targets. Identify components of the program of instruction and educational philosophy that are incorporated into instruction. (1 point) | | | Meets the Criteria in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. | |
| | Score for Reading | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Writing | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Mathematics | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Science | Meets | 1 | | |
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12d | 4.00 | | |
| A.6.9-12e | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 5. Formative Assessment: List criteria for determining whether students have met each of the learning targets. (1 point) | | | Meets the Criteria in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. | |
| | Score for Reading | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Writing | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Mathematics | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Science | Meets | 1 | | |
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12e | 4.00 | | |
| A.6.9-12f | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 6. Summative Assessment: Describe how students will demonstrate mastery of the Required Standard. Describe the criteria used to determine whether a student has mastered the Required Standard. (1 point) | | | Meets the Criteria in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. | |
| | Score for Reading | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Writing | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Mathematics | Meets | 1 | | |
| | Score for Science | Meets | 1 | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|-------|---|--|
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12f | 4.00 | | |
| A.6.9-12g | Provide a complete response based on the Required Standard for Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. 7. Remediation: Describe the processes available to provide support to students that do not meet the learning targets. (.25 points) | | | Meets the Criteria in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science. | |
| | Score for Reading | Meets | .25 | | |
| | Score for Writing | Meets | .25 | | |
| | Score for Mathematics | Meets | .25 | | |
| | Score for Science | Meets | .25 | | |
| | | Total Score for A. 6.9-12g | 1.00 | | |
| | A.6.9-12Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | | | |
| | A.6.9-12Total-Approaches | 3 | | | |
| | A.6.9-12Total-Meets | 25 | | | |
| | | Total Score for 9-12 Instructional Analysis: | 19.25 | | |

REVISED APPLICATION RATINGS

| Part B Operational Plan | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| B.1 | Applicant Entity | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| B.1a | Describe in detail the Applicant's history, including its establishment, evolution, and how operating a charter school became part of its mission as documented in the minutes or resolution of intent to apply for a charter school. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1b | Provide a clear and cohesive organizational chart and narrative that clearly delineates the roles, responsibilities, and reporting structure for each position on the chart. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1c | Clearly describe any subsidiary relationship of the Applicant entity to another organization. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1d | Identify any current or prior charter operation by the Applicant and any Principal, including the authorizer, timeframe, and nature of involvement. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1e | Discuss the role of each Principal in the entity. Clearly describe the qualifications of each Principal to support the Educational Plan, Operational Plan, and/or Business Plan. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1f | Be consistent with the background information documents provided for each individual. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1g | Ensure consistency with legal documentation establishing entity, including number of directors required by the Bylaws. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.1h | Ensure consistency with information listed on Title Page and the contents of the application package. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| | B.1 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | B.1 Total-Approaches | 0 | 8.50 | |
| | B.1 Total-Meets | 8 | | |
| B.2 | Governing Body | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| B.2a | Clearly identify the specific roles and the responsibilities of the school governing body per A.R.S. §15-183 (E)(8). If applicable, describe any role the school governing body will have beyond the statutory minimum. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|---------------------|---|
| B.2b | Indicate if the corporate board for the Applicant will also act as the school governing body, or if and when a school governing body separate from the corporate board will be established. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.2c | Describe how the composition of the school governing body will have the capacity to fulfill its requirements and supports the school's mission. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.2d | Describe a clear and appropriate process for selecting initial governing body members and filling vacancies. The description should indicate a process that will result in the selection of a qualified governing body with the ability to fulfill its responsibilities. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.2e | Be consistent with all sections of the application package. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| | B.2 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | B.2 Total-Approaches | 0 | 8.50 | |
| | B.2 Total-Meets | 5 | | |
| B.3 | Management and Operation | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| B.3a | Provide an organizational chart and clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of each position on the chart as it pertains to administering the day-to-day activities of the school. (2 points) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Providing an organizational chart that clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of each position on the chart. Specifically reporting structures and responsibility for accountability are unclear for positions that have one-way arrows and positions that are not connected to any other position on the chart. |
| B.3b | Present a comprehensive viable and adequate operational plan that includes oversight responsibilities related to instruction and operational services. Plan must identify the number of administrative personnel (each year for the first three years) and their oversight responsibilities related to the following areas: Instruction, Curriculum and Assessment (mandated State testing), Staff Development, Financial Management, Contracted Services, Personnel, Grants Management, and Student Information System (SIS). (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.3c | Identify critical skills or experience that will indicate the minimum qualification for fulfillment of those responsibilities. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.3d | Be consistent with all sections of the application package. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| | B.3 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|---------------|----------------|--|
| | B.3 Total-Approaches | 1 | 4.50 | |
| | B.3 Total-Meets | 3 | | |
| B.3.1 | Education Service Providers | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| B.3.1a | Present a detailed explanation of how contracting with or having a governance relationship with the ESP: allows the Applicant to fulfill its mission and implement its program of instruction, and meets the identified needs of the target population including improving pupil achievement. (2 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| B.3.1b | Provide relevant performance data for other schools that the ESP has managed that demonstrates the ESP's success in implementing the program of instruction and improving pupil achievement in a comparable population. (2 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| B.3.1c | Provide a clear description of the services to be provided by the ESP consistent with the service agreement. (2 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| B.3.1d | (CMOs only) Ensure that the relationship between the ESP and Applicant entity described in the narrative is clearly consistent with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws in Section B.1. (.5 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| B.3.1e | (EMOs only) Provide an explanation for the reasons for contracting with an ESP, in general, and this provider in particular, and how the ESP will further the school's mission and program. (2 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| B.3.1f | EMOs only) Describe the Applicant's performance expectations for the ESP consistent with the service agreement, and a viable and adequate plan for how the Applicant will evaluate that performance. (1.5 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| B.3.1g | (EMOs only) Describe the ESP's roles and responsibilities in relation to the Applicant consistent with the service agreement. (1 point) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| B.3.1h | Ensure ESP-related costs are described in the Budget Assumptions and included in the Start-Up and Three-Year Operational Budget as appropriate. (.5 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| | B.3.1 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | | |
| | B.3.1 Total-Approaches | 0 | | |
| | B.3.1 Total-Meets | 0 | | |
| B.3.2 | Contracted Services | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance/ Comments |
| B.3.2a | Delineate all areas (e.g., business management, legal, IT, special education, curriculum development/alignment, etc.), for which the Applicant plans to contract with a service provider. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.3.2b | Identify the minimum professional qualifications and/or experience expected of those to be retained to perform each listed contracted service. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.3.2c | Provide specific sources for costs of each listed contracted service. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.3.2.d | Describe how the costs associated with each listed contracted service are viable and adequate for the target population identified in A.2. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| B.3.2.e | Ensure costs are described in the Budget Assumptions and included in the Start-Up and Three-Year Operational Budget as appropriate. (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| | B.3.2 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | B.3.2 Total-Approaches | 0 | 4.50 | |
| | B.3.2 Total-Meets | 5 | | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Part B: Operational Plan Total-Falls Far Below | 0 |
| Part B: Operational Plan Total-Approaches | 1 |
| Part B: Operational Plan Total-Meets | 21 |
| Total Scoring | 26.00 |

REVISED APPLICATION RATINGS

| Part C Business Plan | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--------|---------|---------------------------------|
| C.1 | Facilities Acquisition | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| C.1a | Identify a timeframe for securing an appropriate facility consistent with the Target Start Date identified on the Target Population Page. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.1b | Identify and describe the facility necessary to implement the program. Include square footage, number of classrooms, layout of space (floor plan), and location that will accommodate the number of anticipated students and class size as identified throughout the application package. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.1c | Ensure the Layout of Space is consistent with the narrative (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.1d | Ensure costs as described in the narrative accounted for in the Start-Up and Three-Year Operational Budgets and fully described in the Assumptions. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.1e | Be consistent with all sections of the application package (.5 points) | Meets | .5 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.1f(i) | For a planned location only: Identify and provide documentation on available facilities within the target market that will allow implementation of the program of instruction and support the student population and class size described in the application package. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.1f(ii) | For an already acquired facility, purchased land or proposed build only: Identify costs associated with securing the facility and ensuring compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including obtaining educational occupancy. (2 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |
| C.1f(iii) | For an already acquired facility, purchased land or proposed build only: Describe any financial arrangements that have been made for securing the facility. (2 points) | N/A | | Not applicable |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|---------------------|--|
| | C.1 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | C.1 Total-Approaches | 0 | 8 | |
| | C.1 Total-Meets | 6 | | |
| C.2 | Marketing and Student Enrollment | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| C.2a | Provide a viable and adequate timeframe for recruiting students consistent with the start-up date of the proposed school identified on the Target Population Page. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2b | Provide a clear and comprehensive plan that is viable and adequate to support the number of students included in the Three-Year Operational Budget. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2c | Provide clear and specific sources for costs associated with the marketing plan. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2d | Describe how the costs associated with the marketing plan are viable and adequate to attract the projected student population identified in Year 1 of the Three-Year Operational Budget. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2e | Ensure costs as described in the narrative are accounted for in the Start-Up and Three-Year Operational Budgets and fully described in the Budget Assumptions. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2f | Describe the proposed fair and equitable admission requirements. List and describe all documents that will be required in the enrollment packet. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2g | Describe enrollment procedures that are compliant with A.R. S. §15-184, including the timeframe, process used if capacity is insufficient to enroll all students, and documentation collected for student registration once a student is admitted to the school. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|---------------------|---|
| C.2h | Identify the enrollment targets, including the minimum and maximum projected enrollment at each grade level that will be set, and how these targets were determined. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.2i | Ensure all processes, procedures, and documentation used in the enrollment process are compliant with all applicable state and federal statutes, Rules, and policies. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| | C.2 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | C.2 Total-Approaches | 0 | 12 | |
| | C.2 Total-Meets | 9 | | |
| C.3 | Personnel | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| C.3a | Provide a clear and comprehensive staffing plan, including the minimum professional qualifications and/or experience for each position. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.3b | Describe how the staffing plan is adequate for the effective implementation of the program of instruction and operation of the charter school as described, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the grades and number of students to be served in each of the first three years of operation, and • the number of each type of instructional and non-instructional personnel each year. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.3c | Describe a compensation and benefits plan that supports personnel qualifications and experience required to support the program of instruction. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.3d | Provide a detailed plan to recruit, hire, and train instructional staff consistent with the start-up of the school. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.3e | Describe how the process for recruiting initial instructional staff and the identified salaries in the Three-Year Operational Budget result in a staff qualified to effectively implement the program of instruction. (2 points) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Describing how the process for recruiting initial staff and identified salaries in the Three-Year Operational Budget result in a qualified staff to implement the program of instruction. Specifically, additional details regarding the process for locating and recruiting teachers qualified to implement a classical education model and also coach in a high quality athletic program. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|---------------------|--|
| C.3f | Ensure all salaries and Employee Related Expenses (ERE) described in the narrative are accounted for in the Start-Up and Three-Year Operational Budgets and fully described in the Budget Assumptions. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| | C.3 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | C.3 Total-Approaches | 1 | 8 | |
| | C.3 Total-Meets | 5 | | |
| C.4 | Start-Up Budget | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance / Comments |
| C.4a | List only sources of start-up revenue fully supported by Verifiable Proof of Secured Funds documentation. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.4b | List expenditures to cover the start-up plans described in the application package. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.4c | Demonstrate through the assumptions that the amounts listed are viable and adequate. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.4d | Ensure revenues cover expenditures. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.4e | Ensure that timeframes described in all sections of the application package are consistent with timeframes listed on the Start-Up Budget. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.4f | Be consistent with all sections of the application package. (1 point) | Meets | 1 | Meets the Criteria |
| | C.4 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |
| | C.4 Total-Approaches | 0 | 10 | |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|---------------------|--|
| | C.4 Total-Meets | 6 | | |
| C.5 | Three-Year Operational Budget | Rating | Scoring | Technical Assistance/ Comments |
| C.5a | List expenditures to cover the Educational Plan, Operational Plan, and Business Plan described in the application package. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5b | Ensure state equalization detailed in the Projected Revenue Calculator is consistent with the Target Population and the student count by grade level. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5c | If student count add-ons are used in determining projected revenue) Provide an adequate rationale for using the student count add-on levels in the Projected Revenue Calculator in the assumptions that is consistent with the target population described in Section A.2. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5d | Provide an adequate rationale for the percent of full enrollment used as the basis of the budget for Year 1 consistent with Section C.2. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5e | Demonstrate through the assumptions that the amounts listed are viable and adequate. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5f | If operational revenue is used to pay for expenses incurred during the start-up period, clearly describe in the assumptions the sources of costs and repayment terms. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5g | Ensure revenues cover expenditures. (2 points) | Meets | 2 | Meets the Criteria |
| C.5h | Be consistent with all sections of the application package. (1 point) | Approaches | 0 | Addresses criteria, but lacks sufficient detail in: Ensuring consistency between the narrative of the application package and budget costs regarding the student services director position. |
| | C.5 Total-Falls Far Below | 0 | Total Score: | |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|----|
| | C.5 Total-Approaches | 1 | 14 |
| | C.5 Total-Meets | 7 | |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Part C: Business Plan Total-Falls Far Below | 0 |
| Part C: Business Plan Total-Approaches | 2 |
| Part C: Business Plan Total-Meets | 33 |
| Total Scores | 52 |