North Carolina State Board of Education Charter School

Application Rubric

Applicant: City Charter Academy

Reviewers: #1 Robbie Curry; #2 Jonathan Bryant; #3 Ashley Baquero; #4 Ginger Cash (EC), #5 Susan Walz (EL)

Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Evaluations and Criteria

The NC charter application review process is designed to ensure that all students in the state have access to a high-quality charter school. Each application will be reviewed by a team of internal and evaluators, and reviewer comments will be forwarded to the Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB). The CSAB will review applications, conduct interviews of applicants, and make a recommendation to the State Board of Education (SBE), which will then make a final decision to approve or deny the application.

Strong applications will have a clear and compelling mission, a strong educational program, a solid financial plan, effective governance and management structures, and a diverse board of directors with the capacity to execute the plan for the proposed school. In addition to meeting the criteria that are specific to each section, each part of the application should align.

Instructions to Evaluators

Reviewers should complete each rubric section based on the evidence provided in the application. There are five (5) total sections to complete:

I. Mission, Purposes, and Goals
II. Education Plan
III. Governance
IV. Operations
V. Financial Plan

Please note that there may be appendices to support information provided in the above sections. When reviewing an application, evaluators should assess the major strengths and areas of concern and provide comments/questions. Reviewers should look for responses that reflect a thorough understanding of key issues and barriers for operating a successful charter school. Responses should clearly align across each section of the application. Each response should include specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation and understanding of school operations and serving all students. Reviewers should use objective language and complete sentences in their comments on the strengths and concerns/questions of each section of the application. Additional pages should be used as necessary. For example,

Strengths of the academic plan
"The plan aligns with the overall mission and vision because…"
"The chosen curriculum is research based and proven effective with the targeted population of students because…"

Concerns/Questions of the academic plan
"The curriculum and daily schedule do not align with the mission and vision because…" "The discipline plan does not include provisions for students with disabilities."

Strengths of the governance plan
"The governing board has a diverse skillset and will be able to support the school effectively."
"The plan to recruit school leaders and teachers is robust and aligns with the mission of the school."

Concerns/Questions of the governance plan

"The governing board is comprised of only two people who do not have sufficient credentials to support school leadership."

Strengths of the financial plan

"The financial plan is sound, and the assumptions are consistent with the mission and vision of the proposed school."

"The budget includes contingencies for high dollar special needs students and funds are allocated in the budget document for such contingencies."

Concerns/Questions of the financial plan

"The budget includes a line of credit from ABC Bank, but no assurances were provided to support such an agreement."

"The proposed school assumes two buses in the first year, but there is no accompanying line item in the budget that allocates funds for purchasing buses nor is there any indication of salary and training for bus drivers."

Complete the summary page for each major section (Mission, Purposes and Goals, Education Plan, Governance, Operations, Financial Plan) after you have completed all of the subsections within the section. Type a summary of your analysis of each section into the box provided; it will expand as needed. This should be a paragraph outlining the overall strengths or concerns/questions of the application section as a whole. It should summarize your findings and not simply be cut and pasted from your subsection analysis.

Please also remember that all documents, including your individual review, will likely at some time be available to the public.

Application Contact Information

Application Contact Information		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● All questions are adequately addressed and complete ● Projected enrollment figures are tactical and realistic for the proposed region ● Strong rationale provided for year one enrollment and growth plan		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The City Charter Academy board has partnered with an experienced Charter Management Organization (CMO), with experience operating and managing more than eighty (80) charter schools serving more than 58,000 students, in nine (9) states.	● Pg. 18
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Applicant clearly explained role of NHA in preparing the application. ● Projected enrollment seems realistic for the large county (1% of 18/19 ADM at full capacity) but would depend on community interest.	● 8
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● How is THIS charter school unique? How is THIS charter school different than other schools currently operating in the designated area? How does this school directly respond to a need or respond to a specific demographic within the designated area that charter school intends to operate?	●
Reviewer #2	● "Targeted area" - according to NC School Report Cards, in 2017-2018 Guilford Co Schools (GCS) had 59% of schools that were rated "B" or "C."	● 8
Reviewer #3	● Applicant doesn't provide much detail as to growth in area and doesn't elaborate on other public school options - factors that would drive interest in enrolling in the charter school. ● How did the board project enrollment figures and demographics? What research was used to projected demographics?	● 8

Application Addendum: Proposed Management Organization (EMO or CMO)		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● The rationale for contracting with an EMO/CMO is evident. ● A persuasive explanation that the proposed relationship with the EMO/CMO will further the school's mission and educational programming. ● A clear delineation of the roles, relationships, and responsibilities between the EMO/CMO, the governing board, lead administrator, and public charter school employees. ● The rationale includes detailed information regarding the financial and academic performance of other charter schools managed by the EMO/CMO. ● A copy of the executed management agreement was included in the application. ● Evidence that the management company has the capacity to support the proposed school in finances, academics, and operations.		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● CCA has a signed and fully executed CMO agreement, pending authorization, with NHA. ● Agreement provides for the continuation of services, and NHA assumes all risk and are responsible for meeting full cost of agreed upon services, even in the event of the school falling short of budget projections, for which NHA will make up the difference, not to exceed cost projections.	● A4.1 ● A4.1-5
Reviewer #2	● Sufficient rationale for partnering with NHA.	●
Reviewer #3	● Clearly explains decision to partner with NHA. ● Contract with NHA clearly spells out roles/responsibilities. ● No partner board has ever terminated agreement with NHA. ● NHA serves diverse student body. ● NHA strong financial footing. ● CREDO has a strong reputation for ED studies - show NHA schools are successful.	● 18 ● Appendix
Concerns/Questions		**Page**

Reviewer #1	● Per the Termination clause of the agreement, CCA's agreement with NHA provides no provision for termination, or remedy, for lack of academic, financial, or organization performance of the school
	  o How will the board hold NHA accountable for meeting and exceeding academic performance as compared to the state, the schools the students would have otherwise attended, or those schools within a specified geographical area?
	  o How does the authorizing agency's performance framework account for this deficiency in the management agreement?
		● A4.1-3

Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●

Application Addendum: Replication		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● The application contains a strong rationale for replicating an existing charter school, including evidence that this model will be effective in the proposed setting, and the governing board is a good fit for the proposed charter school. ● The rationale includes detailed information regarding the financial and academic performance of the existing charter school model. ● The applicant provided all required evidences ● If requesting fast-track replication, applicant meets all requirements outlined in SBE policy.		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● CCA is partnering with NHA to replicate its model of high performing schools in areas similar to the designated area of the proposed charter school. NHA currently operates one of the highest performing schools in its network of eighty (80) plus schools, and the school for which the replication is model is located North Carolina. ● The school for which the charter replication is being modeled has performance that exceeds the performance of similar schools based on demographics in comparison to state and schools in the identified geographical area.	15 8 and 15
Reviewer #2	●	
Reviewer #3	● Strong existing charter school to replicate - all academic data provided and meets requirements. Greensboro Academy outperforms county. ● Applicant provides required evidences.	Appendix
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	
Reviewer #2	●	
Reviewer #3	● Demographics at Greensboro Academy are vastly different than the projected demographics at this application school. Does the board anticipate the same type of success, why or why not?	p. 8 p. 257 Appendix

Section 1.1 Mission and Vision		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● The mission statement defines the purpose of the proposed charter school ● The mission statement is clear, concise, compelling, and measurable. ● The vision provides a clear description of what the school will look like when it is achieving its mission. ● Response includes a compelling description and clear rationale for selecting the location and target student population. ● Completed enrollment summary and anticipated demographics charts with reasonable enrollment projections. ● Response fully justifies the projected student enrollment and the percentage of the ADM when compared to the LEA. ● Substantial evidence is provided to demonstrate educational need. ● Target population aligns with the proposed school mission.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The mission and vision of the school provides a student centered focus that prioritizes high academic outcomes for all students.	● 23
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Mission is clear and concise. ● Applicant provides rationale for need - growth of area and existing public options. ● Survey results and waitlist data show likely community interest.	● 23 ● 24 ● Appendix
Concerns/Questions		**Page**

Reviewer #1	● How does the proposed curriculum being adopted from NHA align to the "moral" focus of the mission? What adaptations or modifications will the instructional team make to align the "scripted" or "common" curriculum to the mission of the school?
	● The school has not identified a proposed facility or specific location for the school? This is extremely concerning especially giving its enrollment projection of 520 students in its first year of operation.
	    o Without a specific facility or location identified, how does the enrollment projection(s) support the anticipated need?
	    o How does the proposed charter school application respond to a specific need of the "community" or demographic the school is intended to serve? (NOTE: This may not be a specific barrier, however, when the finalized location of the facility is identified, if approved, how will the chapter application's enrollment projects change, if at all, or how will the school's transportation plan support meeting its projected enrollment if demand of the finalized
		●

	facility does not match the projected enrollment?)	
Reviewer #2	● Because there are already 3 NHA charter schools in Guilford Co, and 9 total charter schools - what is the concern for saturation? The wait list survey that is used for rationale includes many families who are on the western area, and may not travel to the area identified by CCA.	● 26
Reviewer #3	● How will the board measure the success of the mission? ● What is compelling/innovative about the mission? ● Character education is standard in many public schools - what makes the vision of this school any different in terms of developing students' character?	● 23

Section 1.2 Purposes of the Proposed Charter School		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Clearly describes how the proposed charter school will achieve one or more of the six legislative purposes. ● Identified purpose(s) is/are meaningful, manageable, and focused on improving student outcomes. ● Purposes are clearly aligned to the proposed mission.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposed charter school intends to replicate the success of other similar schools operated by NHA. The success of the proposed charter school is based on a expertise knowledge of two members of the board who has experience governing another high performing charter school operated by NHA.	● 27
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Purposes align with mission	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Re: legislative priority #1: What is the current year over year retention rate for teaches within NHA schools? How does this support the legislative priority the proposed charter school seeks to fulfill? ● Re: legislative priority #2: The written response is confusing. Who are the "we" identified in the response. Does "we" refer to the CMO or the Board? With that said, this response goes back to the original concern identified in the CMO agreement. It is not clear how the CMO will be held responsible for meeting academic outcomes for the proposed school. ● Re: legislative priority #3: it is not clear how this charter school is unique, different, or providing an expanded choice. How does this charter school propose to be different from the other schools currently operating in the designated area, or the area that the facility will be located once finalized. ● Re: legislative priority #6: the proposed charter school is a replication that does not target a specific population or demographic. Please provide a response on how this model is different or unique? How does this charter school guard against the same factors that have led to poor school performance from schools currently operating with the same demographic of students.	●
Reviewer #2	● Is Math 1 appropriate for all 8th grade students?	● 28
Reviewer #3	● Innovative learning opportunities/teaching methods are not particularly innovative, but seen at many schools.	● 27

Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School			
Characteristics of a strong response: • Performance goals (academic or other) are clear, specific, measurable, attainable, time-specific, and focused on improving student outcomes. • Clear and compelling process for setting, monitoring, and/or revising goals at least annually. • Goals are clearly aligned to the mission and purposes.			
Initial Application Review			
Strengths			**Page**
Reviewer #1	• The proposed charter school seeks to meet and exceed goals greater than schools in the host district or the state at large. • Academic performance for students in the upper middle grades will have performance that meets college ready standards. • The boards governing structure will ensure that the school is meeting its academic, financial, and organizational performance through monthly updates around 4 domain specific questions concerning performance.		• 28 • 28 • 29
Reviewer #2	•		•
Reviewer #3	• Goals are clear, specific, measurable, attainable, time-specific and focusing on improving student outcomes.		• 28
Concerns/Questions			**Page**
Reviewer #1	•		•
Reviewer #2	•		•
Reviewer #3	• Lacks clear and compelling process for setting, monitoring, and revising goals at least annually.		• 29

Section 1 Mission, Purposes, and Goals Summary

Each part of your summary comments should, in a few sentences, provide a clear understanding of
your overall evaluation of the proposal as well as the most significant strengths and/or
Concerns/Questions. The summary comments for each section should support your rating for
the section and should not be simply cut and pasted from your subsection analysis.

Evaluation Summary for Entire Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section
Initial Application Review
Reviewer #1 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary   CCA intends to implement a research-based curriculum and effective teaching practices to meet the diverse instructional needs of its students. Anticipating that many students will arrive to its school with varying academic needs, the school plans to use a mix of direct and small group instruction, blended learning platforms such as i-Ready, and instructional data protocols to respond to needs of its students. The proposal indicates weekly coaching and development for teachers, periodic data reflections that respond to formative and summative assessments, and on-going professional develop to ensure the academic success of its students.
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary   While the mission and purposes described in the application are clear, they are not compelling or innovative. Enrollment projections appear reasonable given the growth of the area. NHA demonstrates many successes and Greensboro Academy is a successful school for replication purposes. Demographics at Greensboro, however, are dramatically different than the projected demographics for this school application (esp. ED population). Goals are clearly described, but could use more detail regarding the monitoring and revising of goals once the school is in operation.

Section 2.1 Instructional Program		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● A clear and comprehensive explanation of the school's academic focus that is aligned with the school's mission and vision. ● A clear and coherent description of the instructional program and instructional methods are provided. ● The proposed assessment strategies align with the proposed instructional program. ● Includes documented evidence that the proposed approach will lead to improved student performance for the school's target student population. ● Instructional design offers clear and specific details that describe the basic learning environment, class size, and structure. ● Curriculum framework and sample course scope and sequence are clearly presented and specific to the school's purpose, aligned with the school's mission, concentrated to support the target student population, and compatible with the North Carolina Accountability Model. ● School calendar and student schedules meet NC requirements of 185 school days or 1025 hours or instruction. ● Calendar and schedule support implementation of the academic plan and align with stated mission and vision. ● Description of a typical day for teachers and students align with key priorities of the academic plan and the overall mission and vision of the school.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● CCA will adopt NHA "scripted" or "common" curriculum that is aligned to North Carolina's state standards. ● Data driven instruction will allow the school to engage in a continuous system of improvement to ensure student's academic needs are constantly being assessed and met.	● 30
Reviewer #2	● Very comprehensive review of this section.	●
Reviewer #3	● Clear and comprehensive description of instructional program. ● Instructional strategies are clear and comprehensive. ● Interventions and personalized instruction described in instructional program. ● Sample lesson plans and scope/sequences are thorough and aligned to standards. ● Calendar meets NC requirements with 1110 hours. ● Good amount of time dedicated to reading and math classes. ● 18 days dedicated to PD.	● 30-38 ● Appendix
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The replication of this charter is using an instructional program presumably being used across the different states NHA operates. o What professional development and/or support will be provided to teachers to ensure the curriculum is not simply "turn keyed" and appropriate adaptations and/or modifications are made to ensure that it directly aligns to	●

	North Carolina's state standards? o The response does not identify the specific normed reference exam that will be used to assess progress? Will the school partner with assessment firms like Achievement Network or use the nationally normed reference exam NWEA to assess progress? The application lacks critical details around the specific assessment that will be used to determine progress.	
Reviewer #2	● Kindergarten and other grade levels class sizes are higher than traditional public schools - how will this impact interest in the school and retention of students/families?	●
Reviewer #3	● Will K classes have TAs? ● What are the qualifications of the grade level deans who coach other teachers?	●

Section 2.2 Special Populations and "At-Risk" Students		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● An identified founding board member or school administrator with experience working with special populations. ● A clear process for identifying "at-risk" students, English Learner students, and intellectually gifted students. ● A realistic plan for hiring licensed and highly qualified personnel including service providers, nursing, and educational assistants. ● Articulated plan for how the school will utilize and evaluate data to inform instruction and evaluate academic progress for "at-risk" students, English learners, and intellectually gifted students. ● A sound, compelling plan is evident to enhance the academic opportunities to meet the needs of "at-risk" students, EL students, and intellectually gifted students.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal to support "at-risk" students includes a provision of continued support after formally exciting mandated services. ● Frequent progress monitoring of every two weeks will be utilized to monitor progress of students receiving intervention. ● The proposal applies a systematic approach to responding to student intervention with a research-based approach of tiered interventions. ● The plan anticipates supporting a wide range of students considered at risk including students with identified disabilities and English language learners.	● 39 ● 40 ● 40 ● 41
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Identification and interventions to meet the needs of students are clearly described. ● NHA has experience and processes established to meet needs of special populations. ● EL identification and instructional program comprehensive. ●	● 39-41 ● 41
Reviewer #4	● Plan included specific types of assessments that teams will use in identifying which students are at-risk & monitoring their progress ● Stated interventions will be matched based on student need & severity of deficits ● Included statement on verification of license when hiring EC teachers & service providers	● 39-40
Review #5	● Plan properly reflects identification through Home Language Survey ● Plan recognizes the importance of training all content teachers ● Parent contact plan is present in application.	● 41 ● 42

		Concerns/Questions	Page

Reviewer #1		● The frequent monitoring of students receiving interventions at two weeks intervals is noteworthy. However, this seems highly unrealistic and does not seem like it will yield any actionable data especially when considering what typical academic progress and growth looks like for struggling students.
		    o I would advise the instructional team to revisit this plan for intervention and align their proposal with effective and best practices of every 6 – 8 weeks.
		● Current and practice on interventions has moved away from a simple tiered approach of intervention to multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS).
		    o How does this proposal integrate and incorporate current research on MTSS?
		    o What's the school plan on training staff on implementing the latest research and best practice on MTSS?
		    o What professional development is the school prepared to provide teaches and staff on current best practice concerning MTSS?
			●

Reviewer #2		●	●
Reviewer #3		● How will parents be informed of the intervention process/steps? What happens if a parent has concerns and wants to bypass a step and go straight to EC evaluation?	● 40
Reviewer #4		● How will the assessments be used to determine effectiveness of instruction for all students? What data decision rules will be applied to determine students are at-risk? ● You state "If Tier III interventions do not succeed, the EC team will meet with student's parents and may recommend an EC referral meeting."--What happens if someone suspects a disability prior to the receipt of Tier III interventions?	● 39-40
Review # 5		● Even if you do not expect any English Learners (ELs) to enroll in year one, an EL may enroll at any time. In order to plan ahead for serving ELs, we recommend developing the school's Language Instruction Educational Plan (LIEP). The LIEP is required as part of the Charter Performance Framework. See A5 -EL component. See:https://sites.google.com/dpi.nc. ● Plan should reflect the updated screening process required in North Carolina to include WIDA Screeners. (https://sites.google.com/dpi.nc.gov/ncels/el-data/el-identification ● Update the testing requirements for ELs as they are no longer exempt from any State testing ands all testing	

	must be in English. - Exit criteria must match what is required by the State. - Students who Exit are now monitored for four years. - Plan recognizes the importance of training all content teachers	

Section 2.3 Exceptional Children		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● A clear process for identifying students with disabilities. ● A viable plan to provide students with special needs with instructional programs, practices, and strategies that ensure access to the general education program and academic success. ● Requirements and processes for monitoring services to students in need and plans to exit students that attain sufficient progress. ● An understanding of, and capacity to fulfill, State and federal obligations and requirements pertaining to students with disabilities. ● A realistic plan for hiring licensed and highly qualified personnel including service providers, nursing, and educational assistants. ● Evidence of adequate resources and staff to meet the needs of all students, including professional development for teachers. ● Articulated plan for how the school will utilize and evaluate data to inform instruction and evaluate academic progress for students with disabilities.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal provides a sufficient response that indicates the school understands its obligations under federal, state, and other applicable laws related to students with identified disabilities including, but not limited to, its obligation to engage in the Child Find process under federal law.	● 45
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● EC program described in detail and aligned with state/federal requirements. ● Two EC teachers/two paraprofessionals planned for first year.	● 45-51 ● 50
Reviewer #4	● Aware of federal/state guidelines regarding Child Find, Evaluation, & Eligibility ● Weekly verification of services provided per IEP ● Included statement on verification of license when hiring EC teachers & service providers ● Prepared to provide the full continuum of services and hire additional staff based on students' needs at enrollment ● Established a plan for reviewing records to ensure compliance ● Articulated a plan for monitoring the progress of students with disabilities and evaluating the data to ensure accelerated progress ● Stated a process of sharing IEP information with general education teachers and documentation of accommodations provided ● PD will be provided to staff on effective teaching practices for students with disabilities	● 45-50
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Similar to my response under section 2.2, the proposal	●

	should be updated to include the current research and best practices concerning MTSS and not simply RtI, which is a model that only responds the academic and behavioral needs of the students without taking into account the varied needs and barriers that contribute to overall lack of performance for students considered "at risk" or with identified disabilities. **(NOTE: The lack of this in the proposal from a national charter operator provides concerning evidence that such proposals like these are carbon copied from previously submitted proposals without substantial and considered revisions to meet the needs of the population THIS charter intends to serve.)** ○ The proposal anticipates and seeks to serve students in a general education environment to the greatest extent possible. This being the case, federal law mandates that schools anticipate and are prepared to provide an education in the least restrictive environment based on the student's IEP. The lack of mention of this specific language in the proposal makes me concerned that general practice will attempt to provide "supplemental aids/services" (pg. 47) not consistent with students IEP. ○ A revision of the section of the application should be sought to ensure full compliance with the provisions of the individuals with disabilities education act as amended in 2004, and reauthorized in 2009.	
Reviewer #2	● Assume that ECATS will be used, although it is not referenced?	●
Reviewer #3	●	●
Reviewer #4	● Plan states that school will secure the records for students with disabilities--How will school maintain confidentiality of the records? How will staff be informed of this process/procedure to maintain confidentiality?	● 45-50

Section 2.4 Student Performance Standards		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Academic achievement goals are rigorous, measurable, and realistic and set high standards and expectations for student learning. ● Academic goals contribute to the stated mission and vision of the school. ● Clear and compelling process for setting, monitoring, and/or revising academic achievement goals. ● Assessment selection will provide sufficiently rich data for evaluation of the academic program and align with state standards. ● Assessment plan details the collection and analysis of individual students, student cohorts, and school level performance throughout the school year, at the end of the academic year, and for the term of the charter. ● A process for using data to support instruction is clearly articulated, with detailed plans to provide adequate training for teachers and school leaders. ● Evidence of clear, rigorous promotion/retention and exit policies and standards. ● Student attendance goals are realistic and plans to ensure high rates of student attendance and address chronic absenteeism are clearly outlined.		

Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal seeks to attain both academic and operational goals for the proposed charter school to ensure overall school performance. ● The proposal intends to engage in a continuous cycle of school improvement by constantly reviewing and updating goals based on school performance. ● NHA has developed a suite of assessments that are easy to administer, grade, and provide actionable data to provide teachers with data to drive instruction. ● NHA provides a weeklong summer professional development to new teachers within their network of schools.	● 51 ● 51-52 ● 52 ● 52
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● A variety of assessments detailed in application.	● 52
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal identifies a cycle of continuous improvement through the use of a suite of data assessments. However, the proposal lacks specificity around specifically what assessments will used and the benchmarks to assess and measure progress.	●
Reviewer #2	● What "national assessment of college readiness" will be given to 8th graders?	●
Reviewer #3	● What type of formative assessments will be used? Formative assessments are usually utilized more than "multiple times per year" ● What type of interim assessments will be used? NC Check-ins? NHA created assessments? ● Will teachers be trained to analyze and act on student	● 52-53

	data? How? ● How will possible retention be communicated to parents? Will there be an appeal process for retained students?	

Section 2.5 School Culture and Discipline		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● A clear vision for school culture or ethos that will promote a positive academic environment and will reflect high levels of academic expectation and support. ● Coherent plan for creating and sustaining the intended culture for students, teachers, administrators, and parents from the school's inception, and for integrating new students and families as they arrive. ● Plan for how school culture will embrace students with special needs. ● Student discipline plan that provides for effective strategies to support a safe, orderly school climate and strong school culture while respecting student rights. ● Evidence of a legally sound school discipline plan that outlines discipline procedures, suspension and expulsion procedures, and appeals processes. ● Thoughtful consideration of how the discipline policies protect the rights of students with disabilities.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal intends to use the research based positive behavior interventions and supports model (PBIS) to drive and improve its positive school climate and culture. ● The proposal intends to use a school wide behavior management system to teach and reinforce expected behavior as identified in the school's code of conduct.	● 54 ● 55
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Use of Behave with Care and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Model.	● 55
Concerns/Questions		**Page**

Reviewer #1	● The school wide behavior management system does not seem to differentiate between early elementary (K-2), upper elementary (3 – 5) and middle school/grades (6 – 8).
	● While the proposal intends to institute a school wide plan, it does not differentiate based on the developmental needs of students across it K-8 continuum.
	● The support provided to teachers around PBIS seems passive through the 30-mini course packet as provided through Positive Behavior Replacement Plan (PBRP).
	    o Who at the school will be the lead trainer and in-role developer around PBIS?
	    o How will these courses be monitored for completion across the teacher cohort?
		●

Reviewer #2	● Some explanation of teacher PD, however more detail could benefit the application. ● Overall this section lacks specifics. ● Discipline of EC students should include more details.	● ● ● 56
Reviewer #3	● Little detail throughout this section. Not clear on the culture the school is striving for. How will the school ensure staff, students, and families are aligned in regards	● 54-56

	to behavior expectations and consequences?	

Section 2 Education Plan Summary

Each part of your summary comments should, in a few sentences, provide a clear understanding of your overall evaluation of the proposal as well as the most significant strengths and/or Concerns/Questions. The summary comments for each section should support your rating for the section and should not be simply cut and pasted from your subsection analysis.

Evaluation Summary for Entire Education Plan
Initial Application Review
Reviewer #1 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary The education plan is standards aligned and uses frequent assessments to monitor progress toward goals. The plan anticipates servicing students considered "at-risk" and students with identified disabilities, for which the educational plan anticipates appropriate changes and provisions to meet the diverse needs of student body. The proposal should be further developed to address recent research and best practices around MTSS and ensure the school wide behavior plans are developmentally appropriate and appropriately match the grade bands in which the systems will be used.
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary In general, the instructional program outlined in the application is thorough and aligned to the mission. Applicant understands the needs of students including special populations. Applicant could elaborate on the student performance standards and school culture components.

Section 3.1 School Governing Body/Section 3.2 Governance		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Evidence the proposed board members will contribute the wide range of knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to oversee a successful charter school, including but not limited to educational, financial, legal, and community experience and expertise. ● Strong understanding of the roles and responsibilities of a governing board, including structure, size, powers, duties, and expertise that aligns with the school's mission and vision. ● Proposed structure is likely to ensure effective governance and meaningful oversight of school performance, operations, and finances. ● Clear, appropriate plans for the board to evaluate the success of the school and school leader. ● Documentation of a clear structure of the governing board is outlined in an organization chart. ● Section includes description of selection and removal procedures, term limits, meeting schedules, and powers and duties of board members, including a conflict of interest policy. ● Plans for meaningful board training. ● Clear, compelling plans to ensure parents have access to the governing board, including a grievance policy that is fair, transparent, and a plan for communicating the process. ● Sound plan and timeline for board recruitment, expansion, and orientation of new members.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposed charter school is an approved non-profit agency appropriately registered with the state of North Carolina with the appropriate non-profit status, registered agent, and federal tax ID number. ● The board represents a range of knowledge and expertise, including member serving on boards of schools currently operated by NHA.	● 57
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Some charter board experience ● Strong financial experience ● Guilford county residents ● Clear grievance processes	● Appendix - resumes ● 64
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● In Jeff Phillips questionnaire - he states immediate removal for allegations of unethical behavior. BOD should follow policy and make sure that belief/allegation is investigated rather than having a "knee-jerk" reaction. ● No BOD member has educational administration or teaching experience. ● Thomas Stainback has several charges and one conviction that are not desirable - not sure how CSAB will view this.	● 506
Reviewer #3	● Appears there is no education experience (teaching, admin, etc) on board.	● Appendix - resumes

Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Compensation packages, system, and strategy that are likely to attract and retain strong staff. ● Recruitment and hiring strategy, criteria, timeline, and procedures that are likely to result in a strong staff that are likely to result in a strong staff and are well suited to the school. ● Effective planning for unsatisfactory leadership/teacher performance and turnover.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal anticipate a multi-pronged approach to recruiting and hiring of staff to ensure the school is fully staffed to meet its projected staffing needs. ● The proposal anticipates retaining teachers through its "total rewards" compensation package, which includes an option for merit based pay for high performing teachers.	● 65-66 ● 67
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Extensive experience in staffing (NHA). ●	● 66 ●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● What is the retention rate of teachers across the NHA network? The proposal intends that pay increase will take effect in the 3rd year of success with the school. How does align with local practice for retaining the best teachers?	●
Reviewer #2	● Is there any concern with larger (compared to traditional LEAs) class sizes and relatively few TAs? ● Interested to know more about the joint employment.	●
Reviewer #3	● How do the teacher salary ranges compare to county ranges?	● 68

Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Professional development standards, opportunities, and calendar/scheduling effectively support the education program and are likely to maximize success in improving student achievement. ● Thoughtful plan for professional development in the areas of special education and EL students, including the implementation of IEPs, discipline of students with disabilities, and communication with EL families. ● Detailed evidence that all school staff will receive ongoing focused professional development to effectively implement the school's mission, instructional methodologies, and education program are included. ● Details in this section align with proposed budget. ● Plan for supporting, developing, and annually evaluating school leadership and teachers that is likely to produce and retain a successful staff.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal indicates that new teachers will be provided a teacher mentor as part of NHA overall approach to teacher development and retention. ● Teachers will be able to have increased compensation based on performance according to an internally developed teacher evaluation tool.	● 71
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Robust PD plan.	● 73
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● Will OGCA use NCEES or another model?	●
Reviewer #3	● How does the NHA "internally developed evaluation tool" compare to NCEES?	● 72

Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing		
Characteristics of a strong response: • Articulated student recruitment and marketing plan, timeline, and enrollment policy that will provide equal access to all interested students and families, including those in poverty, academically low-achieving students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. • Details in the section align with proposed budget.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	• The proposal indicates to utilize a multi-pronged approach to market to and attract students to meet its enrollment targets consistent with the projections of the proposals.	• 75
Reviewer #2	•	•
Reviewer #3	• Board has strong community ties. • A variety of marketing tools outlined. • Plans to reach special populations with marketing efforts.	• 77 • 78
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	•	•
Reviewer #2	•	•
Reviewer #3	• Marketing plan could use a more detailed timeline.	• 77

Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Compelling outreach plan that includes community, family, and student involvement, and that is realistic and likely to foster student retention and community support. ● Description of existing community resources and partnerships already formed that will benefit students and parents and that include a description of the nature, purposes, terms, and scope of services of any such partnerships; and evidence of commitment from identified community partners including documentation of pledged support, if available.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal identifies parental partnership as among the four pillars of the CCA charter application. The proposal seeks to utilize a monthly newsletter, school website, and social media to keep interested families informed of the latest events of our school as it gets closer to opening. Social media will be used to help form and maintain connections between school leaders and parents.	● 78
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● Application mentions sending communication so parents can "become involved in the school," however application primarily mentions communication from the school to parents and a parent room. Effective parent engagement involves parents being active within the school community - application does not contain specifics for how this will occur. Simply keeping parents informed does not automatically equate to active, engaged parents.	● 78-79
Reviewer #3	● Plan lacks detail. ● How will non-English speaking families receive information?	● 78-79

Section 3.8 Admissions Policy		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Enrollment policy that complies with NC state law, SBE policy, and the Charter Agreement.		

Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal seeks to ensure all students and have equal and equitable access to attend CCA. ● The proposal identifies the following strategies to meet the goals of its admission's policy: an open enrollment period and a lottery in cases where demand exceeds spaces available. ● The proposal identifies a number of preferences within the admission's policy, specifically, students who would like to reenroll in successive year; children of board members and full time employees will be granted preference within the admission's policy; siblings of currently enrolled students will always be granted preference in the admission's policy.	● 80 ● 80 ● 80
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Policy in compliance with law/policy.	● 80
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Does the preferences extended to a Board members and full-time employes comply with applicable state and municipal law concerning open and equal access? This may not be an issue but would be investigated to ensure compliance with applicable laws.	●
Reviewer #2	● May need to clarify some preferences and processes in policy.	●
Reviewer #3	● Policy that board develops for stakeholders will need more detail.	●

Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)		

Characteristics of a strong response:
 	
   ● The applicant outlines a weighted lottery process that does not illegally discriminate against a student on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity, gender, or disability.
   ● The weighted lottery process is not based on geographic boundaries, such as zip code or current public school zones.
   ● The weighted lottery or limited lottery process is unique to the school's unique mission and provides a thorough explanation of why the school is choosing to use the process.
   ● Applicant provides a thorough description of the processes and procedures it intends to use to implement the lottery.
   ● Applicant provides underlying research, pedagogical, educational, psychometric and legal, that supports the request and the procedures the applicant is requesting.		

Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●

Section 3 Governance and Capacity Summary

Each part of your summary comments should, in a few sentences, provide a clear understanding of your overall evaluation of the proposal as well as the most significant strengths and/or Concerns/Questions. The summary comments for each section should support your rating for the section and should not be simply cut and pasted from your subsection analysis.

Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan
Initial Application Review
Reviewer #1 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary The proposal provides a sufficient governing structure to adequately provide governing and oversight over the school's daily operations and accountability to the charter management organization. The proposal's recruitment plan, both of staff and students, provides sufficient detail to meet its enrollment and staffing projections, with the CMO assuming risk to cover all operation costs in the event of not meeting projections, not to exceed the projections in the proposal.
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary Board has strengths in that some members have charter board experience. Board has strong financial/management experience. Board appears to have some strong community ties and understand governance responsibilities. Marketing and parent engagement pieces need more thought and detail.

Section 4.1 Transportation Plan		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Clear description of a transportation plan that supports daily transportation, extracurricular activities, field trips, etc. ● A comprehensive oversight plan that identifies school staff responsible for this oversight. ● Description of how the school will arrange transportation for special needs students where necessary ● Demonstrated familiarity with state and federal regulations relating to provision of transportation services to students.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The CCA proposal seeks to ensure that the school is accessible to all students and that transportation needs are not a barrier to any child attending the school. ● The proposal does not plan to provide bus transportation to the general student population. However the proposal identifies options will offer parents and guardians resources and support to coordinate their transportation needs, and, as required by federal and state law, will provide transportation as required by any individual student's IEP, 504 plan, status as a student experiencing homelessness, or other applicable law.	● 82
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●
Reviewer #4	● Statement that school will provide transportation if stated in a student's IEP	● 82
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● "Support and resources" for transportation is very general. Unclear how OGCA is removing transportation barriers for students.	●
Reviewer #3	● Applicant states "we also recognize that our population may include students who have transportation needs" - how exactly will those needs be met?	● 83
Reviewer #4	●	●

Section 4.2 School Lunch Plan		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● A clear description of how the school will offer food service to all students, adhering to all nutritional guidelines. ● A plan to collect free and reduced-price lunch information, including procedures to receive reimbursement. ● Adequate funds allocated for school nutrition, aligned with the target student population. ● A plan to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal regulations.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal identifies a meal plan that ensures each student who wants or needs a meal during the school day will receive one. ● The proposal identifies a daily procedural protocol to identify the number of students who will require food during the school day for which the school will be able to respond accordingly. ● The proposal identifies tht NHA will contract with a food-service provider to operate the schools food program, following U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) procurement requirements and complying with Federal Regulation 7 CFR 210.16 and other applicable law. ● A hot meal for lunch will be offered daily, and a cold breakfast will be offered if needed. ● Students will pay a set price for school meals unless students qualify for free or reduced price meals under the National School Lunch Program.	● 83
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● NHA experience w/National School Lunch Program	● 83
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● This section is fairly general - could include more specifics.	●
Reviewer #3	● Lacks details regarding how families and the school will communicate lunch needs/services.	●

Section 4.3 Civil Liability and Insurance		

Characteristics of a strong response:
    ● Plan to secure comprehensive and adequate insurance coverage, including worker's compensation, liability, property, indemnity, directors and officers, automobile, crime, errors and omissions, and any other required coverage.
    ● Insurance quote provided aligns with budget assumptions.		

Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal identifies sufficient and appropriate liability assurance as required under federal, state, and other applicable laws. ● The proposal shall name SBE as an "additional" insured to ensure proper liability is extended to the authorizing body and its designated agents.	● 84
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●

	Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan		
Characteristics of a strong response:			

Characteristics of a strong response:
- Compelling plan for leading the development of the school from post-approval to opening, including identification of a capable individual or team to lead the planning and start-up.
- Adequately addresses potential challenges
- Detailed start-up plan specifying tasks and timelines (which are aligned with a sound start-up budget, if applicable)

Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposals state up plan is sufficient that if approved accounts for the necessary processes and protocols to ensure a smooth opening of the school. ● The board will hold monthly, public meetings to openly discuss its start up operations, and ensure sufficient community engagement in the "Ready To Open" process.	● 85
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● NHA pledge of $3.8M ● Strong experience on board and with NHA in founding schools	● 86
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●

Section 4.5 Facility		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Facility plans are reasonable and adequately meet the requirements of the educational program and anticipated student population. ● A sound plan and timeline for identifying, financing, renovating, and ensuring code compliance for a facility.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The proposal has not identified a viable facility for this proposed charter school. ● The proposal sets forth two options for the facility as either new construction and or renovation of a standing facility.	● 86
Reviewer #2	● Beyond a specific address for a site, this section is fairly comprehensive.	●
Reviewer #3	● Thorough timeline and plan.	● 86-87
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● How will the board management construction costs associated with a new construction or renovation? ● How much of total school renew will be used to reimburse NHA for construction cost in the near and short term?	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●

Section 4 Operations Plan Summary
Each part of your summary comments should, in a few sentences, provide a clear understanding of
   your overall evaluation of the proposal as well as the most significant strengths and/or
   Concerns/Questions. The summary comments for each section should support your rating for
   the section and should not be simply cut and pasted from your subsection analysis.

Evaluation Summary for Entire Operations Plan
Initial Application Review
Strengths:
Reviewer #1: The operation plan is sufficient and NHA has a record of opening schools on time against an aggressive schedule.
Concerns/Questions: Reviewer #1: How does the budget anticipate construction cost or associated costs for a facility renovation? How much money will NHA be reimbursed for the cost of construction or renovation? With will come at an interest on public dollars? Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary Application needs elaboration in terms of meeting transportation and meal needs of all students. Also needs more detail on marketing and family engagement plans. Application is strong in terms of start up and facility plans.

Section 5.1 Charter School Budget		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Applicant has identified one or more LEA(s) and outlined a realistic revenue projection (state, local, federal) over the next five years. ● The enrollment projection aligns with the Total Student Enrollment projections located in Section 1 of the application. ● Applicant has provided assurances of identified "other funds" or "working capital." ● Applicant provides a realistic budgetary projection in regard to personnel. ● Budget worksheet contains assumptions and reasonable budget numbers that reflect rent, utilities, maintenance, insurance, and build-out costs. ● Detailed budget assumptions that include the impact of the anticipated number of students who receive free or reduced-price lunches. ● Complete, realistic, and viable five-year operating budget ● Applicant has provided a realistic assessment of projected source of revenue and expenses that ensure the financial viability of the proposed school. ● The projection is consistent and aligns with all proposed sections of the application.		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**

Reviewer #1	● ● The proposal anticipates the vast majority of revenue to be generated through a per-pupil funding formula.
	● ● The school plans to enroll 520 students in year one (K-5) adding a grade each year there after until at full capacity of 772 students.
	● Projected revenue:
	  o Year 1: $5,722,402
	  o Year 2: $6,158,150
	  o Year 3: $6,572,130
	  o Year 4: $7,133,695
	  o Year 5: $7,259,845
		●

Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● Positions align with other parts of the application.	●
Reviewer #4	● Assurance that they will provide whatever is needed to meet the unique needs of a student with a disability, and statement that they have additional funding outside of federal and state allotments to cover this need	● 93
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● Not sure that student population is realistic, even though application mentions that viability is not dependant on population.	●
Reviewer #3	● Concerns about ability to find part time positions. ● What is included in the marketing expenses (186k) and tech services (122k)? ● What is the interventionist position specifically? What qualifications? Salary is low. ● Only 10K allotted for transportation needs. This could go	●

	very quickly.	
Reviewer #4	• Who will be assigned to complete grant application specific to students with disabilities? What resources/process will they use to maintain compliance and reporting related to funds received?	• 93

Section 5.2 Budget Narrative		
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Sound contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are lower than expected. ● Individual and collective qualifications for implementing the financial plan successfully, including capacity in areas such as financial management, fundraising and development, and accounting. ● Detailed budget narrative that clearly explains reasonable, well-supported revenue and cost assumptions, including grant/fundraising assumptions, identification of the amounts and sources of all anticipated funds, property, or other resources (noting which are secured vs. anticipated and including evidence of firm commitments where applicable).		
Initial Application Review		
Strengths		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	●	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● EC percentage in the state is higher than 7%, why is this used for the budget? ● What function does the "admissions representative" play, compared to "registrar?" ● Any concern that finding a .8 social worker or .75 recess aid will be challenging? ● I do not see the details on the NHA contributions for the initial years in the agreement, however I could have missed this. ● Budget shows Interventionists making just over $20K/year, what kind of background/experience/qualifications will these individuals have? ● State Health Plan cost is under $7K/employee currently, appears to be over budgeted. ● $185K+/year for marketing? Seems very high. ● Not sure if iReady, chromebooks and MAP/NWEA are included in Tech Services - these are expensive items. ● Since busing is not offered, application states that field trips would be contracted transportation. Field trips reflect less than $3K, not sure if this includes transportation.	● ● 629 ● 629
Reviewer #3	●	●

Section 5.3 Financial Compliance			
Characteristics of a strong response: ● Detailed financial procedures, policy, or other reasonable assurance that the proposed school will have sound systems and processes in place for accounting, payroll, and independent annual school level financial and administrative audits.			
Initial Application Review			
Strengths			**Page**
Reviewer #1	●		●
Reviewer #2	●		●
Reviewer #3	● NHA experience ● Audit firms being considered		●
Concerns/Questions			**Page**
Reviewer #1	●		●
Reviewer #2	●		●
Reviewer #3	●		●

Section 5 Financial Plan Summary

Each part of your summary comments should, in a few sentences, provide a clear understanding of your overall evaluation of the proposal as well as the most significant strengths and/or Concerns/Questions. The summary comments for each section should support your rating for the section and should not be simply cut and pasted from your subsection analysis.

Evaluation Summary for Entire Financial Plan
Initial Application Review
Reviewer #1 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary Budget aligns with application and mission. Some concerns about ability of the board to find part time positions and interventionists at stated salaries. Need more clarity on some large expenses such as marketing and tech services. Not sure enough is allotted to transportation needs.