North Carolina State Board of Education Charter School
Application Rubric

Applicant: North Davidson Charter Academy

Reviewers: #1 Shaunda Cooper (OCS); #2 Dr. Kelli Peterson; #3 Nicky Charles; #4 Rob McOuat (EC); #5 Marshall Foster (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	● Applicants entered a response for each question. It is noted that the 501c3 has not been applied for. ●	● 6 and 7
Reviewer #2	● Applicant responds to all questions completely. ● The projected enrollment summary figures include 46 students per grade level, which is a realistic growth plan.	● 6 ● 7
Reviewer #3	● The applicant chose to work with an EMO that has charter experience ● Provided solid rational for chosen age group by highlighting capacity and desire to provide adequate service	● 9-17 ● 8
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Projected enrollment seems high for the first year with consideration to the saturation of schools in the area.	●
Reviewer #2	● The projected enrollment summary figures, while are consistent grade level and yearly, do not account for attrition year to year or possible growth in cohorts, is there a reason to now increase the number of students in either K-4 or 5-8 to maximize? ● The applicant was unable to certify that the application was not reproduced from any other application.	● 7 ● 8
Reviewer #3	● Did not certify	●

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	● Torchlight Schools is stated to provide $50,000 dollars in supportive startup cost.	● 18
Reviewer #2	● Torchlight Schools will provide $50,000 in start-up funds. ● The applicant demonstrates understanding that the EMO will only advise and is a vendor of the school and that the governing board has the ultimate decision making authority.	● 18 ● 19
Reviewer #3	● Applicant prioritized a CMO with experience in NC and experience with the applicants target population ● CMO/EMO agreed to provide start up funds	● 18 &19
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Torchlight Schools' description indicates positive academic performance. However, evidence of the statements was not provided for review. ● How are funds verified ($50,000)?	● 19
Reviewer #2	● Within the description of the Torchlight Schools and their successes, it is stated that they have "exceeded growth" and closed the achievement gap, but does not provide specific data, rather than generalized growth. ● The applicant does not provide insight into TLS financial data as requested in question number 5. ● If TLS will be a vendor, why would the employees be employees of the TLS, rather than solely the non-profit? This is of concern, because in the event that the charter board decided to terminate the contract with the vendor, they also loose their employees.	● 19 ● 19 ● 20
Reviewer #3	● The Service Agreement with Torchlight is not dated so it is unclear how long the commitment with that particular EMO is valid. The agreement appears to be boilerplate and instance contradicts the narrative	● Appendix 4.1 ● 18&19 ● 19

	esp. in relation to governance (TL board member?) and separation of powers. ● What benefits is TL getting for the $50k support it's providing? The applicant does not list fees and the relationship is unclear. ● The agreement indicates a fee of 10% of revenue but no fees are listed ● Are TLS and TAS the same or is one a specific school? ● As a vendor, what precisely is the financial relationship between TAS/TLS and North Davidson Academy? The roles between EMO and applicant are unclear. ● How precisely was "best fit" of EMO decided. ● The Lead Administrator appears to be an employee of the EMO but the teachers are hired by the school. Where does the accountability for teacher performance and Lead Administrator performance lie? ● What happens to the staff and the school specifically if the EMO cancels the contract? ● The applicant shared info about EMO's fund balance but fails to mention enrollment and other relevant information ● Has TAS/TLS served students in the same age range before?	● 17-19 ● Appendix 4.1 ● 20 ● 20

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 statement is clear.	•
Reviewer #2	• The mission statement is concise and clear. • The applicant proposes to remain socio-demographically consistent with that of the district in which it is situated.	• 21 • 22
Reviewer #3	● The applicant supports foreign language requirements and 21 Century skill building ● Applicant identified specific teaching methods ("Teach like a champion") ● Applicant proposes use of CRT (culturally responsive teaching) ● Ambitious mission set applicant from LEA	• 21
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	• As a reviewer, I remain concerned about projected enrollment numbers due to trends and charter school saturation in the Charlotte area.	• 22
Reviewer #2	• Due to the decrease in enrollment annually in the grades of K-4, is it still realistic to target enrollment for 46 students, rather than one section per grade level? • While the applicant responds that the difference of the proposed school and other schools is that they will focus on 21st Century Education Model, which is theoretical, how will this be communicated to students and families? • The engagement that is described by the applicant seems to lack measurement and specifically focuses on touch points rather than involvement.	• 22 • 23 • 24
Reviewer #3	● Applicant fails to specifically indicate which research based educational practices will be used ● Active based learning, though well documented and researched, is not described in detail in the application so	• 21

	the incorporation of the instructional methodology remains unclear ● The applicant may want to clarify the understanding of DRT as it does not address how students receive information based on culture but how teachers deliver the information in culturally responsive way ● 100 parent surveys is less than 50% of the projected Year 1 enrollment and not enough to indicate the financial viability especially with a breakeven point of 175

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	● N/A	●
Reviewer #2	● The applicant focuses on the educational model, 21st Century Educational Model as the way that the proposed model will meet the legislative purpose of innovative teaching strategies.	● 25
Reviewer #3	● Applicant proposed use of tested instructional model	● 24 & 25
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The purpose statement included in the application does not clearly explain how the school will meet the goal of innovation. This portion of the application lacks detail.	● 25
Reviewer #2	● While the applicant focuses on the educational model, 21st Century Educational Model as the way that the proposed model will meet the legislative purpose of innovative teaching strategies, it does not specifically speak to measurable or quantifiable metrics to demonstrate the effectiveness of the model.	● 25
Reviewer #3	● The application is missing detail and measurable outcomes for any of the legislative purposes. ● The descriptions for "improving student outcomes" and "use of different/innovative teaching methods" are generalized and lack specificity	● 25-27

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	● High standards for operational requirements	● 25
Reviewer #2	● The applicant sets high metrics for the operational requirements of the school, however realistics and relevant given that seriousness of each metric.	● 25
Reviewer #3	● Applicant shared measurable operations goals that indicated thoughtfulness around various domain ● The applicant has assertive growth goals, which is met, have the ability to truly impact student success ● The applicant outlined very ambitious financials goals for a start-up school The applicant demonstrates high board involvement through its proposed meeting schedule	● 27
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● This portion of the application is considered insufficient based on the lack of details and checks and balances required. I would suggest the applicant contribute more concise and specific information.	●
Reviewer #2	● Although the academic metrics focus on growth, it is dependent upon the benchmark assessment, the content area, and the baseline in order to make relevant growth gains. ● Although the financial goals are to have no non-compliance, it fails to have financial metrics regarding budget, sustainability, unrestricted cash, and other monitoring measures. ● The governance goals are not goals, they are tasks that they must complete for compliance.	● 26 ● 26 ● 26
Reviewer #3	● The goal of "greater than 100% of required students to be tested" measure exactly and what is impact on student success? ● There are no achievement goals outlined. The applicant only provides growth measures and comparison goals) ● The outlined governance goals are very base level (i.e. no nepotism clause, no distinction based on EMO contracts) ● How will school climate be measured?	●

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
  The application presented demonstrates the ability to focus on a mission and educational plan, it lacks
  details that demonstrate a thorough understanding of not only setting goals, but realistically being able
  to attain them through action steps.

Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary While the applicant has a concise mission that is focused on the implementation of the 21st Century Education Plan, there are significant concerns with the lack of control that the potentially approved non-profit entity will have over the employees. Additionally, the metrics as written should be revised to ensure alignment with the academic benchmark, and to ensure that the operations, governance and finance include goals that are measurable, and not inclusive of tasks that must be completed.
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary This application is generally solid but could benefit from more measurable outcome description and more detail.

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	● The school's calendar meets and exceeds the state's required guidelines.	● 28
Reviewer #2	● The school calendar provides in excess of 1025 hours of instructional time within the academic school year. ● It is stated that students will engage in 90 minutes of ELA, and 60 minutes of Math and Science. ● Teachers will be provided with 10 days of professional development prior to the beginning of the school year.	● 28 ● 28 ● 30
Reviewer #3	● The applicant focuses on underserved population ● Instructional program is data driven ● The applicant proposed increased instructional time ● The applicant proposed solid technology integration	● 28 &29
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The explanation provided does not create a clear picture of what day to day operations will look like. More details are needed to fully understand implementation.	● 30
Reviewer #2	● The applicant proposes to use assessments from School Net, and mClass. Are these aligned with NC EOG assessments and can they be used as predictors? ● It is unclear of the curriculum that is selected for the content areas and grade levels. ● While the instructional strategy that is identified as the primary strategy is active based learning, it is unclear as to how this translates day to day. The applicant provides theory and research that supports the selection of the	● 28 ● 29 ● 29 ● 30 ● 30 ● 30

	strategy, but it is unclear as to how this will be implemented and executed. ● The applicant does not clearly articulate how the instructional strategies ensure student readiness from grade to grade promotion and/or graduation. ● The applicant describes the school as a data driven school, however, there are only 8 days included within the school calendar to focus on professional development. ● Are the dedicated amounts of instructional time written within the application also applicable to middle school?	
Reviewer #3	● How will Artificial Intelligence included on a K-4 curriculum? ● What does "operate within the school to prison pipeline" mean? ● The applicant does not list citation or data ● Teacher/student ratio is high for early grades and the target population. ● There is not much detail provided and lots of repetition. ● What specific supports are included in the PD for teachers who have little experience with the specific methods? ● Do all grades have the same school days? The applicant should consider building a more developmentally appropriate schedule. ● What languages will be offered and at what grade level ● Do kids and teachers arrive together? ● Day structure is overly strenuous. ● No differentiated scope and sequence (i.e. will K learn about drugs and alcohol)	

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 application reflects a uniform grading system. - Application shows a focus on finding a director for Exceptional Children.	40
Reviewer #2	- The applicant will provide families a Home Language Survey to complete at the time of registration. - The proposed screening assessments are appropriate. - The school proposes to have a uniform grading system.	33 33 40
Reviewer #3	- The applicant is committed to RTI - Applicant proposed full-time EC and EL staff - Programming for at-risk accounts for differentiated instruction	
Reviewer #4	"North Davidson Academy will use a Response-to-Intervention (RTI) model to manage teacher and staff response to data collected from initial benchmark tests and end of marking period benchmark testing."	p. 32
Reviewer #5	There is a basic understanding of the EL identification process, screening and the annual English language proficiency testing.	33-34
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	More clarity is needed to identify the following: 1. IEP Team Members 2. Clarify staffing plan (who will be contract and who will be employee)	40 41
Reviewer #2	- The applicant does not have a board member that has experience with special populations, but rather focuses on the hiring of an exceptional services director. - While it is important to have high expectations for all students, the applicant states " treat all students as being academically gifted." However, students that have been identified as G/T should have a predetermined educational program, and the applicant fails to provide an adequate	32 34 37 39 40 41

	program or plan within the response. ● It is unclear as to who will serve on the IEP team? ● It is unclear is the applicant proposes to contract with related service providers or employ them on-staff. ● While the applicant plans to have a grading scale, will the school implement a uniform grade weight scale to ensure consistency? ● The applicant proposes that in order for students to graduate they must have at least a 70 percent passage rate on their report card. Is the report card standards based? Otherwise, how will they ensure that grades are aligned to standards? How will they ensure that teachers are consistent on grading criteria and normed?	
Reviewer #3	● No intervention for non-academic risks ● Dual certification may be hard to find in the salary range ● Gifted student program are not described, neither is identification and evaluation for gifted students	●
Reviewer #4	● Plan is not clear on how students will be identified as being 'at-risk', which interventions will be provided or who will provide the interventions. ● Plan does identify a founding board member or school administrator with experience working with special populations.	● p. 32 ● p.32
Reviewer #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. ● The plan doesn't fiscally address parental/family interpreting needs nor the translation of any document, that goes out to English speaking families, to non-English speaking families. ● The teachers' skills and competency needs to be able to meet the EL student's needs are not addressed here. If pull out is not to be used by an EL teacher, then a thorough PD plan should be in place to build the capacity and necessary skills of the staff to meet the EL student's needs. ● As you have no dedicated staff for ELs at this time, consider adding an all-staff PD targeted to English Learners e.x. Sheltered Instruction such as SIOP. ● Even though there is a basic understanding of the EL identification process and screening, a more in depth and comprehensive understanding of when to test, how to test, where to enter the official test results, what's the data authoritative source, when and how to notify parents of the test results and any subsequent EL services, needs to be demonstrated.	● 33-34

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	● Application indicates a clear understanding for Exceptional Children responsibilities as well as an understanding of the importance of student confidentiality.	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● The applicant has a good record keeping plan	● 34-40
Reviewer #4	● Good description of Child find obligations ● File confidentiality plan refers to FEFPA. ● Plan includes monitoring teachers schedules to make sure they address service delivery times.	● p. 35 ● p. 36 ● p39
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Submission does not address differentiation of instruction, and progress reporting practices of IEP. This portion of the application needs more clarity and detail to be considered sufficient.	●
Reviewer #2	● No concern identified	●
Reviewer #3	● The applicant should consider their plan distinguish between 504 and IEP more consistently as the needs are very different ● The board has not yet adopted any policies and should prioritize that to help parents decide whether the school is a good fit. ● The application mentions a school psychologist and therapists but neither the budget narrative or financials adequately address the costs ● Who comprises the IEP? ● How will data be used to monitor and progress students? ● The applicant refers the goal of preparing students for EOG. Is that the real goal or is the goal to teach children and have the successes be reflected in the scores (p.38)	● 34-40

Reviewer #4	● Items 4&5 need to mention specially designed instruction that will meet the unique needs of the child. ● progress on IEP should be provided as frequently as report cards ● Discipline section does not mention protections under IDEA including manifestation determination review and continued services during removal.	● p. 36-37 ● p. 38 ● p. 43

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	● No strengths /standard submission	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● Applicant support benchmark testing to allow for data informed responses where needed	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● No concerns/standard submission	●
Reviewer #2	● No concern identified	●
Reviewer #3	● What is the 70% report card score based on? ● Is uniform grading system truly best for K-8 school? Seems that the early grades may need a different structure. ● What specific benchmark tests will be used at the various grade levels? ● How will early grades be promoted? ● Can the applicant share more about the specifics of the "remedial plan mentioned"	●

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 application indicates an understanding of the importance of customer service.	●
Reviewer #2	● The school culture includes a parental focus.	● 41
Reviewer #3	● The applicant incorporated specific PD for school culture ● Teacher/staff evaluation includes culture as a measurable tenet	●
Reviewer #4		
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Has the applicant considered including expectations for parent volunteering and or interaction with the school?	● 41
Reviewer #2	● While the school culture has specific tenants, it is unclear as to how this will translate to student behavior and expectations day to day. ● The applicant states that the staff will be provided with the specific strategies to implement the culture, but is still unclear as to what the strategies are. ● The discipline is unclear, as it does not outline what offenses the school considers minor, intermediate, etc. Thus, the discipline lacks sufficient detail.	● 41 ● 41 ● 42
Reviewer #3	● The plan for school culture is not particular sensitive to the needs of the target population. How will the school support families in "providing a home environment to support student achievement"? Family circumstances can be very complicated and the school should see parents as partners. ● How does school promote social development in its policies? The language reads very punitive rather than supportive. ● How exactly will positive school culture be measures and evaluated for teachers?	●
Reviewer #4		

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 proposed application demonstrates overall a basic understanding of the components submitted. However, each section reviewed with the exception of one, require additional details for full understanding.
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary While the proposed applicant has outlined the educational model, there are various tenants of the educational plan that lacks sufficient detail, and thus unsure of their ability to implement. For example, the school culture is explained in broad strokes, but it is unclear as to how students will experience the culture and discipline plan. Based upon the lack of sufficient detail, it is unclear as to if the applicant is the one that shall develop such, or will they be relying on TLS to develop and execute the day to day functions.
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary The education plan is straightforward but not particularly innovative or responsive to the target population in some areas. The applicant did not spend time making developmentally appropriate distinction in several parts of the educational plan.

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 application indicated that the board will do a nationwide search for operational school leadership.	● 45
Reviewer #2	● The board has five members to ensure balanced voting.	● 45
Reviewer #3	● Applicant proposed SMART goals for Board ● NoDa is committed to having a Parent Advisory Council ● The Board is committed to formal training and professional development hours	● 43-50
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The board shows weaknesses in the area of financial savvy as well as legal experience. What efforts are being made to ensure that the board is more well rounded. ● How successful has the management company been with hiring and maintaining administrators? Has this information been collected and reviewed?	● 44 ● 45
Reviewer #2	● The applicant does not hold current 501c3 status as required. ● Based upon the current membership, the board does not have a person that has financial experience, or legal expertise. ● The board lacks sufficient detail in the response to their primary duties, specifically the oversight of not only the school leader but areas of autonomy. ● While the board has chosen to hire TLS, how will the board have oversight and manage the vendor without sufficient expertise on the board? ● The applicant does not answer the question regarding the board calendar.	● 43 ● 44 ● 44 ● 45 ● 47

| Reviewer #3 | ● Who owns the 501(c)3?
● The board is very small but has many meetings. Are there any concerns about quorum at meetings?
● The board would benefit from more educational, financial and legal expertise on the board.
● The previous narrative and EMO agreement outline TLS/TAS members on the board but this section does not address this.
● It is unclear from the org chart who manages who and what aspects of the school.
● The incomplete board member forms does not allow to identification of conflict.
● The board terms are very long and do not encourage innovation or diversity among members. For example, if members can be on the board for over a decade and the limit is seven members, at what point can community members participate in the decision-making?
● By-laws are not fully executed
● Is the School Director, the EMO, and the Lead Admin the same entity? The by-laws contradict the role separation listed in other parts of the organization
● Lack of clarity about who is providing the building (also mentioned during facility section. | ● |

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	● THere are significant missing components. What special education teachers mentioned.	●
Reviewer #2	● The applicant proposes to retain teachers by increasing salary based on evaluation.	● 51
Reviewer #3	● The applicant shares a diverse recruitment plan ● Applicant is committed to performance raises, providing health care and benefits and retirement	
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● There is a lack of quality in this portion of the application. Please give clarity on positions hired and professional development.	●
Reviewer #2	● Why is there no staff hired for Year 0 to plan? ● Who is the additional school leadership? What is their function? ● There are no special education teachers included. ● Who will provide the PD for teachers, TLS? ● The applicant should provide additional detail and information regarding the benefits package and retirement package that they will provide to ensure that it is comparable to the district package. They should also consider how this may impact teacher recruitment from teachers whom have traditional retirement packages. ● Additional staff, such as an instructional coach, and an administrative staff are mentioned, but they are not included in the staffing plan.	● 50 ● 50 ● 50 ● 51 ● 53 ● 54
Reviewer #3	● Very wide salary ranges for staff could hurt morale ● The applicant relies heavily on TAS/TLS for recruitment but are they families with that part of the state in order to adequate be a resource? ● The applicant does not share a turn-over plan ● There is no AP listed and it is unclear who the additional school leader is. ● Narrative outlines psychologist but is not included in the hiring plan. ● There is not support staff listed which is not responsive to target population ● The applicant proposed to "remove traditional restrictions" for teachers but it is unclear what those are. ● Cost of living increases and performance raises are not	●

	included in the budget ● Hiring plan is not in line with the budget projection ● How specifically are teachers involved in the decision making as this is not addressed in the governance plan ● The confusing structure and distinction between the EMO and the school continues to make evaluating the feasibility difficult	
Reviewer #5	● As you have no dedicated staff for ELs at this time, consider adding an all-staff PD targeted to English Learners e.x. Sheltered Instruction such as SIOP.	

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	● Oversight of the teacher evaluation process ● School leader will be evaluated annually.	●
Reviewer #2	● The school will have oversight to ensure teachers have licensure. ● The board will conduct an annual evaluation of the school leader.	● 56 ● 56
Reviewer #3	● Applicant is committed to using the beginning teacher support program ● There is a plan for a variety of evaluation tools including surveys, instructional reviews, data reviews, etc.) ● The applicant committed a full two weeks, individualized monthly PD, and online PD	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● The summer PD plan includes many components, and while they are all important, it could be of concern that too many items are being covered within 10 days.	● 57
Reviewer #3	● Who evaluates teachers, contracted workers, and Lead Admin (Board or EMO)? ● How is the Lead Admin evaluated and are school discipline and parent relations measured? ● Where is the cost of living increase reflected in the budget and who exactly is eligible to receive it?	●

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	● N/A	●
Reviewer #2	●	●
Reviewer #3	● The school has a strong commitment to being accessible to all students (homeless, high poverty, etc.)	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● This portion of the application lacks clarity. Although a timeline was provided, the plan needs more attention to details surrounding each planned stage/activity.	● 59
Reviewer #2	● In what ways will the school market themselves to gain interest from families? The plan indicates a timeline, but not specific messaging. ● Why is the management company included in the forum for interested families, as this is a vendor of the organization. ● There seems to be admissions selectivity, based upon the applicant stating that the board may approve or deny the final approval of enrollment. Based upon the timeline, this occurs in June/July at which time would be inconvenient to tell parents that their student is actually not enrolled in the school for the upcoming school year that begins in August.	● 58 ● 58 ● 59
Reviewer #3	● The school does not view or use parents as partners ● The recruitment and enrollment windows are very short for an enrollment target of 230 ● What is the EMO's plan for recruitment? ● Parents are not engaged in the outreach process ● Small marketing budget given the many events listed ● What is the charge of applications referring to? (p. 61)	●

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	● Basic submission/No strengths Identified	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● The applicant presents varied volunteer opportunities beyond in class volunteering and after recruitment	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● This portion of the application lacks clarity/details regarding plans for parent involvement and volunteerism.	● 62
Reviewer #2	● The involvement that the proposed Parent Group has based on the applicant response is only regarding volunteer opportunities and playground building.	● 62
Reviewer #3	● How is the Parent Community Support Committee formed? ● How will working parents and shift workers be engaged?	●

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	● Basic submission	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● The process provides a lot of transparency ● The school provides limited preference for board, staff, and teachers which can help build community	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● No concerns	●
Reviewer #2	● No concern identified	●
Reviewer #3	● The very short acceptance timeline may not be ideal for the target population	●

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
This portion of the application, lacks detail that would lead the evaluation to a full understanding of plans, action steps and follow through. The board while meeting number requirements seem to lack diversity of experiences and potentially skill sets needed to properly run the board.
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary
The proposed charter board contains five members to balance voting. While the charter board members have various experiences, there are areas of expertise lacking. Additionally, the parent engagement that is proposed does not include ways to give parent decision making voice, but rather volunteerism.
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary

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	● A proposed plan for transportation has been included in the application. Basic submission.	● 66 ● 68
Reviewer #2	● The applicant proposes to contract with a transportation company to provide transportation for its students.	● 66
Reviewer #3	● The school has plans for bus transportation and car pool options ● Text messaging is increasingly popular with parents and a great addition ● The applicant presents a solid budget for buses	●
Reviewer #4	● "North Davidson Academy's transportation program is designed to ensure that no child is denied access to the school due to a lack of transportation."	● p 68
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● How will students with disabilities receive transportation services? Will it be through the same company or a different one? Lacking details to address these questions.	● 68
Reviewer #2	● No concern identified	●
Reviewer #3	● How many buses will the school have? ● What are the details for bus routes (distance, number, etc.?)	●
Reviewer #4	● Transportation plan does not address students with disabilities that have transportation on their IEP (related service).	● p. 68

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	● NA	●
Reviewer #2	● The school will work with the National School Lunch Program.	● 67
Reviewer #3	● The applicant is committed to child nutrition and hopes to use the National Lunch Program ● The applicant planned for the program in the budget	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● This portion of the application lacks clarity and does not identify how the program will actually work.	● 67
Reviewer #2	● It is unclear as to how the applicant will execute the nutrition program, if they will contract, etc.?	● 67
Reviewer #3	● The budget does not increase with increases in student population	●

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	●	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● All coverage is included	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	●	●
Reviewer #2	● No concern identified	●
Reviewer #3	●	●

Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan		
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	● No strengths identified	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● Applicant provides a detailed start-up plan ● The highlighted potential challenges are reasonable	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● What is the backup plan for enrollment?	● 69
Reviewer #2	● While the applicant forsees a potential concern with enrollment and hiring of staff, the responses lacks sufficient detail as to how the applicant will counter this.	● 69
Reviewer #3	● Potential challenges are not adequately addressed ● The start-up plan may benefit from more specificity especially around the accountability and role division with the EMO ● The plan's timeline is very tight and depends on all things going according to plan. There is no room for error in timing and/or enrollment.	●

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	● Leasing space is available if application is approved.	● 70
Reviewer #2	● The applicant has a contingency lease for space, provided the application is approved.	● 70
Reviewer #3	● The applicant has secured a building	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Will this facility need upfitting?	● 70
Reviewer #2	● The applicants responses fails to state how many classrooms the building already contains, but rather indicates the number that is needed.	● 70
Reviewer #3	● Who is providing the building? The EMO agreement states it is TLS. ● The space is tight for 230 in year one with only 10 classrooms especially is EC services are required. ● Does the facility have a gym, outdoor play areas, and art spaces? ● The contingency plan has not details and cannot be properly evaluated.	●

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: The applicant answered everything adequately
Concerns/Questions: The timelines, budgets, and connection or relationship with EMO remain unclear and concerning.

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	● No strengths identified	●
Reviewer #2	● No strength identified	●
Reviewer #3	● Revenue projections are reasonable based on the identified LEA ● There is alignment between the enrollment in budget and Section 1	●
Reviewer #4	●	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● Budgetary alignment is not present. It does not appear that student instruction is a priority. As a reviewer I question the low allocation toward instruction.	●
Reviewer #2	● The number within the application and within the budget appear to be different. (stated in application that there would be 10 instructional staff year 1, and budget includes 16) ● Is there an MOU to determine if the 20k that is allotted for nutrition is realistic? ● The cost for instructional materials and curriculum is low. ● What is the cost for the management copy services?	●
Reviewer #3	● The section does not identify other funds but throughout the application, $50k from the EMO are mentioned. It is unclear what those funds will be used for and why the EMO is providing the money. ● Not strong evidence that there is enough interest to fill the enrollment projections.	●
Reviewer #4	●	●

37

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	• No strength identified	•
Reviewer #2	• No strength identified	•
Reviewer #3	• The projection for target population is above the breakeven point (230 vs 175) providing some room for attrition	•
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	• This portion of the application is not considered reliable nor sufficient. Would like to see data and responses from potential stakeholders.	• 72
Reviewer #2	• Facebook likes are not a reliable data point to base enrollment projections. • The applicant fails to provide a sufficient response as to what the contingency plan would be, including what areas would be cut if needed.	• 72 • 72
Reviewer #3	• It in unclear where certain staffing costs are reflected (School Psychologist, mission appropriate support staff, etc.) • Where are COLA and performance pay increases reflected and who is eligible to receive them? • Several operational costs do not increase with the increase in student population • Small IT budget given the mission and vision for 21 century and point in the narrative about 1:1 computer school.	•

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	● No strengths identified	●
Reviewer #2	● The board proposes to adopt and align with GAAP.	● 75
Reviewer #3	● Adequate	●
Concerns/Questions		**Page**
Reviewer #1	● The submission does not reflect checks and balances for the board.	● 75
Reviewer #2	● What are the board internal controls?	● 75
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 All required parts of the application were completed. However, there is concern for the lack of allotted money towards the instruction of students.
Reviewer #2 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary The applicant submits all components of the financial section as required. The applicant responses fail to include sufficient detail related to internal controls, and contingency planning. Additionally, the staffing plan within the application and what is presented on the budget is misaligned. The charter board does not include any philinthropic dollars and relies on state and local funding only.
Reviewer #3 Strengths/Concerns/Comments Summary