

**North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation
Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria**

Power Elite Male Academy - School View

School Name:	Power Elite Male Academy - School View					EC	EL
CSAB Member Name:	Clarification Interview Minutes	Full Interview Minutes	External Evaluator Master	Nicky Charles	Kelli Peterson	Jay Whalen	
Strengths				Applicant addresses soft skills and international consciousness	The mission statement is clear, and concise and specific to the target population.	The mission statement is concise and expressly refers to males.	
Page				22	22	2	
Weaknesses				<p>What precisely is "male responsibility" . Global competitive certainly seems to include women and girls. Narrative states that the student population will reflect the LEA which appears not to be the case given that a single sex structure is proposed. Applicant fails to specifically indicate which research based educational practices will be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active based learning, though well documented and researched, is not described in detail in the application so the incorporation of the instructional methodology remains unclear Limited parent surveys are not enough to indicate the financial viability 	The mission statement is not measurable, but rather aspirational.	<p>The vision is vague and does not clearly articulate what achieving the mission looks like.</p> <p>It is unclear exactly what "male responsibility" means in the mission statement.</p> <p>The applicant just restates the projected enrollment numbers, but does not explain the targeted population any further. Where do the enrollment figures come from and what else do you know about the projected population?</p> <p>The description of the surrounding schools is vague and no specific schools are mentioned.</p> <p>Nothing was submitted as part of Appendix A to provide evidence of community support.</p>	
Page				22	23	22 23 24	
Rating							
Strengths					The applicant proposes to meet the legislative purpose for expanded choices of educational opportunities.		
Page					24		
Weaknesses				The evidence and supports for single gender schools provided describe the benefits for adolescents but the applicant proposes an elementary school. Can the applicant support the choice for a single sex school at that level?	The cited research that the applicant provides for the single gender model in generalized, and not specific to the educational model, demographics and approach that is being proposed.		
Page					25		
Rating							
Strengths					Clear goals for operations, academics, and finance		
Page					26		
Weaknesses				Given the contract with the EMO, concrete governance goals should be identified. The applicant identifies a lot of growth measures but does not set clear benchmarks for success. Many of the processes are yet to be developed which for a repeat applicant working with an EMO is concerning.	The proposed goals as written are compliance based, rather than goals for that push the organization and board towards best practices.	The "Operations" goals are things needed to be legally compliant to open. They are not outcomes-based goals. The "Academics" goals need further refinement: you cannot test "greater than 100% of all students"; what are the LEA performance measures that the subgroup goals are contingent on what benchmark assessments are being used? Some "Finance" and "Governance" goals are not outcomes-based.	
Page					26	25 26	
Rating							
Strengths				The section is complete		The applicant is proposing a unique, single-gender model that is specifically targeting a diverse population with a high ED %.	
Concerns/Questions:				What is the division of responsibility between the EMO and Power Elite? How will the mission be accomplished?		The mission and vision is vague and can use further development. There is no evidence to support the enrollment projections and a clear lack of knowledge of the targeted population. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of need for this school in Charlotte.	
Comments Summary				Overall, this section is not detailed enough to assess financial viability or whether the school will actually provide better educational options for underserved students. It is also unclear how a charter can serve only boys.	While the proposed applicant has selected to serve an all male population, it is unclear as the purpose of selecting TLS outside of the applicants belief that only charters connected to an EMO are able to thrive. The contractual relationship between TLS and the governing board is conflicting as a member of the EMO will serve on the board.		
Rating							
Section 2 Education Plan							
Section 2.1 Instructional Program							
Initial Application Review							

**North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation
Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria**

School Name:		Power Elite Male Academy - School View							
CSAB Member Name:	Clarification Interview Minutes	Full Interview Minutes	External Evaluator Master	Nicky Charles	Kelli Peterson	Jay Whalen	EC	EL	
Weaknesses				<p>There is no legal experience on the board. How large is the pool for single sex educators who are willing to lead a new school for \$70,000? Who owns the 501(c)3?</p> <p>The board would benefit from more educational and some legal expertise on the board given the ties to an EMO.</p> <p>The previous narrative and EMO agreement outline TLS/TAS members on the board but this section does not address this.</p> <p>It is unclear from the org chart who manages who and what aspects of the school.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>By-laws are not fully executed</p> <p>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</p>		<p>The applicant does not have current 501c3 status.</p>	<p>It is unclear if any board member has specific expertise in launching or leading an all-male education environment. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that the founding board has the capacity and expertise to launch the school. There is a lack of legal, facilities, marketing, EC/EL, and operational expertise. Additional education expertise would also be beneficial. The applicant did not provide specifics about the ties the board has to the community.</p> <p>There is not a clear and detailed process for evaluating and revising policies.</p>		
Page					46	49			
Rating			Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management	Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management	Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management	Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management	Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management	Section 3.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, and Management	
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	
Page				<p>The applicant shares a diverse recruitment plan</p> <p>Applicant is committed to performance raises, providing health care and benefits and retirement</p>		<p>The applicant has a hiring process that includes panel interviews and sample teaching, as well as a focus on receptiveness to educationally disadvantaged populations. (Though it is unclear who is on the hiring panel interviews).</p>			
Weaknesses				<p>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?</p> <p>The applicant does not share a turn-over plan</p> <p>There is no AP listed and it is unclear who the additional school leader is.</p> <p>There is not support staff listed which is not responsive to target population</p> <p>Cost of living increases and performance raises are not included in the budget</p> <p>Hiring plan is not in line with the budget projection</p> <p>How specifically are teachers involved in the decision making as this is not addressed in the governance plan?</p> <p>The confusing structure and distinction between the EMO and the school continues to make evaluating the feasibility difficult</p> <p>The recruitment plan incorporates a bunch of random pedagogy not included in the instructional plan.</p>	<p>Why does the proposed applicant not include a leader for year 0 for planning purposes, which does not provide for adequate planning for an effective school.</p> <p>In what ways will the proposed school use its culture towards teacher retention efforts? Who is the best employee for an all male school, as a profile been created?</p> <p>When providing the detail on the school leader candidate, why is not important that they have had experience leading an all male public school?</p> <p>The applicant states that the hiring and firing of staff will be between the board, leader, and management company. This demonstrates a misunderstanding of the vendor board relationship.</p>	<p>The staffing chart is not sufficient to support the educational and operational program. It is unclear what the exact specialized teachers roles are. No clerical/front office positions are listed.</p> <p>The transportation and nutrition coordinators listed in the application are not outlined in the staffing plan or budget.</p> <p>The recruitment plan for teachers is weak. What is the process for reviewing recommendations from the management company?</p> <p>The performance bonuses do not appear to be in the budget. Additionally, it is unclear if the cost of living increases are in the budget or not.</p> <p>The plan to "jointly" hire teachers by the management company and board is unclear.</p> <p>The projected salaries to not appear to be competitive for the area. What is the plan to recruit and retain top talent?</p> <p>It is unclear what the "Instructional Leader" role is. Is that the additional school leadership?</p> <p>How is EC position, both as the director and teacher, sufficient for a 14% EC population. That is a caseload of ~30 students in year 1.</p>			
Page				53-55	53-55	57			
Rating			Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development	Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development	Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development	Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development	Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development	Section 3.5 Staff Evaluations and Professional Development	
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	
Page				<p>•There is a plan for a variety of evaluation tools including surveys, instructional reviews, data reviews, etc.)</p> <p>•The applicant committed a full two weeks, individualized monthly PD, and online PD</p>	<p>The applicant plans to have a teacher mentoring structure in place for beginning teachers.</p>	<p>The school has budgeted funds to support professional development. (Though it is not aligned; \$15k in narrative and \$20k in budget)</p>			
					59	59			

**North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation
Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria**

School Name:	Power Elite Male Academy - School View							
CSAB Member Name:	Clarification Interview Minutes	Full Interview Minutes	External Evaluator Master	Nicky Charles	Kelly Peterson	Jay Whalen	EC	EL
Weaknesses				Is there a plan if dually certified teachers cannot be recruited? • Who evaluates teachers, contracted workers, and Lead Admin (Board or EMO)? Are there any measures specific to the single sex mission? • 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?	With the specified focus of an all male model, the PD plan lacks detail on this important component.	Nothing in the professional development plan mentions males or a single-gender education. Is it reasonable for the school to provide a mentor to all beginning teachers with such a small staff? What does this look like?		
Page					59	59-60		
Rating			Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing	Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing	Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing	Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing	Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing	Section 3.6 Enrollment and Marketing
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Page				Detailed marketing plan is included	no strengths	The applicant outlined a number or marketing strategies to students.		
Weaknesses				62-64 • The school does not view or use parents as partners • The recruitment and enrollment windows are very short for an enrollment target of 220 • 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. 64)		It is unclear when all the marketing strategies are happening. Some are listed in the marketing plan, but many others, like door knocking, mailers, press releases, daycare outreach, and local youth leagues, are not mentioned. Who is also responsible for all of these strategies in the planning year?		
Page					no concerns	62-64		
Rating			Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement	Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement	Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement	Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement	Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement	Section 3.7 Parent and Community Involvement
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Page				Diverse family workshops	no strengths	The applicant shows a commitment to engaging parents.		
Weaknesses				66 • How is the Parent Community Support Committee formed? • How will working parents and shift workers be engaged? • Parental engagement is very different than parental involvement during recruitment and enrollment.	The applicant does not capitalize on being an all male school within the Parent-Community Support, and rather provides general responses but not specific to the proposed model and population.	It is unclear how the school plans to recruit and train parent volunteers. Who is responsible for the training, planning, and facilitating of the parent workshops.		
Page				66	66	66		
Rating			Section 3.8 Admissions Policy	Section 3.8 Admissions Policy	Section 3.8 Admissions Policy	Section 3.8 Admissions Policy	Section 3.8 Admissions Policy	Section 3.8 Admissions Policy
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Page					no strengths	The policy is in line with statute.		
Weaknesses				The admission policy isn't developed. However, nothing within the enrollment and admission process addresses the single sex target population. The plan is generalized and not catered to proposed school.	It is stated that the board will adopt an admission policy, however, that should already be determined and included within the application response. The lottery as described is not transparent and lacks details of how it will be conducted, where, and details of waiting list, etc.	68		
Page				68	67-68			
Rating			Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)	Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)	Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)	Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)	Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)	Section 3.8b Weighted Lottery (If Applicable)
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Page								
Weaknesses								
Page								
Rating			Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Governance and Capacity Plan
Strengths			Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Page								
Weaknesses						The applicant shows a commitment to engaging parents and plans to employ several marketing strategies. The board needs to recruit more expertise, particularly legal and more educational expertise. The staffing plan is not sufficient for implementing the education plan and is not consistent across the application or the budget. The professional development plan does not specifically address male education, however it is unclear who would be responsible for all the marketing plans and training and supporting the parent engagement plans.		
Page								
Concerns/Questions:								
Comments Summary				This portion lacks clarity and does not address the unique mission proposed or target population	The applicant seems to be unclear as the duties, roles and responsibilities of a charter board in comparison with the EMO. Additionally, there are several responses within the section that the applicant provides very general responses, but does not focus in on the all male component of the model and thus, highlights the innovative practices that could be embedded and addressed given such a unique and specialized population.			

