

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
	Application Contact Information	Application Contact Information	Application Contact Information	Application Contact Information	Application Contact Information
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		All questions in Section 1 are adequately answered. The projected enrollment figures on page 8 are tactical and realistic for the proposed region. The Applicant proposes to serve 340 students at scale, which would be approximatel 1% of students in Pitt County Schools.	Applicant is proposing to open with grades K-5/120 students, and grow to K-8/340 students by year 5. Growth plan is reasonable.		
Page		6-8	Pg. 7		
Weaknesses		The growth plan isn't robust. The Applicant states, "The NCDPI Office of Charter Schools allows schools to increase enrollment approximately 30% each year, the above numbers are within the allowable standards. Also, because this school will be centrally located, the Board is planning for as many students as possible" (p. 8).	While the growth plan doesn't appear overly ambitious, the applicant states that it's based on the allowable growth by statute, as opposed to demonstrated parent demand. The submitted budget shows the school opening with grades K-4, not K-5. There is also misalignment between projected enrollment in certain grades listed in the narrative vs the budget.		
Page		8	Pg. 8		
	Application Special Request: Acceleration	Application Special Request: Acceleration	Application Special Request: Acceleration	Application Special Request: Acceleration	Application Special Request: Acceleration
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		N/A	N/A		
Page					
Weaknesses		N/A	N/A		
Page					
	Application Addendum: Replication	Application Addendum: Replication	Application Addendum: Replication	Application Addendum: Replication	Application Addendum: Replication
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		N/A	N/A		
Page					
Weaknesses		N/A	N/A		
Page					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
	Application Addendum: Proposed Management Organization (EMO or CMO)	Application Addendum: Proposed Management Organization (EMO or CMO)	Application Addendum: Proposed Management Organization (EMO or CMO)	Application Addendum: Proposed Management Organization (EMO or CMO)	Application Addendum: Proposed Management Organization (EMO or CMO)
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		N/A	N/A		
Page					
Weaknesses		N/A	N/A		
Page					
	Section 1 Mission, Purposes, and Goals	Section 1 Mission, Purposes, and Goals	Section 1 Mission, Purposes, and Goals	Section 1 Mission, Purposes, and Goals	Section 1 Mission, Purposes, and Goals
	Section 1.1 Mission and Vision	Section 1.1 Mission and Vision	Section 1.1 Mission and Vision	Section 1.1 Mission and Vision	Section 1.1 Mission and Vision
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					

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

North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria					
School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Strengths		<p>The mission described on p. 21 is clear and concise. The Applicant proposes a school centered around empowering students with confidence through rigorous curriculum in order to be active participants in the 21st century. The tenets of the vision include yearly academic growth (of one or two years), service projects, and confidence developing. With the exception of confidence development, the tenets of the mission/vision are measurable.</p> <p>The Application adequately describes the Target Population (Farmville / Pitt County Schools). The Application describes a Target Population that mirrors the demographics of Pitt County Schools. Additionally, the Target Population of SEA mirrors that of surrounding schools, such as Sam D. Bundy, a 3rd-5th grade school. The narrative fully justifies the projected student enrollment and the percentage of the ADM when compared to the LEA.</p>	<p>Mission statement is clear.</p> <p>Vision explains how aspects of the mission will be measured (outstanding academic program and community engagement).</p> <p>School seeks to mirror the demographics of the LEA.</p> <p>Applicant provides academic achievement data of schools in the community as evidence that parents do not have a high quality school for students to attend.</p> <p>Applicant recognizes the importance of both the home and school environments in helping students achieve.</p> <p>School appears to have community support.</p> <p>104 parents who responded to the survey are interested in a charter school.</p>		
Page		21	Pg. 21		

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

North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria					
School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>Misalignment - Section 1 states the school intends to serve a 14% of students with disabilities, which is aligned with the submitted budget. However, the narrative states, "The school plans to serve no more than 10-12% of students SWB, and ELL students, however, the final numbers will depend on the actual student enrollment and attendance once the school is open" (p. 22).</p>	<p>Mission is generic.</p> <p>How will school measure character development in students?</p> <p>The survey administered to parents is nearly identical to the survey administered by Torchlight Academy Schools. Other materials (such as the sample daily/weekly calendar) are also nearly identical. Did TAS assist with the writing of this application? What relationship exists between the board of SEA and TAS?</p> <p>Applicant states that the one of the elements of the model that will meet the needs of the target population is arts being integrated across the curriculum and into the classroom to help students understand standards and apply them in coursework. Is this a core part of the educational model? Why isn't this stated in the mission or vision? Why isn't the ecological focus mentioned in either the mission or vision if it's the school's focus?</p> <p>The survey doesn't specify how many of the respondents will have students in grades K-5 in 2021, when the school opens. It also asks parents if they're interested in sending their child to a charter school without specifying what the focus of the school will be. How does the applicant know that parents will be interested in the specific type of school they are proposing to open?</p> <p>The FAQ document shared with parents states that The SEA will be a STEAM infused school - why isn't STEAM mentioned in the mission?</p>		
Page		22	P. 21 Apx A		
	Section 1.2 Purposes of the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.2 Purposes of the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.2 Purposes of the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.2 Purposes of the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.2 Purposes of the Proposed Charter School
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Rating					
Strengths		The Applicant describes how it will achieve Purpose 3. Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of education opportunities that are available within the public school system. The Applicant intends to use an Ecological Model centered around the arts curriculum to promote character building.	Applicant describes how the proposed school will meet goal #3.		
Page		25	Pg. 25		
Weaknesses		The Applicant makes mention of multiple approaches to its mission, including Ecological Model (p. 23), Arts Exposure (p. 25), rigorous curriculum (p. 21), and service projects (p. 21). Though these numerous approaches could be implemented simultaneously, there is not a clear plan to properly implement multiple models.	Arts integration again appears to be central to the school's educational program - but it's not mentioned at all in the mission or vision. Why is this?		
Page		21-25	Pg. 25		
	Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School	Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		Operations goals in Year 1 are clear and quantifiable. Academic goals in Year 1 are measurable. Academic goals are centered around growth for K-5 students. Operations and Academic goals through Year 5 are attainable and measurable.			
Page		26			

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>One of the Academic Goals in Year 1 includes parents volunteering 10 hours. It is unclear how this goal will benefit Academic progress of the school. Additionally, it is unclear what measures/follow-up will be in place for parents who cannot volunteer 10+ hours.</p> <p>The financial goal for Years 1-5 revolved around reporting and meeting all financial deadlines to NCDPI as well as surplus amounts. The surplus amounts identified in the narrative (p. 27-31) are not the same as the surplus amounts identified in the submitted budget. The disparity of the amounts ranges from 4K to 30K.</p>	<p>Goals are quite ambitious - particularly the academic goals, given the baseline of students' current performance. What evidence does the school have that they will be able to meet these goals?</p>		
Page		27-31	Pg. 27		
	Evaluation Summary for Entire Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section	Evaluation Summary for Entire Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section	Evaluation Summary for Entire Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section	Evaluation Summary for Entire Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section	Evaluation Summary for Entire Mission, Purposes, and Goals Section
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		<p>The Target Population proposed by the Applicant mirrors that of the community, Pitt County Schools. Additionally, there is evidence of community support/demand for the proposed school.</p>			
Concerns/Questions:		<p>The mission/vision becomes unclear throughout this section. The Application describes character building, 21st century skills, arts integration, ecological model, and service projects. The Application does not include a plan for properly implementing these models simultaneously.</p> <p>The proposed goals are clear and quantifiable. The goals are based on growth rather than proficiency, given the lacking proficiency of students in this community. The school doesn't explain how it will achieve these growth goals.</p>	<p>In reviewing all of the materials the applicant has provided, the school's mission/vision are increasingly unclear. The narrative states building interactive learners and creative thinkers, but later states that the school will have a focus on arts integration. The supplementary materials state that the school will have a STEAM focus. Mission needs to be much clearer and more consistent across the application.</p> <p>Purposes are also muddled by the vague and inconsistent mission.</p> <p>Goals are comprehensive, but it's unclear whether they are attainable (specifically the academic goals), especially in year 1, given the current academic performance of schools in the area.</p>		
Comments Summary					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
	Section 2 Education Plan	Section 2 Education Plan	Section 2 Education Plan	Section 2 Education Plan	Section 2 Education Plan
	Section 2.1 Instructional Program	Section 2.1 Instructional Program	Section 2.1 Instructional Program	Section 2.1 Instructional Program	Section 2.1 Instructional Program
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths					
Page					
Weaknesses					
Page					
	Section 2.1b High School Graduation Requirements and Post-secondary Readiness (High Schools Only)	Section 2.1b High School Graduation Requirements and Post-secondary Readiness (High Schools Only)	Section 2.1b High School Graduation Requirements and Post-secondary Readiness (High Schools Only)	Section 2.1b High School Graduation Requirements and Post-secondary Readiness (High Schools Only)	Section 2.1b High School Graduation Requirements and Post-secondary Readiness (High Schools Only)
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		N/A	N/A		
Page					
Weaknesses		N/A	N/A		
Page					
	Section 2.2 Special Populations and "At-Risk" Students	Section 2.2 Special Populations and "At-Risk" Students	Section 2.2 Special Populations and "At-Risk" Students	Section 2.2 Special Populations and "At-Risk" Students	Section 2.2 Special Populations and "At-Risk" Students
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The Application includes a 3-step plan for serving at-risk students not making academic progress. The plan includes in-classroom differentiation/interventions prior to IEP referral.		Board members have been identified with the experience of working with special populations. There is a process in place for identifying "at risk" students. There is a plan in place which includes data reflection.	
Page		41-42			

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>There are numerous concerns as it pertains to ELL students:</p> <p>- "Any student that fills out this form (English/Language Survey) with a language other than English as their first language will be automatically made a part of the ELL program" (p. 43). The school will certainly misidentify native Spanish speakers as English learners despite their English proficiency.</p> <p>- "The school will be hiring a bilingual teacher in Spanish and English to facilitate with parents/teacher/school conferences and monitor incoming students..." (p. 43) and "The school will also hire a Spanish teacher and offer Spanish classes for added support. The Spanish teacher will be the school, student, parent liaison" (p. 43). The Applicant clearly misunderstands the staffing needs to serve English Language Learners. Additionally, this position is not in the submitted budget. It may be 1 of 2 elective/specialty teachers (\$38K) or 1 of two support teachers (\$30K).</p> <p>The Application states that At-Risk students will be serviced by outsourced personnel (p. 41). The budget does not include an allocated fund for outsourced personnel or contracts.</p> <p>The Application does not include a clear process/system for identifying Gifted students. The school does not plan to do a screening and instead will rely on referral to identify gifted students. The school will then be prone to disproportionately identifying non-Black/Latinx students as gifted.</p> <p>Additionally, the Application mentions "contract with Gifted Specialist" (p. 45), which is not reflected in the submitted budget.</p>		How will differentiated instruction look for students?	<p>It's important to know the EL identification process, which starts with a review of the Home Language Survey to determine if there is a primary language other than English, if yes, then the WIDA test is administered, but the student's EL status is only based on the results from the test and if the student passes the test, then that student is not EL. Students will not automatically be added to the ACCESS test, only those that don't pass the WIDA Screener. It's important to keep in mind that the degree of EL services is determined by completing the mandatory Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) document that is a part of Charter compliance. The LIEP is required as part of the Charter Performance Framework.</p> <p>See A5 -EL component. See: https://sites.google.com/dpi.nc.gov/ncels/new-el-coordinators</p> <p>Monitoring the student's progress in English acquisition must be based on the NC English Language Development Standards or WIDA Standards.</p> <p>The teachers' skills and competency needs to be able to meet the EL student's needs are not addressed here. 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 the school would not have a dedicated staff for ELs during the first year, consider adding an all-staff PD targeted to English Learners e.x. Sheltered Instruction such as SIOP.</p>

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
		43			
		41			
Page		45		41	
	Section 2.3 Exceptional Children	Section 2.3 Exceptional Children	Section 2.3 Exceptional Children	Section 2.3 Exceptional Children	Section 2.3 Exceptional Children
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		<p>The school has a clear plan for identifying students who have previously been eligible for an IEP or 504 services.</p> <p>The school will honor a parent's request to provide an IEP evaluation.</p>		A process is in place for obtaining and securing records.	
Page		45			
		46			

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>The school may disproportionately identify students based on their approach to identifying students, which includes, "Students will be given a pre-assessment using NWEA MMap testing along with teacher observation, and student portfolio. The records check of past report cards, end-of-grade test scores, previous assessments, and teacher notes will be helpful for teacher working with potential students" (p. 46). Underperformance is not a clear indication of a learning disability.</p> <p>"The [SEA] will contract for the following related services as needed: Speech Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy..." (p. 49). None of these external contracts/services are included in the budget.</p>		<p>How will the EC teacher serving in a dual role (teacher and coordinator) be allowed to obtain needed professional development opportunities to ensure he/she is able to successfully assume both responsibilities?</p>	
Page		46 49		45	
	Section 2.4 Student Performance Standards	Section 2.4 Student Performance Standards	Section 2.4 Student Performance Standards	Section 2.4 Student Performance Standards	Section 2.4 Student Performance Standards
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		None.			
Page					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>The Student Performance Standards outlined on p. 50 differ from the Academic goals established in Section 1.3 Goals for the Proposed Charter School. The goals listed are general and unrealistic given the context of students in the Pitt County Schools LEA. Additionally, the goals are contradictory. For example, " Students will take all assessments and do their best. Students are expected to increase their growth on each assessment given to approx. a total of 5 percentage points bt year end" and "Students wwill be expected to take and appss all end-of-grade tests" and "...take and pass teacher generated tests" (p. 50)</p> <p>The outlined goals do not mention NWEA Map or iReady, though those assessments appears to be the primary tests for measuring student growth throughout the application.</p> <p>The Application states, "Students must also exhibit satisfactory behavior in their educational journey" (p. 50), which implies that students may not be promoted due to behavior rather than academic progress/proficiency alone.</p> <p>Promotion standards state that students must "pass", but the Application does not detail what entails a passing grade.</p>	<p>Unclear when promotion criteria will be communicated to parents/students, and when students/parents will be notified when/if a student is in danger of being retained.</p> <p>What additional supports, if any, will be in place for students with disabilities when it comes to promotion/retention standards?</p>		
Page		50			
	Section 2.5 School Culture and Discipline	Section 2.5 School Culture and Discipline	Section 2.5 School Culture and Discipline	Section 2.5 School Culture and Discipline	Section 2.5 School Culture and Discipline
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The application consistently identifies E-Colors in Education as the method for school culture/behavior management.			
Page		52			

North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria					
School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		The detailed school discipline does not differentiate for early elementary students (K-2) or students with special needs.	Discipline policy does not appear to be written for students at different developmental stages. The applicant mentions suspension/expulsion, but is serving students in grades K-8 - students younger than 14 cannot be expelled, per state law.	How will SEA explicitly teach behavioral expectations after the first two weeks of school?	
Page		52-53		51	
	Evaluation Summary for Entire Education Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Education Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Education Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Education Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Education Plan
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		None.			
Concerns/Questions:		The Application does not present an Instructional Plan that is consistent or demonstrates success with the targeted population. The Applicant makes mention of numerous instructional practices without demonstrating expertise in any particular instructional method. The Application does not provide adequate/appropriate plans for serving at-risk, gifted, or ELL students. The Applicant refers to outsourced services, including OT, PT, speech, but fails to properly allocate funds to serve the needs to diverse learners in the submitted budget.	Education plan lacks focus and specificity, especially in how it will be administered for students in the younger grades compared to students the middle grades. Arts focus is not apparent across the entire curriculum. Unclear what curricula the school is proposing to use, and whether these programs have been proven effective with their target population. Overall, the education plan is vague and in need of much additional clarification.		
Comments Summary					
	Section 3 Governance and Capacity	Section 3 Governance and Capacity	Section 3 Governance and Capacity	Section 3 Governance and Capacity	Section 3 Governance and Capacity
	Section 3.1 School Governing Body/Section 3.2 Governance	Section 3.1 School Governing Body/Section 3.2 Governance	Section 3.1 School Governing Body/Section 3.2 Governance	Section 3.1 School Governing Body/Section 3.2 Governance	Section 3.1 School Governing Body/Section 3.2 Governance
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>The Board is predominately current and former K-12 educators. The selection of Board Members does not offer a wide range of knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to oversee a successful charter school, including but not limited to financial, legal, and community experience and expertise.</p>	<p>Board is heavy on educators. Have they considered adding legal expertise (aside from a board member who knows someone with legal expertise and is willing to help out)? Marketing? School/student finance? Facility acquisition?</p> <p>Parent grievance policy does not indicate steps parents should take to file a grievance.</p> <p>If a staff member is filing a grievance against the school leader, are they still required to first submit the grievance to the "front office"?</p> <p>Timeline for filling vacancies on the board is unclear.</p>		
Page		55	P. 58		
	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
Rating	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Strengths		<p>The charter school proposes to pay core teachers \$40K in Year 1 with increased salaries (likely for cost-of living adjustment) throughout the first 5 years. The proposed salary of \$40K is above the reported average for classroom teachers in Pitt County Schools (\$37,789 - Indeed.com).</p>			
Page		61			

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

North Carolina Charter School Application Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria					
School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>There are gross disparities in the budgetted allocations for Health Care, Retirement, and Social Security for Instructional Staff. Using the Salary and Benefits Statement tool from North Carolina K-12 Public Schools, the Applicant under budgetted Health Care by \$17,104, Retirement by \$44,832, and Social Security by \$6,688. These numbers do not include miscalculated allocations for administrative positions.</p> <p>The Application does not include a recruitment and hiring strategy that will likely result in a strong staff. The strategy includes a "grow your own program where community members are recruited that are vested in the community and would like to become teachers. The Board will also offer financial incentives for any employee seeking advanced degrees or certifications" (p. 61-62). The recruitment of aspiring teachers who are neither certified or have received proper training does not ensure a high quality instruction/education for the at-risk target population. Additionally, the budget does not demonstrate funds allocated for advanced degrees/certifications.</p> <p>A principal/head of school has not been identified yet. In the event that a well-qualified candidate is not found, the Application states that "the Board Chair has extensive traditional school and school school experience... and is well qualified to lead a charter school if necessary" (p. 62). Though the Applicant does not expect the Board Chair to serve as the Head of School, the Application does not adequately address conflicting roles serving as a Board Chair and Head of School.</p>	<p>How many positions for each year does the school project hiring? Staffing chart is filled out with salaries, not the number of staff they intend to hire. Does board think the salaries for the school leader and assistant principal are competitive enough to attract high quality talent?</p> <p>Applicant states the school will offer raises and incentives to all staff as the school is financially able - will the school at least give teachers cost-of-living adjustments each year?</p>		
Page		61-62			
	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
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Rating					
Strengths		<p>The Application describes core components of professional development plan, which teachers are supposed to receive training on during the first week of school. It is unclear who will be responsible for providing said training.</p> <p>The Applicant identifies the NCDPI and Administrator walk through observations as the system of evaluation.</p>			
Page		65			
Weaknesses		<p>The details of the Professional Development trainings expected to be offered during the first week are not detailed in the proposed budget.</p> <p>Of the planned teacher trainings (p. 66), none include properly training faculty on implementing IEP's, discipline of students with disabilities, and communication with EL families.</p>	<p>When will the weekly in-house staff development take place? When will teachers be provided PD on EL/SWD populations?</p> <p>Will a half day of A+ PD be enough to ensure that teachers are prepared to open the year integrating arts across the curriculum? Five days of PD does not seem like enough to implement all of the programs that the applicant discussed earlier in the application.</p>		
Page		66, Budget			
	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
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		<p>The Applicant has already engaged the community/target population about the proposed charter school and has gathered support from the surrounding the community. Appendix A demonstrates different outlets of communication, including newspaper, to inform the community of the proposed school. The Applicant proposes to continue using these mediums (newspaper, social media, churches, local malls) to market and recruit families/students.</p> <p>The Application affirms that the Charter School will not discriminate against any student regarding admission (p. 67).</p>			

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Page		Appendix A 66			
Weaknesses		The budget allocates \$5,000 for marketing. Not knowing the cost of TV, radio, and newspaper advertisements, this may or may not be sufficient for the marketing plan proposed. Generally, the recruitment plan (door to door, churches, community centers) will be free labor of the Board members/applicants.	Marketing plan and timeline are underdeveloped. Has board considered developing enrollment benchmarks leading up to the month prior to school beginning to ensure they've met their targets? How many letters of intent/enrollment packets does the school hope to obtain (and by when) to ensure that they meet the assumptions contained in the budget? The applicant submitted sign-in sheets from community events (which are referenced in the marketing plan), however, on a number of sheets several individuals indicate that they do not have school aged children, and the ones that do have school aged children don't have space to indicate if they have children that would be eligible to enroll in this school.		
Page		67	Pg. 67		
	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
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The Application explains that the initial form of parent involment is volunteering, which is feasible. Additionally, the Application details plans for home visits. There is however, lack of detail regarding the expected volunteer work to be done and an inconsistency about expected/required volunteer time. Earlier in the application, 10 hours were required, on p. 68, the Application states 5 hours per year.			
Page		68			

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		No specific programs or resources have been identified for the benefit of parents/students. On p. 23, the Application speaks to an Ecological Model, which is meant to consider how both school and home environments affect a child's education. The lack of partnerships does not convey a concrete plan aligned with the mission to serve at-risk students.	Pg. 29 of the application states that parents will be asked to contribute 10 hours of volunteer service, but pg. 68 says they'll be asked to contribute 5 hours. Which is it? How will this be enforced?		
Page		68			
	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
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		Admissions Policy appears to abide by NC state law and SBE policy.			
Page		69			
Weaknesses		There is some lack of clarify between withdrawal and transfer students. It is unclear what a withdrawal is and how it differs from a transfer. As a transfer, the student would be able to return to the school if space permits. HOWEVER, as a withdrawal, the student would need to re-apply and potentially wait on a waitlist for re-enrollment.			
Page		69			
	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)
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		N/A	N/A		
Page					
Weaknesses		N/A	Application narrative states that weighted lottery will not be used, but FAQs distributed to parents and submitted in supplementary materials (pg. 21 of appendices) states that "the school's enrollment policy will give preference to educationally disadvantaged students." Which is accurate?		
Page					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
	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
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The Applicant has sufficiently demonstrated engagement of the community and demand. The proposed Board members have a wealth of knowledge and experience in the K-12 education.			
Concerns/Questions:		The largest deficit in this section is inaccurate funds allocated for instructional personnel's benefits (health, retirement, social security). There is some lack of clarity around the demand of parent volunteer work and the proper training and evaluation of teachers/staff.			
Comments Summary					
	Section 4 Operations	Section 4 Operations	Section 4 Operations	Section 4 Operations	Section 4 Operations
	Section 4.1 Transportation Plan	Section 4.1 Transportation Plan	Section 4.1 Transportation Plan	Section 4.1 Transportation Plan	Section 4.1 Transportation Plan
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		Considering that Transportation is not required to be provided by charter schools in NC, it is a strength that this school wants to assure accessibility by providing transportation to Pitt County residents.		The application includes provisions for students in need of specialized transportation.	
Page		71			
Weaknesses		The Application states the school's intent to purchase 4 school buses for transportation for an Pitt County students. The budget details \$15K for Year 1 Buses, then decreases to \$5K. The assumption is that purchases would attribute the largest cost in Year 1, but does not explain what the \$5K would be for. Additional busses? Or will the 4 buses be purchased over time? Additionally, the Application states that if 15+ students outside of Pitt County need transportation, that transportation will be provided. It is unclear where in the budget that is reflected.	Applicant states the school will run four buses - \$15K is dedicated to buses in the budget. How did the board arrive at this figure? Why is only \$5K allotted for buses in years 2-5? Will this be sufficient? Why are only three positions allotted for transportation personnel? Who will drive the fourth bus in year 1? How will the school know which students require transportation services?		

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Page		71			
	Section 4.2 School Lunch Plan	Section 4.2 School Lunch Plan	Section 4.2 School Lunch Plan	Section 4.2 School Lunch Plan	Section 4.2 School Lunch Plan
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The Application affirms that "No student will be refused food based on their ability to pay." The School plan to apply for NLP and has detailed how it will collect free and reduced-priced lunch information from families.	School plans to participate in the NSLP. School will collect FRPL information from students at the beginning of the year.		
Page		72	Pg. 72		
Weaknesses		The proposed budget allocates \$10K for Child Nutrition. The school plans to partner with a food vendor, but does not provide a quote or evidence that the allocated \$10K would be sufficient funds for providing school lunch for all students.	How will the school provide lunch for students who forget to bring one? School has budgeted \$10K and anticipates serving 90% low-SES students - unclear whether or not the school is serving breakfast as well. Will \$10K be sufficient?		
Page		72	Pg. 72		
	Section 4.3 Civil Liability and Insurance	Section 4.3 Civil Liability and Insurance	Section 4.3 Civil Liability and Insurance	Section 4.3 Civil Liability and Insurance	Section 4.3 Civil Liability and Insurance
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The Application includes 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. An insurance quote is provided and aligns with budget assumptions.	All required coverages are included.		
Page		73 269			
Weaknesses					
Page					
	Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan	Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan	Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan	Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan	Section 4.4b Start-Up Plan
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Strengths		The Application does clarify, however, that Board members will be donating their time in Year 0.			
Page		74			
Weaknesses		The Application does not provide a 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.			
Page		74			
	Section 4.5 Facility	Section 4.5 Facility	Section 4.5 Facility	Section 4.5 Facility	Section 4.5 Facility
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The Application has identified a facility in the proposed community. The Application states that a preliminary lease is in place.	The board has identified a possible facility in the Farmville neighborhood.		
Page		74	Pg. 74		
Weaknesses		<p>The available space in the identified facility does not appear to line up with the facility needs to serve the proposed student population beyond Year 1 (180 students). Additionally, the 9 rooms would only be for core classroom teachers and thus would not have dedicated space for Art, which appears to be central to the mission of the instructional program.</p> <p>Additionally, the school plans to serve lunch to every student, but does not appear to have dedicated space for serving lunch.</p> <p>As a contingency plan, the Application states that the Board Chair and Board member (as opposed to the entire Board) have identified two other suitable facilities. However, these facilities are not described beyond the buildings being within city limits in Farmville.</p>	<p>If there are nine classes across the grades and nine classrooms available, is there space for EL/EC pullouts? Arts across the curriculum is a core piece of the instructional program, but the board doesn't currently have plans for an art room. Is one of the two specials teachers in the budget going to be an art teacher? The education plan also mentions dance, theatre arts, music, etc. Will all of these classes also take place in classrooms? Why no dedicated space? Facility contingency plan lacks sufficient detail. Is the applicant certain that an educational CO can be obtained on short notice, should the Sugg community center not work out?</p>		
Page		74-75			

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
	Evaluation Summary for Entire Operations Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Operations Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Operations Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Operations Plan	Evaluation Summary for Entire Operations Plan
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths		The school's transportation plan and school lunch plan, though lacking in detail, speaks to the school's desire to serve at-risk students and assure equal access.			
Concerns/Questions:		It is unclear whether the allocated funds for both transportation and school means will suffice. Additionally, the identified facility appears to be temporary for it would not properly accommodate the proposed enrollment of Year 2 and beyond.			
Comments Summary					
	Section 5 Financial Plan	Section 5 Financial Plan	Section 5 Financial Plan	Section 5 Financial Plan	Section 5 Financial Plan
	Section 5.1 Charter School Budget	Section 5.1 Charter School Budget	Section 5.1 Charter School Budget	Section 5.1 Charter School Budget	Section 5.1 Charter School Budget
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths					
Page					
Weaknesses		As mentioned in Section 3, the funds allocated in the budget for instructional staff fringe benefits are grossly underbudgeted. For Year 1, the charter school only has a surplus of about \$9K, which would not cover the error. Additionally, the budget does not include other services/costs described in the application, such as contracted services for IEP students (PT, OT, etc.).	There is only a \$10K surplus at the end of year 1, which is just over 1 student to breakeven. The budget contingency plan lacks sufficient detail to explain where the school will make cuts in order to cover the cost of operation should they not meet enrollment targets.		
Page		Budget			
	Section 5.2 Budget Narrative	Section 5.2 Budget Narrative	Section 5.2 Budget Narrative	Section 5.2 Budget Narrative	Section 5.2 Budget Narrative
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths					
Page					

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

School Name:	The Soaring Eagle Academy				
CSAB Member Name:	Buffy Fowler	Biridiana Rodriguez	Danielle Allen	Michelle Hamm	EL
Weaknesses		<p>The Application has minimally responded to the prompts of the Financial Plan section.</p> <p>As a contingency plan, the charter school proposes "scaling down the operation" (p. 77), but does not specify whether this means serving less students, different grade scale, less teachers?</p> <p>The charter school has no outsourcing plan nor will it rely on outside revenue despite start-up costs.</p> <p>The application does not sufficiently demonstrate competent knowledge that will ensure the financial sustainability and viability of the charter school.</p>			
Page		77			
	Section 5.3 Financial Compliance	Section 5.3 Financial Compliance	Section 5.3 Financial Compliance	Section 5.3 Financial Compliance	Section 5.3 Financial Compliance
	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review	Initial Application Review
Rating					
Strengths					
Page					
Weaknesses		<p>The Application fails to include 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.</p>			
Page		78-79			