**North Carolina Advancing Charter Collaboration
and Excellence for Student Success (NC ACCESS) Program
Subgrant Application Rubric**

Applicant:

Reviewer Name:

Overview of the NC ACCESS Subgrant Program

In 2018, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) was awarded a Public Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant from the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) of approximately $26,600,000. The CSP grant will be used to implement the North Carolina Advancing Charter Collaboration and Excellence for Student Success (NC ACCESS) Program to:
1. Increase the number of educationally disadvantaged students attending high quality charter schools and expand the number of high quality charter schools available to educationally disadvantaged students;
2. Develop a cohort of 100 charter school leaders who can develop and demonstrate best practices in serving educationally disadvantaged students; and
3. Broadly disseminate best practices in serving educationally disadvantaged students and foster collaboration in the charter school community and between charter schools and traditional public schools.

The NC ACCESS Program and CSP define educationally disadvantaged students as students who are economically disadvantaged, homeless or unaccompanied youth, English learners, and students with disabilities.

The NC ACCESS program has allocated the majority of the CSP funds to advance Priority 1 listed above through school-level subgrants, though subgrant recipients must also demonstrate a desire to share best practices with both charter schools and traditional public schools. For each of the five (5) years of the federal CSP award, the NC ACCESS Program will run a competitive subgrant competition and award subgrants to North Carolina charter schools that propose a comprehensive plan to increase the number of educationally disadvantaged students attending high quality charter schools and expand the number of high quality charter schools available to educationally disadvantaged students.

Ratings and Criteria

The NC ACCESS Subgrant Program is a competitive application process designed to award funding for schools that propose to serve an increased number of educationally disadvantaged students. Each subgrant application will be reviewed by a team of NC ACCESS Program team members and external evaluators. All evaluations will be considered, and a recommendation will be made to the Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB). The CSAB will take all recommendations, application reviews, and due diligence into account and make a recommendation for the approval of subgrants to the State Board of Education (State Board). The State Board will determine the final approval of all subgrant awards.

A subgrant application that merits a recommendation for approval should present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to successfully implement the proposed plans to increase the number of educationally disadvantaged students attending high quality charter schools and expand the number of high quality charter schools available to educationally disadvantaged students. In addition to meeting the criteria that are specific to each section, each part of the proposal should align with the overall mission, budget, and goals of the application and NC ACCESS Program.

Recommendations for approval or denial will be based on the completed application which includes school information, signed assurances, enrollment projections, application narrative, budget, budget narrative, logic model, and appendices. The enrollment projections, application narrative, budget, budget

narrative, and logic model are scored out of a possible 100 points. Applicants must score are least 80 points to meet the standard.

Applications that do not meet standard in all sections as evidenced by the summary review ratings will be deemed not ready for approval.

Instructions for Reviewers

Reviewers should complete each rubric section based on the evidence provided in the application. There are eight (8) total rating sections to complete:
  I. Applicant Contact Information
  II. Signed Assurances
  III. Enrollment Projections
  IV. Application Narrative (no more than fifteen (15) pages)
      a. If applicable, a school closure plan (no more than five (5) pages)
  V. Budget, Budget Narrative, and Logic Model (no more than five (5) pages)
  VI. Competitive Preference Standards (optional)
  VII. Priority Consideration Status
  VIII. Certification

Please note that there may be appendices to support information provided in the above sections. When evaluating an application, reviewers should both rate each section and provide comments, if applicable. Reviewers should look for responses that reflect a thorough understanding of key issues and barriers for educationally disadvantaged students. Responses should clearly align with the mission, goals, and budget of the proposed plan. Each response should include specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation and understanding of school operations and serving educationally disadvantaged students. Reviewers should use objective language and complete sentences in their comments on the strengths and weaknesses/areas of concern of each section of the application. The comments and evidence provided are as significant as the rating. Below are examples of specific and detailed comments:

Strengths of the application:
  • "The plan aligns with the overall mission and goals because…"
  • "The education and discipline plans are research based and proven effective with the targeted population of students because…"
  • "The lunch program is comparable to the National School Lunch Program and will support an educationally disadvantaged population by..."
  • "The marketing plan clearly outlines how the school will recruit and enroll a higher educationally disadvantaged population by…"
  • "The budget uses sound assumptions and is consistent with the goals of the proposed plan."

Weaknesses/areas of concern of the application:
  • "The curriculum and school calendar do not align with the mission and goals because . . ."
  • "The discipline plan does not include provisions for students with disabilities."
  • "The budget assumptions include the unallowable use of funds for construction."
  • "The plan proposes two buses, but there is no accompanying line item in the budget that allocates funds for purchasing buses."

Once all eight (8) rating sections are scored individually, the applicant should complete the summary ratings page with all final ratings and scores. In order to pass the review, applicants must (a) meet all criteria in sections (I), (II), and (VIII); and (b) score at least 80 combined points between sections (III), (IV), (V), and (VI). Section (VII) will be used to determine priority if there are more eligible applications than subgrant awards. The CSAB will make a final recommendation to the State Board on subgrant awards. The State Board will determine the final approval of all subgrant awards.

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

Application Scoring Rubric

Section I – Application Contact Information
- All applicant contact information is complete and accurate.

Status:	Complete ☐	Incomplete ☐
Notes (if applicable):		

Section II – Assurances
- Assurances are signed.

Status:	Complete ☐	Incomplete ☐
Notes (if applicable):		

Section III – Enrollment Projections
- Enrollment projections are complete, ambitious, and realistic.
- Enrollment projections demonstrate a significant increase of educationally disadvantaged students, including economically disadvantaged, homeless or unaccompanied youth, English learners, and students with disabilities.

Points Possible:	10	Points Earned:	
Overall Strengths:			
Overall Weaknesses/Areas of Concern:			

Section IV – Application Narrative *(*see subgrant application for full list of narrative questions)*
- Clear rationale for how the projected enrollment figures are ambitious and feasible, including the implementation of a weighted lottery.
- Detailed description of how the educational program, school calendar, and professional development plans are specifically tailored to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged students.
- At least three (3) school-specific SMART goals are provided to support the proposed plan.
- Clear explanation of how the charter school's education plan compares to or differs from that of the local LEA(s).
- General Education Provision Act (GEPA) statement demonstrating how the school has or will eliminate any and all barriers to enrollment for educationally disadvantaged students.
- Clear description of the strategies the charter school currently uses or plans to use to serve educationally disadvantaged students.
- Detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of the applicant, partner organizations, and CMO/EMO, including the administrative and contractual roles and responsibilities of such partners.
- Detailed plan for how the governing board will contribute to the recruitment and development of educationally disadvantaged students.
- Clear vision for the school's climate philosophy and a comprehensive discipline plan that supports the development of educationally disadvantaged students.
- Detailed marketing and recruiting plan is described, with an emphasis on strategies to provide outreach to the families of educationally disadvantaged students.
- Clear and comprehensive transportation and school lunch plans are provided.
- A coherent plan to implement the parent/community advisory council.
- If applicable, detailed plans for forming a Student Transition Committee and a clear and specific Student Transition Plan.

Points Possible:	60	Points Earned:	
Overall Strengths:			
Overall Weaknesses/Areas of Concern:			

Section V – Budget, Budget Narrative, and Logic Model
- Budget outlines complete, realistic, and viable costs for the duration of the grant period.
- Detailed budget narrative clearly explains reasonable, well-supported cost assumptions anticipated for the duration of the grant period, as well as a plan that demonstrates financial viability beyond the expiration of the grant period.
- All operational costs and major expenditures are accounted for and are realistic.
- There is clear alignment between the budget, budget narrative, and the proposed plan to support educationally disadvantaged students.
- Logic Model clearly demonstrates how actions and expenditures are expected to lead to specific outcomes.

Points Possible:	30	Points Earned:	
Overall Strengths:			
Overall Weaknesses/Areas of Concern:			

Section VI – Competitive Preference Standards
- The applicant may receive up to three (3) points for each competitive preference standard.
- The applicant should provide evidence in the application narrative and appendices.

Opening, expanding, or replicating a school in a rural or underserved urban area (i.e. without a high-quality school within fifteen (15) miles).			
Points Possible:	3	**Points Earned:**	
Notes (if applicable):			

Increasing the racial and ethnic diversity in their new, expanded, or replicated school.			
Points Possible:	3	**Points Earned:**	
Notes (if applicable):			

The inclusion of high school (9-12) grade levels.			
Points Possible:	3	**Points Earned:**	
Notes (if applicable):			

Develop or manage a charter school focused on dropout recovery and academic reentry.			
Points Possible:	3	**Points Earned:**	
Notes (if applicable):			

Section VII – Priority Consideration Status

- The applicant meets the requirements for the following priority consideration criteria:

Priority Consideration Criteria:	Criteria Met:
Currently serve a forty percent (40%) or higher economically disadvantaged population.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Economically disadvantaged, English learners, and students with disabilities have proficiency rates higher than the state average for their subgroup.	☐ Yes ☐ No
As evidence of participation in applicable federal programs, have Title I status.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Maintained an "A" or "A+NG" SPG, as determined by the NCDPI, and met or exceeded growth, as determined by EVAAS, for three consecutive years prior to the application.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Priority Consideration Status Total *(number of criteria met above)*:	

Section VIII – Certification

Status:	Complete ☐ Incomplete ☐
Notes (if applicable):	

Summary
- Please complete the summary tables below with the final ratings from each section above:

General Standards	Status	
Section I – Application Contact Information	☐Met	☐Not Met
Section II – Assurances	☐Met	☐Not Met
Section VIII – Certification	☐Met	☐Not Met
Total *(must meet **all** standards to pass)*	☐**Pass**	☐**Fail**

Technical Standards	Points Possible	Points Earned
Section III – Enrollment Projections	10	
Section IV – Application Narrative	60	
Section V – Budget, Budget Narrative, and Logic Model	30	
Section VI – Competitive Preference Standards	Up to 12	
Total *(must receive at least **80 points** to pass)*	**100**	

Priority Standards	Standards Possible	Standards Met
Section VII – Priority Consideration Status	**4**	

Overall Application Status	Rating
In order to pass, the application must (a) achieve a rating of "Pass" for the General Standards and (b) score at least 80 points on the Technical Standards. The Priority Standards will be used to determine priority if there are more eligible applications than available awards.	☐**Pass with Priority** ☐**Pass** ☐**Fail**