

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

NAME OF PROPOSED NEW OR REPLICATING SCHOOL	
DATE OF WRITTEN REVIEW	
DATE OF CAPACITY INTERVIEW	
REVIEWER NAME	
REVIEWER SIGNATURE	
FINAL APPLICATION SCORE	
RECOMMEND FOR PRELIMINARY AGREEMENT	

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

INSTRUCTIONS: Application Component – General Theme for the Indicators.

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The standard condition that should be provided in the application.			
The application does not address or meet this indicator for the design criteria.	The application does not sufficiently address or only partially meets this indicator for the design criteria.	The application addresses or meets an appropriate level of expectation for this indicator for the design criteria.	The application addresses and exceeds this indicator for the design criteria. Examples or evidence are provided.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
The application reviewer has the opportunity to take notes on the application.			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

BACKGROUND INFORMATION – Item #1(a-d) Applicant and Founding Group

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school clearly demonstrates a founding group working together with capacity to develop a successful school.			
The proposed school has not provided information about the founding group and their relevant skills and experience.	The proposed school provided basic and limited information about the founding group and their relevant skills and experience.	The proposed school provided an appropriate level of information about the founding group and their relevant skills and experience.	The proposed school provided an appropriate level of information about the founding group and their relevant skills and experience as requested. Specific information and evidence was provided related to successful operation of a charter school in Ohio or out-of-state.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

ORGANIZATION VIABILITY – Item #2 Organizational Chart

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school clearly understands the relationships and authority of each core member/organization; and their relationship to the financial stability and health of the operations of the proposed school.			
The proposed school has not provided an organizational chart and detailed narrative description of the chart.	The proposed school provided basic or limited information about the organizational structure.	The proposed school provided a clear organizational chart and descriptive narrative of the chart. The narrative includes basic correlations with the proposed school’s budget, governance structure, and enrollment projections.	The proposed school provided a clear organizational chart and descriptive narrative of the chart. The narrative description of the chart makes clear and direct correlations with the proposed school’s budget, governance structure, and enrollment projections.
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

ORGANIZATION VIABILITY – Item #2(a-b) Governance – Proposed school Board Roles & Responsibilities, Code of Ethics & Conflict of Interest

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The board has a wide range of experienced board members who understand their accountability in oversight of a successful proposed school.			
<p>Neither a code of ethics policy or conflict of interest statement is included as an attachment. There is no description of the roles and responsibilities of the board. There is no description of a process for hiring or evaluating the administrator or management organization, if any. There is no description for how the board will regularly monitor key financial metrics, student achievement, and proposed school culture metrics. There is no system for how the board will receive this information and from whom.</p>	<p>Attachments are insufficient. There is a partial description of the roles and responsibilities of the board and the roles and responsibilities of the proposed school’s administrator; however the description does not sufficiently address the distinction between the roles. There is a limited description of a process for hiring or evaluating the administrator or management organization, if any. There is a partial description for how the board will regularly monitor key financial metrics, student achievement, and proposed school culture metrics. There is a partial or unclear system for how the board will receive this information and from whom.</p>	<p>Code of Ethics policy or Conflict of interest statement are attached. There is a clear description of the separation between the roles and responsibilities of the board and the roles and responsibilities of the proposed school’s administrator. The application demonstrates that the board understands its role in reference to governance versus management. A plan to hire and evaluate the administrator is described. There is a clear description of how the board will regularly monitor key financial metrics, student achievement, and proposed school culture metrics; including how the board will receive this information and a timeline.</p>	<p>Code of Ethics policy and Conflict of interest statement are attached. There is a clear description of the separation between the roles and responsibilities of the board and the roles and responsibilities of the proposed school’s administrator; evidence is provided to demonstrate compliance with the distinctions. The administrator’s qualifications are described, and a plan to hire and evaluate the administrator is described. Evidence of a plan to hire and evaluate a highly qualified administrator is provided. There is a clear description of how the board will regularly monitor key financial metrics, student achievement, and proposed school culture metrics; including how the board will receive this information and a</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

			timeline from whom. There is evidence of well-defined communication systems and processes to ensure frequent (at least quarterly) monitoring of key financial metrics, student achievement, and proposed school culture metrics.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

ORGANIZATION VIABILITY – Item #2(c) Governance – Proposed school Board Design

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The board has a wide range of experienced board members who understand their accountability in oversight of a successful proposed school.			
<p>Governance design is not included. Supporting documents detailing the proposed school board design are not provided. There is no description of the recruitment and selection process, decision making process, or the board membership terms. There is no description of procedures for handling complaints. There is no explanation of the board plans to comply with Open Meetings Laws. There is no plan for board member training.</p>	<p>There is a partial description of the proposed school board design; however the description does not sufficiently address all the specific components. There is a partial or unclear description of recruitment, complaints, training, and compliance with Open Meeting Laws.</p>	<p>There is a clear description of the governance design. Supporting documents detailing the proposed school board design are provided. There is a description of the recruitment and selection process, decision making process, and the board membership terms. There is a description of procedures for handling complaints. There is an explanation of the board plans to comply with Open Meetings Laws. There is a plan for board member training.</p>	<p>There is a clear description of the governance design. Supporting documents detailing the proposed school board design are provided. There is a description of the recruitment and selection process, decision making process, and the board membership terms. There is a description of procedures for handling complaints. There is an explanation of the board plans to comply with Open Meetings Laws. There is a plan for board member training. Attachments detailing the governance structure such as organizational chart, key position descriptions, draft board policies, bylaws, committee descriptions, etc. are provided and evidence is provided to demonstrate compliance with guiding documents.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

ORGANIZATION VIABILITY – Item #2(d) Governance – Proposed school Board Capacity

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The board has a wide range of experienced board members who understand their accountability in oversight of a successful proposed school.			
Board membership reflects a lack of diverse experiences and skills. No specific needs or qualifications for board members are listed. Board member information is not provided. There is no structure to the board make-up demonstrating capacity to achieve the mission and properly govern the proposed school.	Board membership reflects some diversity of experience and skills. A plan to recruit board members exists, but will not likely result in recruiting board members with identified skill sets. Only board member names are provided.	Board membership reflects diverse experiences and skills (such as education, management, financial planning, law, and community outreach). A plan is in place to recruit board members with identified skill sets. Board member resumes are included in the application.	Board membership reflects diverse experiences and skills (such as education, management, financial planning, law, and community outreach), including experience with charter proposed school leadership. A plan is in place to recruit highly qualified board members with identified skill sets. Board member resumes are included in the application.

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

COMMUNITY NEED AND IMPACT – Item #3(a-h)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school has provided a clear description of the target student population and has demonstrated not only a sufficient interest in the school but also a sufficient demand for the school model. The proposed school demonstrates community support for the proposed program through community partnerships, business relationships, and resource agreements.			
No description about the community in which the proposed school will recruit and/or draw its students is provided. Demographics of the community are not included. The targeted student population is not described. The proposed school	The proposed school has provided a limited description of the community in which the proposed school will recruit and/or draw its students. Limited demographics are provided. The targeted student population is not clearly described. The proposed school	The proposed school has clearly provided a description of the community in which the proposed school will recruit and/or draw its students. Community Demographics are provided. The proposed school has clearly described the targeted student	The proposed school has clearly provided a description of the community in which the proposed school will recruit and/or draw its students. The proposed school has clearly described the targeted student population and has provided aggregate student

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

<p>has provided little or no description or evidence of support from the larger community. There has been little or no parent and community involvement in the concept for the proposed school or the development of the proposed school. The proposed school has not attempted to communicate with at-risk families or described the impact the proposed school will have on the community or families it intends to serve.</p>	<p>has stated that the larger community's interests were considered in the development of the school; however evidence of support from the community is limited. The proposed school demonstrates some parent and community involvement in the concept for the school model and the development of the proposed school. The proposed school has engaged in some strategies for communicating with at-risk families. The proposed school distributes some information about the school operation, implementation, and progress to a limited audience.</p>	<p>population. The proposed school has provided evidence that the school reflects the larger community's interest and evidence of support from the community in the form of letters of support. The proposed school demonstrates parent and community involvement in the concept for the school model and the development of the proposed school. The proposed school has engaged in specific strategies for communicating with at-risk families and families who might not be aware of the proposed school. The proposed school distributes information about the school operation, implementation, and progress to an established parent community. The programmatic impact the proposed school will have on the community is clear.</p>	<p>population projects based on demographic data. The proposed school has provided evidence that the proposed school reflects the larger community's interests and evidence of support from the community in the form of letters of support, letters of intent, and contractual relationships. The proposed school has engaged in specific strategies for communicating with at-risk families and families who might not be aware of the proposed school. Evidence of interest in the school model reflects that communication efforts have been successful. The proposed school regularly distributes and makes widely available information about the school operations, implementation and progress to an established parent community and other interested parties. The programmatic impact of the proposed school on the community is evident</p>
--	--	--	--

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Written Proposal

Strengths:

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

PARTNER ORGANIZATONS – Item #4(a-d)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school has provided a clear description of the target student population and has demonstrated not only a sufficient interest in the school but also a sufficient demand for the school model. The proposed school demonstrates community support for the proposed program through community partnerships, business relationships, and resource agreements.			
The proposed school has not developed any partnerships or community partnerships.	The proposed school has developed at least one partnership or community partnership, however a description of the partnership is not provided.	The proposed school has developed community partnerships and organization partnerships; and has provided a clear description of the nature of each partnership. Letters of intent or commitment with terms and extent of involvement are provided.	The proposed school has developed community partnerships and organization partnerships; and has provided a clear description of the nature of each partnership. Evidence is provided as attachments to the application. Draft service agreements and/or MOUs are provided.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATON – Item #5(a-g)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The management company has a wide range of experience, capacity, successful operation of a charter school, and understands their accountability in oversight of a successful charter school.			
There is little or no information provided regarding the management organization or evidence of an organizational structure to support not having a management organization.	There is a partial description of the management company and its role in the proposed school’s operation; however the description does not sufficiently address all the specific components. There is no or a partial description of the management company’s role in selecting proposed board members.	There is a clear description of the management company and its role in the proposed school’s operation. The application provides a clear process of how the management organization was selected to operate the school. A clear description of the process and criteria used to the select the management organization and deny others, as well as, a compelling explanation	There is a detailed description of the management company and its role in the proposed school’s operation. The application provides a clear process of how the management organization was selected to operate the school. A detailed description of the process and criteria used to the select the management organization and deny others, as well as, a compelling explanation

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

		<p>of why the management organization was selected is included. A clear explanation of the management company's role in selecting governing authority members is provided. A sample copy of the management contract is included as an attachment to the application.</p>	<p>of why the management organization was selected is provided. Evidence of thoroughly vetting each management organization that was considered is included as an attachment to the application. A draft or signed management contract is attached.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Mission Item #6

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The mission statement describes the purpose for the school and expresses the ideal, long-term impact, focus, scope and scale of the proposed school.			
<p>The mission does not express a clear, focused, and compelling purpose for the proposed school throughout the application for the intended population. The mission does not focus on educational outputs or is unlikely to result in increased student achievement.</p>	<p>The mission is provided, however, there may not be a clear focus, or the statement may not be specific enough to be measurable to create a compelling purpose for the proposed school throughout the application for the intended population. The mission does not sufficiently focus on educational outputs and may not result in increased student achievement.</p>	<p>The mission does express a clear, focused, measurable, and compelling purpose for the proposed school throughout the application for the intended population. The mission focuses on quality educational outputs and is likely to result in increased student achievement.</p>	<p>The mission does express a clear, focused, measurable, and compelling purpose for the proposed school. The mission clearly translates into achievable goals, the selected curriculum, operations, and all aspects of the proposed school. The mission focuses on high quality educational outputs and are likely to result in increased student achievement. Research is provided as an attachment to the application to support the identified outputs and expectations.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

EDUCATION PLAN – Enrollment Plan Item #7(a-b)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The enrollment plan reflects compliance with state statute and the gran span/size is attainable and sustainable.			
<p>There is no understanding of the student population including grade levels and ages. No explanation of how the decision to serve the grades specified and the number of students in each grade is provided. No rationale for the growth pattern or attrition is provided. The Enrollment Plan and the Budget do not align.</p>	<p>There is a basic understanding of the student population including grade levels and ages. No explanation of how the decision to serve the grades specified and the number of students in each grade is provided. No rationale for the growth pattern or attrition is provided. The Enrollment Plan and the Budget may not fully align in every category; may not be realistic; and sustainable.</p>	<p>There is a clear understanding of the student population including grade levels and ages, expected demographics, and academic needs. A compelling explanation of how the decision to serve the grades specified and the number of students in each grade is provided. A rationale for the growth plan and attrition is provided. The Enrollment Plan and the Budget fully align in every category; is realistic; and sustainable.</p>	<p>There is detailed research on and demonstrated understanding of the student population in a clearly identified neighborhood/region, including grade levels and ages, expected demographics, and academic needs. A compelling explanation of how the decision to serve the grades specified and the number of students in each grade is provided. A clear and detailed rationale for the growth plan and attrition is provided. The Enrollment Plan and the Budget fully align in every category; is realistic; and sustainable.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

EDUCATION PLAN – Academic Program Item #8(a-b)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The academic program design will increase student achievement and decrease/eliminate student achievement gaps with the targeted student population.			
It is unclear what the key design elements are of the proposed school. It is unclear how the academic program relates to the mission of the proposed school. Description of the academic program does not include adequate information of how the	Key design elements are listed but vague. Description of the academic program seems to relate to the mission of the proposed school, but connection is not obvious. Description of the academic program is brief and does not provide a clear picture of	Key design elements are clearly described. Description of the academic program directly relates to the mission of the proposed school. Description of the academic program is clear and provides sufficient information of the school's plan to increase	Key design elements are detailed and includes instructional practices. The academic program directly relates to the mission of the proposed school. Description of the academic program is detailed and provides clear and abundant information of the

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

school will increase student achievement, decrease/eliminate achievement gaps, or materially further bullet point items listed in the application.	the school's plan to increase student achievement, decrease/eliminate achievement gaps, and materially further bullet point items listed in the application.	student achievement, decrease/eliminate achievement gaps, and materially further bullet point items listed in the application.	school's plan to increase student achievement, decrease/eliminate achievement gaps, and materially further bullet point items listed in the application.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Curriculum Item #9(a-g)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: The school is proposing to use a clearly defined, research-based curriculum with the potential to raise the achievement of the intended student population, and is aligned with the state standards.</p>			
<p>Research to support the chosen curriculum is not provided. The curriculum framework is not presented clearly and does not align with the proposed school’s stated mission and goals. There is no process for the school to evaluate the curriculum. There is no evidence that the chosen curriculum is aligned with state standards. The description of the curriculum lacks sufficient detail to determine whether it is aligned across the school for all grade levels in order to be effective with the intended student population. There are no Tier resources named. A sample unit plan for math and English are not provided.</p>	<p>Research to support the chosen curriculum is limited or unreliable. The curriculum framework is partially defined; however the alignment to the proposed school’s stated mission and goals is unclear. There is an unclear process for the school to evaluate the curriculum. Evidence that the chosen curriculum is aligned with state standards is insufficient. The description of the curriculum presented does not provide sufficient detail regarding alignment, objectives, content, and skills for all grades the school will serve. There are limited Tier resources named. A sample unit plan for math and/or English are not provided.</p>	<p>Research to support the chosen curriculum is included in the application/supplemental information. The curriculum framework is presented and aligned with the proposed school’s mission. There is a clear process for the school to evaluate the curriculum. There is sufficient evidence that the chosen curriculum is aligned with state standards. The description of the curriculum presented does provide sufficient detail regarding alignment, objectives, content, and skills for all grades the school will serve. There are Tier resources named. A sample unit plan for math and English are provided.</p>	<p>Clear research on the success of the chosen curriculum when used with the target population, along with the rationale of why chosen, is included in the supplemental information. The curriculum framework is clearly presented and alignment to the proposed schools stated mission is clearly articulated. There is a detailed process for the school to evaluate the curriculum. There is clear and abundant evidence that the chosen curriculum is aligned with state standards. A fully aligned curriculum is presented and includes objectives, content and skills, learning outcomes, and promotion and exit standards for all grades the school will serve. There are detailed Tier resources provided. Sample unit plans for multiple courses and grade levels are provided.</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

EDUCATION PLAN – Pedagogy Item #10(a-e)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school identifies quality instruction that is research-based and has been effective in meeting the needs of the target population. For unique innovative practices, the team presents a compelling rationale for effectiveness.			
Instructional practices are not addressed. There is no connection between the proposed instructional practice’s and the proposed school’s mission. There is no description regarding how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs. Research to support proposed instructional	Instructional practices are insufficiently addressed to demonstrate an effective proposed school framework for the targeted student population. The proposed school does not effectively connect the instructional practices and the proposed school’s mission. The	Instructional practices support the educational philosophy, are clearly articulated and demonstrate an effective proposed school framework for the targeted student population. The school’s proposed instructional practices support and are aligned with the proposed	The educational philosophy and instructional practices and techniques are clearly aligned and articulated. The instructional practices are proven to be successful with similar student populations. The proposed school describes how instruction will be differentiated based on identified

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

<p>practices is not provided. No evidence is provided related to how the instructional methods support the curriculum provided in question #9 of the application.</p>	<p>proposed school insufficiently describes how instruction will be differentiated to meet student needs. Research to support proposed instructional practices is limited or unreliable. Evidence related to how the instructional methods support the curriculum provided in question #9 of the application is limited or unclear.</p>	<p>school’s mission. The proposed school describes how instruction will be differentiated based on identified student needs. Research on the instructional practices is included in the supplemental information. Clear evidence is provided of how the instructional methods support the curriculum provided in question #9 of the application.</p>	<p>student needs and examples are provided. Research on the proposed instructional practices with the targeted population and curriculum is included in the supplemental information.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Assessment Item #11(a-d)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: The proposed school has appropriate internal assessments in place to evaluate both student needs and the effectiveness of the academic programs, and external assessments to ensure State content standards will be met.</p>			
<p>The proposed school does not specify a list of assessments, or the list of assessments is too limited in number to demonstrate an appropriate evaluation process. The assessment plan is not completely clear, and does not show it will be aligned with state standards. There is no plan for collecting, analyzing or using the data to meet required benchmarks. The application does not address the impacts of the testing requirements and results on the instructional program and staff. There is no communication plan provided. The cost of the assessments including any technology requirements are not reflected in the budget.</p>	<p>A preliminary list of assessments, or the list of assessments is provided; however the assessment plan does not sufficiently address an anticipated schedule of frequency, or a plan to select additional assessments. Required state assessments are listed. Internal assessments will be aligned with state standards, but no explanation is given as to how alignment occurs. There is a vague plan for collecting, analyzing or using the data to meet required benchmarks. The application does not sufficiently address the impacts of the testing requirements and results on the instructional program and staff. There is a vague description of how test results will be distributed to stakeholders and used to make decisions. The cost of the assessments including any technology requirements</p>	<p>A list of assessments is provided. The assessment plan includes an anticipated schedule of frequency, and a plan to select additional assessments. Required state assessments are listed. The plan includes provisions for literacy testing, interventions, formative assessments and summative assessments. Assessments will be chosen with curriculum, instruction, standards, and legal requirements in mind. There is a clear plan for collecting, analyzing or using the data to meet required benchmarks. The application sufficiently addresses the impacts of the testing requirements and results on the instructional program and staff. There is a plan for the distribution and use of results by stakeholders. The cost of the assessments including any technology requirements are</p>	<p>A detailed list of assessments is provided. The assessment plan includes an anticipated schedule of frequency, and a clear plan to select additional assessments. Required state assessments are listed. The plan includes provisions for literacy testing, interventions, formative assessments and summative assessments. Assessments will be chosen with curriculum, instruction, standards, and legal requirements in mind. There is a detailed plan for collecting, analyzing or using the data including responsible parties to meet required benchmarks. The application sufficiently addresses the impacts of the testing requirements and results on the instructional program and staff. There is a detailed plan for distribution and use of data by stakeholders. The cost of the</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

	reflected in the budget is unclear.	reflected in the budget.	assessments including any technology requirements are directly aligned to the budget. The assessment schedule is reflected in the calendar provided in the application.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Accountability Plan Item #12(a)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school has clearly stated high and attainable educational and achievement goals aligned with the BCHF Performance Framework contained in Appendix C.			
<p>The proposed school does not have measurable academic goals. The proposed school does not demonstrate an understanding of state accountability. The proposed school does not address Value Added. The proposed school does not identify a growth measure for the students it intends to serve. The outcome measures do not align to the BCHF Performance Framework. No outcome measures are provided.</p>	<p>The proposed school has goals that are measurable, but there may be too few or too many goals for the school to successfully manage. The proposed school has proved an insufficient plan to meet Value Added. The proposed school has insufficiently described a plan to meet state accountability performance measures. The proposed school insufficiently describes a growth measure for the students it intends to serve. The outcome measures somewhat align to the BCHF Performance Framework. Insufficient outcome measures are provided for each bullet point contained in the application.</p>	<p>The proposed school has an appropriate and manageable number of SMART goals that reflect high expectations. The proposed school has a goal designed to meet Value Added. The proposed school has a clear plan to meet state accountability performance measures. The proposed school describes a growth measure aligned to the students it intends to serve. The outcomes measures clearly align to the BCHF Performance Framework. Three outcomes measures are provided for each bullet point contained in the application.</p>	<p>The proposed school has an appropriate and manageable number of SMART goals that reflect high expectations and include benchmarks based on reliable research and data. The proposed school has a specific goal designed to meet Value Added. The proposed school has a detailed plan to exceed state accountability performance measures. The proposed school describes a growth measure aligned to the students it intends to serve. The outcomes measures clearly align to the BCHF Performance Framework. Alignment is provided in a document in the supplemental information. Three or more detailed outcome measures are provided for each bullet point contained in the application.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

EDUCATION PLAN – Progress Monitoring Item #13(a-b)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The progress monitoring plan provides appropriate levels of measurable education standards specifically related to student achievement.			
The progress monitoring plan is vague or not included. The proposed school does not have a plan to monitor progress toward meeting the Accountability Plan goals. The proposed school does not have a plan for reporting, at least annually, results of goals to stakeholders and the authorizer. There is no evidence of analysis and use of the data for corrective	The progress monitoring plan provides insufficient information to determine the proposed school’s ability to meet the Accountability Plan goals. The proposed school’s plan for reporting, at least annually, results of goals to stakeholders and the authorizer is vague. There is some evidence of a plan to analyze and use data for	The progress monitoring plan is included for both academic and non-academic goals. The proposed school has clearly described a plan to monitor progress toward meeting the Accountability Plan goals. The proposed school’s plan for reporting, at least annually, results of goals to stakeholders and the authorizer is documented	The progress monitoring plan is included for both academic and non-academic goals. The budget reflects the costs for student data system and data collection. The proposed school has clearly described a plan to monitor progress toward meeting the Accountability Plan goals and are proven to be effective with the target population. The proposed

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

action in order to achieve the mission of the proposed school.	corrective action in order to achieve the mission of the proposed school.	on the proposed school's calendar. The plan includes a description of how the proposed school will initiate corrective action in order to achieve the mission of the proposed school.	school's plan for reporting, on a frequent and consistent basis, results of goals to stakeholders and the authorizer, along with access to the public, is documented on the proposed school's calendar. The plan includes a description of how information gathered will be used by the administration, teachers, and board for proposed school improvement purposes.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – At-Risk Student Populations Item #14(a-c): Students with disabilities, ELL, and Low-performing

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: The proposed school has strategies in place to meet the legal requirements and individual student needs when serving students that are considered to be at-risk, disabled, gifted, and English Language Learners, and/or that are performing below grade level.</p>			
<p>The proposed school has no process in place to identify students who are struggling academically and to determine the cause and how this need will be addressed. The school has no plan in place to identify and meet the needs of ELL, Special Ed, or Gifted and Talented students who enroll in the school. The proposed school does not address how staffing allocations will be used to meet the needs of students. There is no provision for ongoing monitoring of these populations. The budget does not reflect costs involved in addressing the needs of special populations. Research on interventions and chosen materials is no provided.</p>	<p>The proposed school has a partial plan to identify and meet the needs of students who are struggling, and to identify students with special needs. RTI is mentioned but details are not provided. The school has a partial plan in place to identify and meet the needs of any ELL, Special Ed, or Gifted and Talented students who enroll at the school. The school has provided a vague plan to provide staff to meet the needs of students, but does not clearly identify staffing allocations. The budget reflects some of the costs involved in addressing special populations; however, sufficient detail is not provided. Limited research on interventions and chosen materials is references.</p>	<p>The proposed school has a plan in place to meet all legal requirements to identify students with special needs, to include IDEA, FAPE, and IEPs. Intervention strategies for 3 tiers used in RTI are identified. The proposed school has a plan in place to identify and meet the needs of ELL, Special Ed, and Gifted and Talented students who enroll at the schools. The school has provided a plan to provide adequate staff to meet the needs of all students that includes a licensed Special Ed teacher. The school identifies the need for ongoing monitoring of these populations. The budget reflects allocations for resources, staffing, and training needed to serve the needs of special populations. Research on interventions and chosen materials is included in the supplemental information.</p>	<p>The school has a plan in place to meet all legal requirements to identify students with special needs, to include IDEA, FAPE, IEP, ADA, and 504. Intervention for the 3 tiers used in RTI are fully described. The proposed school has a plan in place to identify and meet the needs of any ELL, Special Ed, and Gifted and Talented students who enroll at the school. Strategies and interventions are fully described. The proposed school has provided a plan to provide adequate staff to meet the needs of all students that includes a licensed Special Ed teacher. A timeline that fully describes the development of the staffing and instructional and curricular plans is included. The proposed school provides exit standards and plans for ongoing monitoring of these populations. The budget reflects allocation for</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

			resources, staffing, and training needed to serve all students' needs. Research on effective strategies and support materials, with the identified populations, is included in the supplemental information.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Behavior Management, Discipline, Proposed school Culture, & Attendance Item #15(a-d)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: There is a PBIS plan or other research based behavior plan in place to establish and maintain a culture that supports learning and achievement. There is a plan in place to address student discipline, suspension, and expulsion which complies with applicable laws and board policy.</p>			
<p>The culture described is not supported by a behavior plan. Systems, practices, and traditions are not in place that the school leader and staff can implement on day 1. The plan does not address inclusion of students with special needs. The proposed school has provided some information about student discipline. The proposed student discipline policies are not in compliance with applicable laws.</p>	<p>The culture described is supported by a behavior plan but may not sufficiently promote a positive, rigorous academic environment. The behavior plan may promote responsibility, trust, and efficacy among staff, students, and families. Systems, practices, and traditions may or may not be in place that the school leader and staff can implement on day 1. The plan vaguely addresses inclusion of students with special needs. There is a vague description of the school’s policy or plans to address suspension, expulsion and education of expelled or suspended students, if applicable but the information provided is insufficient.</p>	<p>The culture described is supported by a detailed plan to promote a positive, rigorous academic environment. The behavior plan should reinforce student emotional and social development. The behavior plan should promote responsibility, trust, and efficacy among staff, students, and families. Systems, practices, and traditions will be in place that the school leader and staff can implement on day 1 to foster this culture for students, teachers, administrators, and parents. The plan addresses inclusion of students with special needs. The proposed school has a research-based plan for investing students in the life of the school, promoting student voices, and for engaging them both in their individual academic goals and the school-wide achievement goals.</p>	<p>The culture described is supported by a detailed plan to promote a positive, rigorous academic environment. The behavior plan will reinforce student emotional and social development. The behavior plan will promote high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy among staff, students, and families. Systems, practices, and traditions are in place that the school leader and staff can implement on day 1 to foster this culture for students, teachers, administrators, and parents. The plan specifically addresses inclusion of students with special needs and ELLs. The proposed school has a research-based plan for investing students in the life of the school, promoting student voices, and for engaging them both in their individual academic</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

		<p>There is a description of the school’s policy or plans to address suspension, expulsion and education of expelled or suspended students, if applicable.</p>	<p>goals and the school-wide achievement goals. There is a clear description of the school’s policy addressing suspension, expulsion and education of expelled or suspended students, if applicable. A draft of the policy is provided in the supplemental information.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Calendar and Schedules Item #16(a-b)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: The school calendar and daily schedule demonstrate a clear understanding of appropriate instructional time and professional development opportunities to promote academic success.</p>			
<p>The proposed school did not provide a calendar or supporting schedules or the information provided was insufficient.</p>	<p>Proposed school schedule shows the total number of days and hours of instruction that students will receive; the length of the proposed school day, and the minimum number of hours per day that the school will devote to academic instruction. The proposed school calendar, including the amount of instructional time identified some of the in-service days for teachers and partially aligns with the intended educational program. The proposed school schedule partially meets the minimum state requirements for instructional time. The teacher schedule appears to provide some planning time, teacher collaboration time, and/or professional development time.</p>	<p>Proposed school schedule clearly details the total number of days and hours of instruction that students will receive; the length of the proposed school day, including start and dismissal times; and the minimum number of hours per day and week that the proposed school will devote to academic instruction in each grade for core subjects. The proposed school calendar, including the amount of instructional time and identified number of the in-service days for teachers, aligns with the intended educational program and will support the stated goals of the educational program. The proposed school schedule meets or exceeds the minimum state requirements for instructional time and notes specific times for interventions and accelerations that do not compromise a</p>	<p>Proposed school schedule clearly details the total number of days and hours of instruction that students will receive; the length of the proposed school day, including start and dismissal times; and the minimum number of hours per day and week that the proposed school will devote to academic instruction in each grade for core subjects. The proposed school calendar, including the amount of instructional time and identified number of the in-service days for teachers, aligns with the intended educational program and will support the stated goals of the educational program. The proposed school schedule meets or exceeds the minimum state requirements for instructional time and notes specific times for interventions and accelerations that do not compromise a</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

		<p>student's ability to access the core curriculum. The teacher schedule provides adequate planning time, teacher collaboration time, and professional development time.</p>	<p>student's ability to access the core curriculum. There is a compelling explanation for how the proposed school schedule was intentionally crafted to optimize student learning for all students, including those needing English language development, acceleration or intervention, and the actual proposed school calendar and schedule provided will support learning for all students in practice. The teacher schedule provides adequate planning time, teacher collaboration time, and professional development time.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Instructional Leadership Item #17(a-f)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: Highly Qualified staff will be hired and evaluated including academic performance metrics. Evaluations will be tied to implementation of the curriculum.</p>			
<p>The duties of the instructional leader are not described. There is not a clear process for evaluating teacher effectiveness or frequency. There is no plan of support tied to the PD plan. There is no plan of supervision. The plan for underperforming teachers is not included. There are no links between the evaluation process and the curriculum.</p>	<p>The duties of the instructional leader are described; however, there is no description of a process for evaluating the leader. There is a process for evaluating teacher effectiveness; however it is unclear as to how this is tied to student academic performance. The frequency of the evaluation is vague or inconsistent with best practices. There is a vague or general plan of support and supervision. The plan for working with underperforming teachers is vague or incomplete. Links between the evaluation plan and implementing the curriculum are lacking or vague.</p>	<p>The instructional leader’s duties are described, and a plan to hire the instructional leader is described. There is a clear process for evaluating teacher effectiveness and this will be tied to student academic performance. The frequency of evaluations is included and will follow board policy. There is a clear plan of support and supervision outlined and tied to the PD plan. The plan for working with underperforming teachers is clearly detailed. The evaluation plan included clear links to implementing the curriculum with fidelity (through professional development and expected collaboration) and high expectations.</p>	<p>The instructional leader’s duties are described, and a plan to hire the instructional leader is provided. Evidence of a plan to hire a highly qualified instructional leader is provided. A comprehensive evaluation of teacher effectiveness is tied to student academic performance. The teacher evaluation rubrics are included in the supplemental information. The frequency of evaluations is included and will follow board policy and best practices or research based models. The plan for working with underperforming teachers provides specific steps to be taken and includes timelines for the process. The evaluation plan includes clear links to implementing the curriculum with fidelity and high expectations. A draft of the staff evaluation tool is provided in the supplemental</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

			information.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

EDUCATION PLAN – Professional Development Item #18

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The professional development plan is based on evaluated teacher needs, which is aligned with the school’s mission, helps teachers meet school goals, and addresses any shortcomings in student learning.			
Professional Development (PD) offerings are minimal and are not aligned with proposed school’s educational philosophy/mission or based on teacher need or student progress monitoring. There is not a clear process for evaluating the	There is an intention to base professional development on teacher need and student progress, but no clear plan is in place. There is a process for evaluating PD effectiveness, however it is unclear as to how	Professional Development and programmatic changes will be determined based on thorough data-analysis, and a list of initial trainings is provided. There is a clear process for evaluating PD effectiveness and this will be tied	Professional Development and programmatic changes will be determined based on thorough data-analysis, and a comprehensive list of initial trainings, timing of trainings, and the person responsible for

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

<p>effectiveness of the PD. No time is allotted in the calendar for PD. The budget does not include funding to support the professional development plan, including staff time.</p>	<p>this is tied to student academic performance. The proposed school offers some professional development days that are noted on the calendar. The budget includes insufficient staff and resources to support professional development plans.</p>	<p>to student academic performance. Time is allotted in the calendar and schedule for ongoing PD, data-analysis and collaborative planning. The budget reflects funding estimates to support professional development plans.</p>	<p>evaluating need is provided. A comprehensive evaluation of PD effectiveness is tied to student academic performance. The evaluation rubric is included in the supplemental information. Time is allotted in the calendar and schedule for ongoing PD, data-analysis and collaborative planning. The professional development plan is aligned to standards. The budget fully supports the professional development plans, with reliable assumptions used for financial information.</p>
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Personnel Item #19(a-c)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: The staffing level of classroom teachers aligns with the Enrollment Plan and Budget. The School Leader criteria and management structure support strong academic outcomes.</p>			
<p>The staffing plan for the proposed school is not included. Qualifications, roles and responsibilities for the school leader and other management personnel are not provided. There is no plan for staff recruitment.</p>	<p>The staffing plan is provided for less than (5) years of operation. Assignments of teaching staff are unclear. There is no clear alignment to the enrollment plan or budget. Limited criteria for the school leader is provided. The management structure is provided; however the management organization and structure may or may not contain roles or responsibilities tied to evaluations. There is a description provided to recruit staff.</p>	<p>A clear staffing plan is provided for the first (5) years of operation including specialty teachers. Qualifications and responsibilities for each position is included. The management structure for the school is provided tied to key organizational decisions – budget, enrollment, and staffing. A draft evaluation plan and schedule is provided. Management practices and procedures are clearly tied to academic performance. A description of the process to evaluate the management company by the board is included. There is a plan provided to recruit and retain high quality teachers and staff. Some personnel policies were provided.</p>	<p>A detailed staffing plan is provided for the first (5) years of operation including specialty teachers by classroom and grade. Qualifications and responsibilities for each position is detailed. The management structure for the school is provided clearly tied to key organizational decisions – budget, enrollment, and staffing. The evaluation and schedule to evaluate staff is provided. Management practices and procedures are clearly tied to academic performance. Copies of management policies and procedures are included in the supplemental information. The evaluation forms and process used by the board to evaluate the management company is included. A detailed plan was provided to recruit, hire, and retain high quality teachers and staff. Draft personnel policies</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

			were provided.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

EDUCATION PLAN – Parental Involvement Item #20

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: Parent involvement is a priority to the school.			
The application contains no discussion of parental involvement in the governance of the proposed school. The proposed school has provided little or no information about the frequency or how a student’s progress will be communicated to a parent. The proposed school has provided little	The plan provides for parental involvement in the governance of the proposed school but does not ensure it. The proposed school has provided a limited description about the frequency or how a student’s progress will be communicated to a parent. The proposed school has provided a	A clear plan is provided to ensure parental involvement in the governance of the proposed school. The proposed school has clearly described the frequency and how a student’s progress will be communicated to a parent. The proposed school has described the volunteer	The plan outlines numerous ways and ensures authentic parental involvement in the governance of the proposed school. The proposed school has clearly described the frequency and how a student’s progress will be communicated to a parent and provided a schedule of the

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

or no information about volunteer opportunities or requirements.	limited description about volunteer opportunities or requirements.	opportunities or requirements at the proposed school. Strategies to build strong relationships between teachers, parents, and administrators are provided.	communications to be completed throughout the proposed school year. The proposed school has clearly described the volunteer opportunities or requirements at the proposed school. Evidence of a large volunteer pool is provided or evidence of exemplary practices in recruiting and retaining volunteers. Strategies are detailed to promote strong relationships between teachers, parents, and administrators.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

EDUCATION PLAN – Student Recruitment and Retention Item #21(a-b)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
<p>Design Criteria: Enrollment plans, recruitment processes, and student retention policies and procedures ensure the processes are equitable for ALL students and support the long-term financial plan for the school.</p>			
<p>The enrollment plan is incomplete. The description of the recruitment and retention process is insufficient and/or inequitable. Process for making citizens aware of enrollment opportunities is vague. The marketing plan is non-existent. The recruitment plan does not include efforts to reach students with disabilities and English Language Learners. No re-enrollment plan is provided.</p>	<p>The enrollment plan is vague. The description of the recruitment and retention process is insufficient and/or inequitable. Process for making citizens aware of enrollment opportunities is limited. The marketing plan is limited in scope to reach the targeted population of the proposed school. The recruitment plan includes some efforts to reach students with disabilities and English Language Learners. The re-enrollment plan is basic and may not result in long-term student retention.</p>	<p>The enrollment plan is clear and should meet the target enrollment numbers in the first five years. The description of the recruitment and retention process is sufficient and/or equitable. Process for making citizens aware of enrollment opportunities is evident. The marketing plan is designed to reach the targeted population of the proposed school. The recruitment plan includes efforts to reach students with disabilities and English Language Learners. The re-enrollment plan is clear and should result in long-term student retention.</p>	<p>The enrollment plan is detailed and will result in the proposed school meeting the target enrollment numbers in the first five years. The description of the recruitment and retention process is sufficient and/or equitable. Process for making citizens aware of enrollment opportunities is evident and materials used are included in the supplemental information. The marketing plan is designed to reach the targeted population of the proposed school and included with the supplemental information indicating enrollment numbers already reached through these efforts. The recruitment plan includes efforts to reach students with disabilities and English Language Learners with copies of materials included in supplemental information. The re-enrollment plan is detailed and</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

			will result in long-term student retention.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

FACILITY – Proposed Facility Needs Item #22(a-c) – Facility Has Been Identified/Selected

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school’s location and facility meets the needs of the students in the attendance area and provides an appropriate environment for learning and academic success for ALL students.			
Proposed location outside of proposed school district boundaries. Attendance area is difficult to determine or unclearly stated. A description of the proposed school facility is provided; however either detail	The location is unclear. Attendance area is outlined, but may lead to confusion. A description of the proposed school facility is provided; however either detail is insufficient, or the facility may not be sufficient to ensure the full implementation	Proposed location located within district boundaries. Attendance area is clearly outlined and described. A description of the proposed school facility is provided; and includes sufficient detail to indicate that the facility	Multiple locations proposed within district boundaries. Map of attendance area is included and boundaries are clearly explained. A description of the proposed school facility is provided and includes detail to indicate that the

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

<p>is insufficient to ensure the full implementation of the proposed school program. The proposed school has an unreasonable timeline for identifying and completing the development of the school facility. The school's budget does not reflect reasonable costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility, or the school's financing plan is unreasonable and inappropriate. The school has not demonstrated that the facility is in compliance with applicable codes, health, and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc.</p>	<p>of the proposed school program. The proposed school budget reflects costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility and the proposed school's financing strategy is presented; however, costs may be unreasonable and are not substantiated with reliable data. The location for the proposed school may be appropriate based on need and the targeted student population. The proposed school has partially demonstrated that the facility is in compliance with applicable codes, health, and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc.; however more information is needed to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>is appropriate and sufficient to fully implement the proposed school program. The proposed school budget reflects reasonable costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility and the proposed school's financing strategy is reasonable and appropriate. The location for the proposed school is appropriate based on need and the targeted student population. The proposed school has proposed a reasonable timeline for identifying and completing the development of the proposed school facility. The proposed school demonstrates that the facility is in compliance with applicable codes, health, and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc.</p>	<p>facility is fully adequate to implement the proposed school program. The proposed school budget reflects reasonable costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility and the proposed school's financing strategy is reasonable and appropriate. Costs reflected in the budget are based on written quotes and reliable data. The location was selected specifically to address the targeted student population. The proposed school demonstrates that the facility is in compliance with applicable codes, health, and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc. and has provided certifications to verify compliance in the supplemental information.</p>
--	---	---	--

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

FACILITY – Proposed Facility Needs Item #22(a-c) – Exact Location Has Not Been Identified

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The proposed school’s location and facility meets the needs of the students in the attendance area and provides an appropriate environment for learning and academic success for ALL students.			
<p>If the facility has not been identified, a description of the proposed school facility requirements is provided; however, either details is insufficient, or facility priorities are not sufficient to ensure full implementation of the proposed school program. The proposed school budget does not reflect reasonable costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility or the proposed school’s financing strategy is unreasonable and inappropriate. The location for the proposed school is inappropriate based on need and</p>	<p>If the facility has not been identified, a description of the proposed school facility requirements is provided; however, either details is insufficient, or facility priorities may not be sufficient to ensure full implementation of the proposed school program. The proposed school budget reflects costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility, and the proposed school’s financing plan is presented; however costs may be unreasonable and are not substantiated with reliable data. The proposed school has presented</p>	<p>A description of the proposed school facility requirements is provided and includes sufficient detail indicate that priorities will focus on a facility that is appropriate and sufficient to fully implement the proposed school program. The proposed school budget reflects reasonable costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility and the proposed school’s financing strategy is reasonable and appropriate. The anticipated area of location for the proposed school is appropriate based on need and the targeted student population.</p>	<p>Multiple locations proposed within district boundaries. Map of attendance area is included and boundaries are clearly explained. A description of the proposed school facility requirements is provided and includes detail to indicate the priorities will focus on a facility that fully adequate to implement the proposed school program. The proposed school budget reflects reasonable costs associated with the development and operation of the proposed school facility and the proposed school’s financing strategy is reasonable and appropriate. The proposed school budget reflects</p>

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

<p>does not address the targeted student population. The proposed school has presented an unreasonable timeline for completion of the proposed school facility. The proposed school does not provide assurances that the facility will be in compliance with applicable codes, health and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc.</p>	<p>an aggressive timeline for completion of the proposed school facility which may be unattainable. The proposed school has partially demonstrated that they understand the requirements for the facility to be in compliance with applicable codes, health, and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc.; however more information is needed to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>If the facility has not been identified, the proposed school has proposed a generally reasonable timeline for identifying and completing the development of the proposed school facility. The proposed school provides assurances that the facility will be in compliance with applicable codes, health and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc.</p>	<p>reasonable costs associated with the anticipated development and operation of the proposed school facility, and the proposed school's financing plan seems reasonable and appropriate. Costs reflected in the budget are based on written quotes and reliable data, if applicable. The location for the target area for the proposed school is appropriate and was selected specifically to address the anticipated targeted student population. The proposed school has presented a reasonable and appropriate timeline which includes a contingency plan for completion of the proposed school facility. The proposed school demonstrates that the facility will be in compliance with applicable codes, health, and safety laws, the requirements of ADA, etc. and has provided plans to obtain compliance in the supplemental information.</p>
--	---	---	---

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Written Proposal

Strengths:

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

FISCAL VIABILITY – Fiscal Soundness #23(a-c)

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The budget is based on realistic revenue and expenditures for a period of 5 years. The school budget details are based on valid assumptions, and enable the school’s mission to be realized.			
Little or no details are provided in the budget narrative. There is no connection of the budget to the proposed school’s mission and focus. No long term planning is evident. Projected growth in the enrollment plan is not adequate to meet long range plans or is not realistic. Budgets are included with very little information as to what the assumptions are based on, or the budget does not balance.	A limited budget narrative explanation is provided. There is minimal connection to the proposed school’s mission and focus. The budget and content in sections of the charter application don’t always match. The proposed school has developed an inconsistent plan that includes plans to pursue some fundraising to meet the growth needs. Projected growth in the enrollment plan is not adequate to meet long range plans or is not realistic. A pre-operational budget and 5-year forecast is included	Budget narrative explains assumptions, how those were determined from reliable sources, and what budget changes will be made if actual enrollment does not meet projections. Spending priorities align with the proposed school’s mission, curriculum, and plan for growth, and the budget clearly reflects the proposed school plan described. The proposed school had developed a fundraising plan and strategies that identify specific grantors, fundraising groups and areas of support. Projected growth is	Budget narrative clearly explains detailed assumptions, how those were determined from reliable sources, and include a description of what budget changes will be made if actual enrollment does not meet projections. Spending priorities align with the proposed school’s mission, curriculum, professional development, and plan for growth, and the budget clearly reflects the proposed school plan described throughout the application to include for support services such as Professional Development, and

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

	with little information as to what the assumptions are based on. It cannot be determined if the budget balances.	adequate to meet long range plans for the chosen proposed school model, staffing, and facility needs. A pre-operational budget and 5-year forecast is included and balanced.	the facility needs. The proposed school had developed a fundraising plan and strategies that actively identifies specific grantors, involves different constituencies and diverse revenue sources. Projected growth is adequate to meet long range plans for the chosen proposed school model, staffing, and facility needs. Projections are conservative and are based on realistic data. A pre-operational budget and 5-year forecast is included, along with a cash flow chart for the first year of operation.
--	--	--	--

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Written Proposal

Strengths:

Concerns and Questions:

Capacity Interview

Strengths:

Concerns and Unanswered Questions:

FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

ACTION PLAN - Item #24

RANKING			
DOES NOT MEET – 0	PARTIALLY MEETS – 1-2	MEETS – 3-4	EXCEEDS – 5
Design Criteria: The Action Plan aligns with the budget and will result in a successful start-up of the proposed school.			
No Action Plan or an incomplete Plan is provided. There is no link to budgetary resources.	A general or partially complete plan is included; dates and responsible parties may or may not be identified. Pre-opening tasks partially align with the budget and other required elements for a successful start-up.	A clear Action Plan for start-up is provided with required tasks, reasonable completion dates, and responsible party. Identified steps appear to meet the criteria for a successful start-up, including budgetary resources.	A detailed clear Action Plan for start-up is provided with required tasks, reasonable completion dates, and responsible party. Steps and tasks Identified align with the pre-operational budget and resources. All steps are well-thought out and will lead to a successful start-up.
EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS			
Written Proposal			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Questions:			
Capacity Interview			
Strengths:			
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:			
FINAL RATING FOR THIS ITEM: _____			

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION #25(a-b)

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:

CHARTER STATUS #26

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Written Proposal
Strengths:
Concerns and Questions:
Capacity Interview
Strengths:
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:

Buckeye Community Hope Foundation Charter Application Evaluation Rubric

UNDERSTANDING OF VOLUNTARY ACCEPTANCE

COMPLETE _____ NOT COMPLETE _____

APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

COMPLETE _____ NOT COMPLETE _____

BUSINESS PLAN – APPENDIX A

EVALUATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS	
Written Proposal	
Strengths:	
Concerns and Questions:	
Capacity Interview	
Strengths:	
Concerns and Unanswered Questions:	