|  |
| --- |
| **Local Campus Application and Evaluation Rubric****(for districts not using the TEA model local application and scoring rubric)** |
| ***This is the rubric that TEA will use to evaluate local campus partner applications and scoring rubrics for benefits eligibility. Districts should use this document to self-assess their application and rubric to ensure they will meet requirements.*****Instructions for TEA Evaluators:**1. In the [Evaluation Information](#EvaluationInformation) section, fill in your name and the name of the district.
2. During your initial individual analysis:
	1. Highlight the elements of the success criteria that are met in the documents and select a score under “Initial TEA Review” for the success criteria (Meets, Partially Meets, or Does not Meet). *Note: a bulleted list of all success criteria can be found in the* [*appendix*](#Appendix)*.*
	2. Identify any missing or unclear criteria in the “Needs Follow-up” column under “Initial TEA Review.” Be sure to include page references where applicable.
	3. Select a subsection rating (Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet):
		1. The subsection ratings are included in the rows in gray above the success criteria for that subsection.
		2. The subsection rating should align to your success criteria ratings. For example, if there are four success criteria in a subsection, and an applicant only met two of those success criteria, you might select “Partially Meets” for your subsection rating.
3. If the district needs to resubmit documents, use the “Resubmission” column to provide your final evaluation of that success criteria based on the additional information received.

Please note that your comments and evidence are as significant as your rating, and there should be clear alignment between the comments you provide and the rating you selected. |
| **Evaluation Information** |
| * Evaluators will use the following criteria to rate materials.
* Ratings should be given based on tangible evidence provided in the documents submitted.
* Within each section, specific criteria define the expectations for a strong response that “Meets the Standard.” Evaluators will rate responses by applying the following guidance:

**Meets the Standard**: The response meets all of the criteria described in that section of the rubric. It reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; and inspires confidence in the applicant’s capacity to carry out the plan effectively.**Partially Meets the Standard**: The response meets some of the criteria or lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas.**Does Not Meet the Standard**: The response meets little to none of the criteria described in that section of the rubric, or it is wholly undeveloped or significantly incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation; is unsuited to the mission of the authorizer or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the viability of the review process. |
| **Evaluator Name:**  | **District Name:**  |
| **Application Process Information** |
| **The local application includes relevant information about the application process.** | **Meets** [ ]  | **Partially Meets** [ ]  | **Does Not Meet** [ ]  |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | **Resubmission** |
| **Score** | **Needs Follow-up** | **Score** | **Evidence** |
| The local application includes submission criteria, requirements, and due dates | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The local application includes an assurance that the proposed operating partner prepared the application without assistance from the district or a district assigned vendor | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| **Academic Plan Questions** |
| **The local application requires the proposed operating partner to describe or provide evidence of a clear, coherent, and complete academic plan.** | **Meets** [ ]  | **Partially Meets** [ ]  | **Does Not Meet** [ ]  |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | **Resubmission** |
| **Score** | **Needs Follow-up** | **Score** | **Evidence** |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the curriculum to be implemented at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the instructional strategies to be implemented at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the assessment program to be implemented at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the school culture vision, routines, and processes (including the discipline policy) to be implemented at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the talent recruitment and management strategies the proposed operating partner will use  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the professional development activities or programs the proposed operating partner will implement at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the rationale or justification for the academic plan, including how this plan will be effective for the entire student population served at the campus(es), including students served in special education, bilingual students, English learners, gifted students, and any other relevant special populations | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| **Governance, Operations, and Capacity Questions** |
| **The local application requires the proposed operating partner to describe a viable management plan for the campus(es).** | **Meets** [ ]  | **Partially Meets** [ ]  | **Does Not Meet** [ ]  |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | **Resubmission** |
| **Score** | **Needs Follow-up** | **Score** | **Evidence** |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the management routines and practices to be implemented by the proposed operating partner in managing the staff and academic programs at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to name the staff that will be fully dedicated to the oversight of the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to provide evidence that the staff that will manage each campus has experience managing schools or academic programs  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application requires the proposed operating partner to provide evidence that the staff that will manage each campus is/will be fully dedicated to the management of the campus (i.e., no other job duties with the proposed operating partner organization, not managing campuses in other districts) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| **The local application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the organization and any operating history.** | **Meets** [ ]  | **Partially Meets** [ ]  | **Does Not Meet** [ ]  |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | **Resubmission** |
| **Score** | **Needs Follow-up** | **Score** | **Evidence** |
| The application has a section that requires proposed operating partners that have managed a campus or campuses in the past to describe any operating and academic performance history  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application asks what type of eligible entity the proposed operating partner organization is (an open-enrollment charter school, an institution of higher education as defined under Section 61.003, a private or independent institution of higher education as defined under Section 61.003, an organization that is exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3), Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. Section 501(c)(3)), or a governmental entity) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application asks for information about the proposed operating partner board, including:* The current board members (must be at least 3 at time of application to the district)
* Qualifications, affiliations and/or employers of the proposed operating partner board members
* The current and continued independence of the proposed operating partner board from the district board and district authorizing staff
 | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The application asks for evidence of the capacity of the proposed operating partner organization to manage the organization's finances | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| **Scoring Rubric** |
| **The scoring rubric ensures that applications are thoroughly and consistently reviewed.** | **Meets** [ ]  | **Partially Meets** [ ]  | **Does Not Meet** [ ]  |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | **Resubmission** |
| **Score** | **Needs Follow-up** | **Score** | **Evidence** |
| The scoring rubric includes ratings with clearly defined criteria that must be met and evidence that must be provided to earn each rating | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric provides reviewers with a method to identify strengths and weakness of the proposed operating partner proposal | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric ensures that reviewers can capture the areas of weakness that need to be followed up on in the capacity interview | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the proposed operating partner’s proposal for OR evidence of the academic plan to be implemented at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the proposed operating partner’s governance/organizational structure  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the relevant experience of proposed operating partner staff | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets [ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the school management routines and staffing plans the proposed operating partner will use at the campus(es) | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the proposed operating partner’s financial plan | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |
| The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate any past academic, financial, or operational history of the proposed operating partner | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  | [ ]  Meets[ ]  Partially Meets[ ]  Does Not Meet |  |

Appendix: Bulleted List of Success Criteria

* The local application includes relevant information about the application process, including:
	+ Submission criteria, requirements, and due dates
	+ An assurance that the proposed operating partner prepared the application without assistance from the district or a district assigned vendor
* The local application requires the proposed operating partner to describe or provide evidence of a clear, coherent, and complete academic plan:
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the curriculum to be implemented at the campus(es)
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the instructional strategies to be implemented at the campus(es)
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the assessment program to be implemented at the campus(es)
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the school culture vision, routines, and processes (including the discipline policy) to be implemented at the campus(es)
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the talent recruitment and management strategies the proposed operating partner will use
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the professional development activities or programs the proposed operating partner will implement at the campus(es)
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the rationale or justification for the academic plan, including how this plan will be effective for the entire student population served at the campus(es), including students served in special education, bilingual students, English learners, gifted students, and any other relevant special populations
* The local application requires the proposed operating partner to describe a viable management plan for the campus that includes:
	+ The management routines and practices to be implemented by the proposed operating partner in managing the staff and academic programs at the campus(es)
	+ The proposed operating partner staff that will be fully dedicated to the oversight of the campus(es)
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to provide evidence that the staff that will manage each campus has experience managing schools or academic programs.
	+ The application requires the proposed operating partner to provide evidence that the staff that will manage each campus is/will be fully dedicated to the management of the campus (i.e., no other job duties with the proposed operating partner organization, not managing campuses in other districts)
* The local application requires the proposed operating partner to describe the organization and any operating history.
	+ The application has a section that requires proposed operating partners that have managed a campus or campuses in the past to describe any operating and academic performance history
	+ The application asks what type of eligible entity the proposed operating partner organization is (an open-enrollment charter school, an institution of higher education as defined under Section 61.003, a private or independent institution of higher education as defined under Section 61.003, an organization that is exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3), Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. Section 501(c)(3)), or a governmental entity)
	+ The application asks for information about the proposed operating partner board, including
		- The current board members (must be at least 3 at time of application to the district)
		- Qualifications, affiliations and/or employers of the proposed operating partner board members
		- The current and continued independence of the proposed operating partner board from the district board and district authorizing staff
	+ The application asks for evidence of the capacity of the proposed operating partner organization to manage the organization's finances
* The scoring rubric ensures that applications are thoroughly and consistently reviewed.
	+ The scoring rubric includes ratings with clearly defined criteria that must be met and evidence that must be provided to earn each rating
	+ The scoring rubric provides reviewers with a method to identify strengths and weakness of the proposed operating partner proposal
	+ The scoring rubric ensures that reviewers can capture the areas of weakness that need to be followed up on in the capacity interview
	+ The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the proposed operating partner’s proposal for OR evidence of the academic plan to be implemented at the campus(es)
	+ The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the proposed operating partner’s governance/organizational structure
	+ The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the relevant experience of proposed operating partner staff
	+ The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the school management routines and staffing plans the proposed operating partner will use at the campus(es)
	+ The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate the proposed operating partner’s financial plan
	+ The scoring rubric includes sections that evaluate any past academic, financial, or operational history of the proposed operating partner

**Review process evidence (verified at time of application for benefits; included in application rubric)**

* The district employed a review panel to read the application from the operating partner (aligned to the process described in board policy)
* The review panel used the scoring rubric with fidelity
* The review panel identified strengths and weaknesses of the application
* The panel reviewed any operating and academic performance history of the proposed operator
* The panel conducted a capacity interview with the board and proposed staff of the partner organization
* Capacity interview questions are aligned with areas of weakness identified by the review panel in the proposed operating partner’s initial application to the district