|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Texas Partnerships Benefits Application Rubric** | | | | | | | | | |
| ***This is the rubric that TEA will use to evaluate the Texas Partnerships benefits for the 2022-2023 school year. Districts should use this document to self-assess their application to ensure they will meet requirements.***  **Instructions for Evaluators:**   1. In the [Evaluation Information](#EvaluationInformation) section, fill in your name, the name of the operating partner, and the name of the campus(es). 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:** | | **Operating Partner:** | | | | **Name of Campus(es):** | | | |
| **Operating Partner Eligibility** | | | | | | | | | |
| **A. The operating partner meets eligibility requirements** | | | | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | | | | **Does Not Meet** |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | | | | **After Capacity Interview/Resubmission** | | | | |
| **Score** | | **Needs Follow-up** | | **Score** | | | **Evidence** | |
| 1. The operating partner is one of the following eligible entities:   * An open-enrollment charter school that has been authorized by the state of Texas, has not had its charter previously revoked or surrendered, has received an overall performance rating of acceptable or higher for each of the last three years, and has received a financial accountability rating of satisfactory or higher for each of the last three years * An out of state charter operator * An institution of higher education * A private or independent institution of higher education * A non-profit * A governmental entity | Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 2. The operating partner has three board members | Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 3. The operating partner has at least one staff member that is currently employed by the OP | Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 4. The partner organization has reasonable staff to manage the campuses with whom they have partnered:   * If campus management staff has not yet been hired, the anticipated hire date is before school begins * If campus management staff is currently employed by the district, the district provided sufficient evidence that this staff is under contractual obligation with the operating partner board, and solely dedicated to planning the launch of the campus at the time of application for benefits | Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 5. For organizations partnering with a campus whose last final overall performance rating was an F, the partner organization:   * Has been in existence for at least three years prior to undertaking the management of the district campus * Has managed multiple campuses for multiple years * Has a track record of managing campuses to academic success or has significantly improved the academic performance of the campuses | Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| **District Authorizing Policy and Local Application** | | | | | | | | | |
| **B. The district’s most recently adopted policy is attached and is the TEA model charter authorizing policy (without changes) OR the district received approval in Fall 2021 for a similar policy** | | | | **Meets** | | | **Does Not Meet** | | |
| **C. The district used the TEA model application and scoring rubric (without changes) or received approval in Fall 2021 for a similar application and rubric** | | | | **Meets** | | | **Does Not Meet** | | |
| **District Authorizing Practices (only evaluated for districts partnering with New Partners)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **D. The district can articulate a clear and compelling Authorizing Mission and Core Vision** | | | | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | | | | **Does Not Meet** |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | | | | **After Capacity Interview/Resubmission** | | | | |
| **Score** | | **Needs Follow-up** | | **Score** | | | **Evidence** | |
| 6. The mission is focused on improving student learning, increasing choice, creating professional opportunities to attract teachers, establishing new forms of accountability, and encouraging innovative learning methods | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 7. Authorizing principles emphasize high standards, operator autonomy, and the well-being of students | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 8. The district provides a clear explanation of how authorizing charter schools will align to a broader, defined district strategy | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| **E. The district has demonstrated commitment and capacity to oversee district charter campuses** | | | | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | | | | **Does Not Meet** |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | | | | **After Capacity Interview/Resubmission** | | | | |
| **Score** | | **Needs Follow-up** | | **Score** | | | **Evidence** | |
| 9. The district has dedicated capacity and resources to charter authorizing processes and ongoing monitoring of district charter campuses, including a dedicated FTE (or equivalent) that began in the position prior to the evaluation of the partnership | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 10. Members of the district’s leadership team are qualified to oversee authorizing activities and have:   * Engaged in authorizing training * Prior experience in authorizing in this or another district, or * Have worked with a technical assistance provider and plan to engage in authorizing training in the next year | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| **F. The district’s description of the application and review process demonstrate a rigorous and transparent evaluation of applications** | | | | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | | | | **Does Not Meet** |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | | | | **After Capacity Interview/Resubmission** | | | | |
| **Score** | | **Needs Follow-up** | | **Score** | | | **Evidence** | |
| 11. The description provided by the district matches the processes described in the board policy and include opportunities for community engagement | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 12. The district employed a review panel to read the application from the operating partner, as evidenced by both this description and the submitted evidence of evaluation | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 13. There is evidence the review panel used the scoring rubric with fidelity | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 14. The district described the strengths and weaknesses of the application that the review panel identified, and there is evidence of this in the evaluation documents | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 15. The district described the review of operating and academic performance history of the proposed operator, and there is evidence of this in the evaluation documents | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 16. The district described the capacity interview with the board and proposed staff of the partner organization and provided evidence or documentation of this interview | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 17. Capacity interview questions were aligned with areas of weakness identified by the review panel in the proposed operating partner’s initial application to the district | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| **G. The district’s description of oversight and renewal of partnerships aligns with other application documents** | | | | **Meets** | **Partially Meets** | | | | **Does Not Meet** |
| **Success Criteria** | **Initial TEA Review** | | | | **After Capacity Interview/Resubmission** | | | | |
| **Score** | | **Needs Follow-up** | | **Score** | | | **Evidence** | |
| 18. The district’s description of the oversight and evaluation of district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the board policy | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 19. The district’s description of the oversight and evaluation of district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the performance contract | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 20. The district’s description of the revocation and renewal procedures for district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the board policy | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |
| 21. The district’s description of the revocation and renewal procedures for district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the performance contract | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | |  | | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet | | |  | |

*Appendix: List of Success Criteria*

**Operating Partner Eligibility**

**A. The operating partner meets eligibility requirements**

1. The operating partner is one of the following eligible entities:

* An open-enrollment charter school that has been authorized by the state of Texas, has not had its charter previously revoked or surrendered, has received an overall performance rating of acceptable or higher for each of the last three years, and has received a financial accountability rating of satisfactory or higher for each of the last three years
* An out of state charter operator
* An institution of higher education
* A private or independent institution of higher education
* A non-profit
* A governmental entity

1. The operating partner has three board members
2. The operating partner has at least one staff member that is currently employed by the OP
3. The partner organization has reasonable staff to manage the campuses with whom they have partnered:

* If campus management staff has not yet been hired, the anticipated hire date is before school begins
* If campus management staff is currently employed by the district, the district provided sufficient evidence that this staff is under contractual obligation with the operating partner board, and solely dedicated to planning the launch of the campus at the time of application for benefits

1. For organizations partnering with a campus whose last final overall performance rating was an F, the partner organization:

* Has been in existence for at least three years prior to undertaking the management of the district campus
* Has managed multiple campuses for multiple years
* Has a track record of managing campuses to academic success or has significantly improved the academic performance of the campuses

**District Authorizing Policy and Local Application**

**B. The district’s most recently adopted policy is attached and is the TEA model charter authorizing policy (without changes) OR the district received approval in Fall 2021 for a similar policy**

**C. The district used the TEA model application and scoring rubric (without changes) or received approval in Fall 2021 for a similar application and rubric**

**District Authorizing Practices**

**D. The district can articulate a clear and compelling Authorizing Mission and Core Vision**

1. The mission is focused on improving student learning, increasing choice, creating professional opportunities to attract teachers, establishing new forms of accountability, and encouraging innovative learning methods
2. Authorizing principles emphasize high standards, operator autonomy, and the well-being of students
3. The district provides a clear explanation of how authorizing charter schools will align to a broader, defined district strategy

**E. The district has demonstrated commitment and capacity to oversee district charter campuses**

1. The district has dedicated capacity and resources to charter authorizing processes and ongoing monitoring of district charter campuses, including a dedicated FTE (or equivalent) that began in the position prior to the evaluation of the partnership
2. Members of the district’s leadership team are qualified to oversee authorizing activities and have:

* Engaged in authorizing training
* Prior experience in authorizing in this or another district, or
* Have worked with a technical assistance provider and plan to engage in authorizing training in the next year

**F. The district’s description of the application and review process demonstrate a rigorous and transparent evaluation of applications**

1. The description provided by the district matches the processes described in the board policy and include opportunities for community engagement
2. The district employed a review panel to read the application from the operating partner, as evidenced by both this description and the submitted evidence of evaluation
3. There is evidence that the review panel used the scoring rubric with fidelity
4. The district described the strengths and weaknesses of the application that the review panel identified, and there is evidence of this in the evaluation documents
5. The district described the review of operating and academic performance history of the proposed operator, and there is evidence of this in the evaluation documents
6. The district described the capacity interview with the board and proposed staff of the partner organization and provided evidence or documentation of this interview
7. Capacity interview questions were aligned with areas of weakness identified by the review panel in the proposed operating partner’s initial application to the district

**G. The district’s description of oversight and renewal of partnerships aligns with other application documents**

1. The district’s description of the oversight and evaluation of district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the board policy
2. The district’s description of the oversight and evaluation of district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the performance contract
3. The district’s description of the revocation and renewal procedures for district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the board policy
4. The district’s description of the revocation and renewal procedures for district charter partnerships aligns with the process described in the performance contract