



WASHINGTON STATE
Charter School Commission
STUDENTS • INNOVATION • TRANSPARENCY

2018 CHARTER SCHOOL PROSPECTUS EVALUATION RUBRIC

Issue Date: September 17, 2018

Washington State Charter School Commission

Mailing Address

P.O. Box 40996
Olympia, WA 98504-0996

Email: charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us

Visit our website at: <http://charterschool.wa.gov>

Physical Address

1068 Washington St. SE
Olympia, WA 98501

© 2016 and the Washington State Charter School Commission.

For more information about the contents of this document, please contact:

Amanda Martinez, Executive Assistant

Email: amanda.martinez@k12.wa.us

Phone: (360) 725-5511

The Washington State Charter School Commission (Commission) provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Executive Director:

Washington State Charter School Commission

Attn: Executive Director

PO Box 40996, Olympia, WA 98504-0996

charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us

(360) 725-5511

CONTENTS

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT	4
Introduction	4
Rating Characteristics	4
Section 1: Executive Summary	5
Section 2: Program Overview	6
Section 3: Family & Community Engagement	7
Section 4: Student Recruitment.....	8
Section 5: Organization Structure and Partnerships.....	9
Section 6: Mission-Specific Goals.....	10

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

Introduction

The *Charter School Prospectus Evaluation Rubric (Rubric)* provides the authorizer and evaluators with a means of determining the quality of a charter school prospectus submission. The *Rubric* is also intended to provide a common language for evaluators to draw on during the evaluation process.

Before being assigned to evaluators, submissions will have already been reviewed for completeness by Washington State Charter School Commission staff. For this reason the Prospectus Cover Sheet will not be evaluated as a part of the *Rubric*, as its contents are administrative in nature.

The criteria and several indicators of quality are provided for each section of the Prospectus. A proposal that adequately addresses the section will score a “Sufficient” for that section. A submission scoring an “Insufficient” on a section would only partially meet the expectation.

Participation in the Prospectus process is separate and distinct from the annual New Charter School Application solicitation. Ratings of sufficiency and positive feedback provided by evaluators on the Prospectus in no way guarantee a similar result in the evaluation of the New Charter School Application. Additionally in order to maintain an independent evaluation process, evaluators who score a school’s prospectus submission will exempt themselves from evaluating a school’s complete New Charter School Application.

Rating Characteristics

The evaluation team assesses each Prospectus against the *Rubric*. In general, the following definitions guide evaluator ratings:

Sufficient

Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity.

Insufficient

Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section 1: Executive Summary		
Topic	Ranking	
	Insufficient	Sufficient
Educational Needs, Student Population, and Non-Academic Challenges	The executive summary fails to address key criteria. It outlines the anticipated student population, though it is unclear and provides insufficient detail about the educational need and anticipated student population.	The executive summary clearly outlines a description of the proposed student population and the educational needs of the anticipated student population and non-academic challenges the school is likely to encounter. There is a description of how the applicant team has assessed demand and/or need for the school.
Geographic Location	The applicant has provided little to no description of the geographic location of the school, and/or the rationale for selecting the school location, and student body.	The executive summary has completely described the geographic location of the school, the rationale for selecting the school location, and student body.
School Plan, Mission, Vision, and Goals	The mission statement has little or no description of the students and community to be served, school goals, what success will look like, and/or no alignment with Washington charter law and the Commission's stated priorities.	The executive summary has provided a clear school plan with a description of the students and community to be served, a mission and vision statement, measurable school goals, what success will look like, and aligns with Washington charter law and the Commission's stated priorities.

Section 2: Program Overview		
Topic	Ranking	
	Insufficient	Sufficient
Educational Program Terms	The essential design elements of the school model and the Educational Program Terms (at least three) lack clarity and/or are not all measurable.	The applicant has provided the essential design elements of the school model, and at least three (no more than five) specific and measurable Educational Program Terms.
Research Driven Program	There is a limited understanding of the research-based and/or other evidence that promises success for this program with the anticipated student population.	The Educational Program or essential design elements of the program are based on proven methods and provided evidence that the proposed educational program has a sound base in research, theory, and/or experience, and has been or is likely to be rigorous, engaging, and effective for the anticipated student population.
Culturally Responsive Program	Minimal mention of the instructional methods and/or does not describe in sufficient detail the impact of the culturally responsive instructional aspects of the program on the proposed student population.	The culturally responsive instructional aspects of the educational program have been described in detail.
Overall	Overall, the applicant has provided little or no description of its educational program model and/or does not demonstrate an understanding of its educational program terms and design.	Overall, the applicant has described a strong educational program model and demonstrated an understanding of its educational program.

Section 3: Family & Community Engagement

Topic	Ranking	
	Insufficient	Sufficient
Family Engagement and Demand for Need	There is a description of how the school will engage parents/guardians in the life of the school, though it is limited in its assessment of community need. The plan for building family-school partnerships that strengthen support for learning and encourage parental involvement and the description of any commitments or volunteer activities the school will seek from or offer to parents/guardians has limited evidence of activities and/or plans for involvement.	There is a description of how the school will engage parents/guardians in the life of the school and how this plan will be addresses a need in the community. There is a plan for building family-school partnerships that strengthen support for learning and encourage parental involvement and a detailed description of any commitments or volunteer activities the school will seek from or offer to parents/guardians.

Section 4: Student Recruitment

Topic	Ranking	
	Insufficient	Sufficient
Recruitment and Enrollment Plan	There is a limited and incomplete description of the culturally inclusive student marketing and recruitment plan and how it will provide equal access to all interested students and families, and/or the applicant has minimally described the school's plan for outreach to at-risk students as outlined in RCW 28A.710.050.	There is a description of the culturally inclusive student marketing and recruitment plan and how it will provide equal access to all interested students and families. The applicant has specifically described the school's plan for outreach to at-risk students as outlined in RCW 28A.710.050.

Section 5: Organization Structure and Partnerships

Topic	Ranking	
	Insufficient	Sufficient
Organizational Management & Staffing	Incomplete or unclear description of school governance, management, and staffing plan and structure. Roles and responsibilities of, and lines of authority and reporting among, the governing board, school leader, management team, staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent/teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school are not well-defined or articulated.	Clear and completed descriptions of school governance, management, and staffing plan and structure. Roles and responsibilities of, and lines of authority and reporting among, the governing board, school leader, management team, staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent/teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school are clearly defined and delineated.
Philosophy	The applicant has provided a limited and non-specific description of the governance philosophy that will guide the board, inclusive of the nature and extent of involvement by key stakeholder groups.	The applicant has described the governance philosophy that will guide the board, inclusive of the nature and extent of involvement by key stakeholder groups.
Board Governance & Structure	<p>The applicant has described the governance structure of the proposed school, including the primary roles of the governing board, how it will interact with the principal/head of school and any advisory bodies, the size, current and desired composition, powers, and duties of the governing board, the key skills, areas of expertise, and constituencies that will be represented on the governing board, though has done so in a limited and non-specific manner.</p> <p>The explanation of the governance structure and composition does not adequately suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The school will be an educational, financial and operational success; ▪ The board will evaluate the success of the school and school leader; ▪ There will be active and effective representation of key stakeholders, including parents; and <p>The school will be a culturally responsive education system.</p>	<p>The applicant has described the governance structure of the proposed school, including the primary roles of the governing board and how it will interact with the principal/head of school and any advisory bodies. The applicant describes the size, current and desired composition, powers, and duties of the governing board. The applicant identifies key skills, areas of expertise, and constituencies that will be represented on the governing board.</p> <p>The explanation of the governance structure and composition suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The school will be an educational, financial and operational success; ▪ The board will evaluate the success of the school and school leader; ▪ There will be active and effective representation of key stakeholders, including parents.

Section 6: Mission-Specific Goals

Topic	Ranking	
	Insufficient	Sufficient
Academic and Organizational Goals	Some of the mission-specific academic goals and target are clear in terms of the measures or assessments the school plans to use, and/or some are specific, measurable, action oriented, realistic, relevant, and time-bound.	The applicant has provided, as Attachment 1 , a completed mission-specific goals form with 1-3 of the school's mission-specific academic and organizational goals and targets. Goals are clearly stated in terms of the measures or assessments the school plans to use, are specific, measurable, action oriented, realistic, relevant, and time-bound.