

DRAFT: State Board of Education
Evaluation Criteria and Sample Evaluation Form
May 6, 2013

Rating Scale:

Well-Developed (WD)	The response meets the expectations established by the State Board of Education and NACSA's <i>Principles & Standards</i> in material respects and warrants approval subject to satisfactory execution of an authorizing contract with the State Board of Education.
Partially Developed (PD)	Incomplete in that the response contains some aspects of a well-developed practice but is missing key components, is limited in its execution, or otherwise falls short of satisfying the expectations established by the State Board of Education and NACSA's <i>Principles & Standards</i> .
Undeveloped (UD)	Wholly inadequate in that the applicant has not considered or anticipated the practice at all, or intends to carry it out in a way that is not recognizably connected to the expectations established by the State Board of Education and NACSA's <i>Principles & Standards</i> .

Instructions:

- Evaluators rate the responses articulated in the application in relation to the criteria for approval. For example, for Section 2, *Authorizer Commitment and Capacity*, evaluators will rate whether, "The description of capacity conveys a clear and accurate understanding of the district's duties and responsibilities as a charter school authorizer, in accordance with Washington's charter school law and the Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing developed by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers."
- Based on the summary of the subsection ratings, evaluators will assign an overall section rating for each of the five sections of the application.

Standard for Approval:

- An applicant receiving an overall rating of **Well-Developed** will be recommended for approval, and, if approved, will be eligible to begin authorizing activities subject to timely execution of an authorizing contract with the State Board of Education.
- Authorizing contracts will include standard operating expectations and may also be subject to district-specific terms and conditions that reflect or incorporate specific elements of the district's application and operating plan.
- An applicant receiving a rating lower than Well-Developed for *any of the five sections* of the application will be recommended for denial.

DRAFT

EVALUATION FORM SAMPLE

SECTION I. AUTHORIZER STRATEGIC VISION FOR CHARTERING

Section	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluators will Look for Evidence of the Following:	Rating (WD, PD, UD)
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Authorizer Strategic Vision for Chartering</p>	<p>1.The vision clearly aligns with the statutory intent and purposes for charter schools. The vision need not address every statutory purpose; however, it should align clearly with at least one of those purposes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district articulates an intentional strategic vision and plan for chartering, including clear priorities, goals, and time frames for achievement. • The vision aligns with at least one of the statutory purposes set forth in RCW 28A.710.005. • The district articulates in clear and specific terms how it will give priority to serving at-risk student populations, as defined in RCW 28A.710.010(2). • The vision articulates how the district will protect the autonomy and promote the accountability of the charter schools it oversees. 	
	<p>2. The district clearly articulates any additional purposes it may have for chartering that are particular priorities for the district. Any additional purposes address clearly identified educational needs of the district, and are supported by specific evidence and examples that illustrate the identified needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district has conducted a preliminary analysis of the geographical area(s) it serves, and identified specific needs or priorities (e.g., programmatic, grade range, location, target population, etc.). • If applicable, additional chartering purposes or priorities are based on solid analysis. 	
	<p>3. The district’s response describes with specificity the desired characteristics of the schools it will charter, such as types of schools, student populations to be served, and geographic areas to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district has identified specific types of proposals that it would like to receive, e.g. arts, dual language, drop-out recovery, college prep. 	

		be served, along with the demographic data and instructional research it will use to evaluate needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district articulates how the school or schools it wishes to authorize might differ from the schools the district currently operates with regard to such features as staffing, schedule, curriculum and community engagement. • In the draft RFP or other materials, the district publicizes its strategic vision and chartering priorities, without restricting or refusing to review applications that propose to fulfill other goals. • The district has identified potential ways to encourage desired groups or proposal types such as priority for available competitive funds or facilities. 	
		4. The response reflects a commitment to providing flexibility for charter schools in day-to-day operations, including respecting the autonomy of the charter school board.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district’s vision for chartering does not impose district processes, requirements or systems unnecessarily on charter schools. • For any service-based fees that the district intends to offer charter schools, the district is committed to making purchase of those services voluntary for schools. 	
		5. The response demonstrates a sound understanding of and commitment to performance-based accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district’s vision and responses reflect a consistent and appropriate balance between autonomy and accountability. • The district demonstrates commitment to maintaining consistently high standards for all charter schools, regardless of whether a school or proposal targeted to identified priorities. 	

SECTION II. AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT

Section	Evaluation Criteria		Evaluators will Look for Evidence of the Following:	Rating (WD, PD, UD)
2	Authorizer Capacity and Commitment	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description indicates sound understanding of authorizers’ responsibilities for overseeing charter schools by setting clear expectations, collecting relevant performance information, evaluating performance on an ongoing basis, and holding schools accountable. The description indicates a realistic sense of the cyclical nature of authorizing work in the demands on resources. 	
		Human Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district identifies resources appropriate for each of the core authorizer functions including application decision-making, performance contracting, ongoing oversight and evaluation, and revocation or renewal decision-making. Staff resources are articulated in time allocations (FTEs) that are likely to be sufficient based on the district’s projected authorizing activity. Resources and plans reflect anticipated scale of charter portfolio. 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan clearly articulates where primary authorizing responsibilities reside. The plan demonstrates understanding of district functions that will need to assume some authorizing responsibilities (e.g., special education). The lines of authority indicate appropriate prioritization of charter school authorizing. Lines of authority protect from political influence and support merit-based decision-making. 	

		<p>4. The district demonstrates that it has or will secure access, through staff, contractual relationships or interagency collaboration, to expertise in all areas essential to charter school authorizing and oversight, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School leadership • Curriculum, instruction and assessment • SPED, ELL, and other diverse needs • Performance management • Operations i.e. law, finance, & facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan identifies clearly and appropriately where in the district the required expertise for essential authorizing responsibilities currently resides or, in the alternative, how it will be accessed outside the district. • The plan clearly and appropriately identifies areas where it anticipates the need to build, expand or contract for additional capacity with respect to authorizing responsibilities and articulates a viable plan for doing so consistent with its estimates of financial needs. 	
	Financial Resources	<p>5. The estimates of the financial needs of the authorizer and projected resources for authorizing are reasonable and supported, to the extent possible, by verifiable data, including such data about the district’s overall financial condition as will demonstrate capacity for the new task.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The estimates of financial needs are reasonably sound and well-aligned with other key aspects of the plan including allocation of staff resources and access to needed expertise when the district needs to acquire or access expertise it does not currently possess. 	

SECTION III. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Section	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluators will Look for Evidence of the Following:	Rating (WD, PD, UD)
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Request for Proposals</p>	<p>1. The draft or outline of the RFP includes all components of RFPs required by RCW 28A.710.130(1)(b).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district intends to publish an annual RFP by the date established by the SBE. • The RFP includes (1) the authorizer's strategic vision for chartering; (2) performance framework; (3) application evaluation criteria; and (4) application questions and guidelines for formatting and content. • The RFP requires applicants to articulate the components of a comprehensive school plan, as articulated in RCW 28A.710.130(2)(a) through (ff). • The RFP requires applicants to demonstrate that they will provide educational services that at a minimum meet the basic education standards set forth in RCW 28A.150.220. • The RFP includes distinct requirements and criteria for: (1) conversion charter school applicants, including demonstrated support by a majority of teachers or parents; (2) applicants proposing to contract with Educational Service Providers (ESPs) consistent with NACSA's <i>Principles & Standards for Quality Authorizing</i>; (3) applicants that propose to operate virtual or online charter schools, consistent with NACSA Principles & Standards for Quality Authorizing; and (4) applicants that already operate schools in other states, including evidence of past performance, evidence of success serving at-risk students, and capacity for growth. 	

		<p>2. The draft or outline of the RFP demonstrates that the district intends to implement a comprehensive application process that follows fair procedures and rigorous criteria, based on a performance framework meeting the requirements of Washington’s charter school law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP process will be open, well-publicized, and transparent. • The RFP includes a clear and realistic timeline that outlines key milestones and explains how each stage of the process is conducted and evaluated. • The RFP includes a strategy for communicating and disseminating information regarding the application process, approval criteria, and decisions to the public. • The RFP welcomes proposals from first-time charter applicants and existing school operators, while including appropriately differentiated proposal requirements and evaluation criteria. • The RFP is open to considering diverse educational philosophies and approaches, and expresses commitment to serving students with diverse needs. • The RFP outlines applicant rights and responsibilities and outlines procedures for promptly notifying applicants of approval or denial, and the factors that determined the decision. • The district outlines plans to evaluate each application through a thorough review of the written application, a substantive in-person interview with the applicant group, and other due diligence to examine the applicant’s experience and capacity, conducted by knowledgeable and competent evaluators. • The RFP outlines parameters for decision-making that grant charters only to applicants that have demonstrated their competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of the school, consistent with the stated approval criteria. 	
--	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district intends to engage evaluators with relevant educational, organizational, financial, and legal expertise, as well as through understanding of the essential principles of charter school accountability and autonomy including an appropriate combination of internal and external evaluators. • The district intends to provide orientation and training to application evaluators to ensure consistent and fair standards and treatment of applicants. 	
		<p>3. The RFP has clearly articulated criteria for evaluating the charter applicant’s proposed mission and vision that are aligned with the purposes of Washington’s charter school law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP requires a vision statement that presents a clear, compelling picture of the learning environment and student experience. • The RFP requires a mission statement that is clear and focused, and points to measurable educational goals. • The evaluation criteria require that the application as a whole is well-aligned with the focus and priorities identified in the vision and mission statement. 	
		<p>4. The RFP has clear and rigorous requirements for presenting and criteria for evaluating the applicant’s proposed educational program, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academic program aligned with state standards; • The proposed instructional design, including the type of learning environment, class size and structure; • Curriculum and teaching methods; • Teaching skills and experience; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP requires a thorough description of the educational program, including each of the components listed in the evaluation criteria. • The RFP requires a description of the curriculum that is consistent with state standards. • The evaluation criteria assess how well the applicant’s budget is aligned with the proposed educational program for expenses such as instructional materials and supplies that are either described in or required by the proposed plan. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments to measure student progress; • School calendar and sample daily schedule; • Discipline policies, and plans for serving students with special needs. 		
	<p>5. The RFP has clear and rigorous requirements for presenting and criteria for evaluating the applicant’s organizational plan, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legal status of the applicant as specified in RCW 28A.710010(1); • The proposed organizational structure of the school; • The roles and responsibilities of the school’s proposed governing board, leadership, management team, and any external organizations; staffing plan; • Employment policies, including performance evaluation plans; • Student enrollment and recruitment plan, and the plan for parent and community involvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP requires a thorough description of the proposed governance and management structures and systems including an organization chart that clearly outlines the school’s lines of authority and reporting; a clear description of the roles and responsibilities for the governing board and school leadership and management team; staffing plans and recruitment timeline; employment policies; proposed governing bylaws; anticipated partnerships or contractual relationships (including Educational Service Providers) that are central to the school’s operations or mission; and plans for key operational services such as pupil transportation and food service. • The RFP evaluation criteria assess the viability of the organizational plan and its alignment with the educational program and budget. • The evaluation criteria consider whether the plan for professional development is aligned with the particular skills and competencies that will be needed for effective implementation of the educational program. • The evaluation criteria consider the relevance of proposed community relationships and evidence indicating the degree to which asserted relationships have actually been established. 	

		<p>6. The RFP has clear and rigorous requirements for presenting and criteria for evaluating the applicant’s proposed business plan, including but not limited to start-up plan, financial plan and policies, budget and cash-flow projections, and facilities plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP requires a sound business plan, including: start-up and five-year budgets with clearly explained assumptions; start-up and first-year cash-flow projections with clearly explained assumptions; a description of the insurance coverage the school will obtain; evidence of anticipated fundraising contributions, if claimed in the application; a description of the school’s internal financial controls including audit requirements; and a sound facilities plan, including backup or contingency plans, if appropriate. • The evaluation criteria require that budgeted revenues are based on realistic assumptions about state funding and any local funding, private funding, or other resources such as federal start-up funding. • The evaluation criteria require that expenditures align with the priorities and commitments reflected in the description of the educational program. • The evaluation criteria consider whether the proposed financial plan is viable. 	
		<p>7. The RFP has clear and rigorous requirements for demonstrating, and criteria for evaluating, the applicant’s capacity to implement the proposed program effectively, with particular focus on the capacity of the proposed governing board and school leadership. The evaluation of capacity includes a personal interview with applicants being considered for approval.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirements for evaluating founding group capacity including submission of resumes and bios for proposed governing board members as well as identified leadership and management team members. • The RFP requires that applicants disclose actual or potential conflicts of interest for proposed governing board members. • The evaluation criteria assess whether the governing board members understand and possess the necessary capacities, experience, and skills needed for effective governance of the school. 	

		<p>8. For applicants that operate one or more charter schools in any state or nation, the RFP provides for review of evidence of the applicant’s past performance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP requires applicants that already operate existing charter schools to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide clear evidence of their capacity to operate new schools successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools; ○ Document their educational, operational, and financial performance records based on existing schools; ○ Explain any never-opened, terminated, or non-renewed schools (including terminated or non-renewed third-party contracts to operate schools); ○ Present their growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits; and ○ Meet high standards of academic, organizational, and financial success to earn approval for replication. 	
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

SECTION IV. PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

Section	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluators will Look for Evidence of the Following:	Rating (WD, PD, UD)	
4	Performance Framework	<p>1. The draft performance framework meets the requirements for performance frameworks in Washington’s charter schools law, including indicators, measures and metrics for each component enumerated in the law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academic performance framework appropriately incorporates the state accountability system applicable to all public schools. • The academic performance framework includes indicators, measures, and metrics for: (a) Student academic proficiency; (b) Student academic growth; (c) Achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between major student subgroups; and (d) Graduation rates and postsecondary readiness, for high schools; • The financial performance framework includes indicators related to near-term and long-term performance and sustainability; • The organizational performance framework includes indicators related to compliance with applicable laws, rules, and terms of the charter contract. • The performance framework provides an opportunity to include rigorous, valid, and reliable school-specific indicators to augment external evaluations of the charter school's performance. 	
		<p>2. The district clearly states any additional, district-selected indicators, measures and metrics of student and school performance it may include in its draft performance framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district provides a clear rationale for additional indicators, measures and metrics, including research-based evidence of their validity and reliability. • Additional metrics are clear, measureable, and attainable. 	

		Any district-selected indicators, measures and metrics are rigorous, valid and reliable.		
		3. The district identifies the sources of all data supporting the indicators, measures and metrics included in its draft performance framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district defines the sources of academic data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, including state-mandated and other standardized assessments, student academic growth measures, internal assessments, qualitative reviews, and performance comparisons with other public schools in the district and state. 	
		4. The draft performance framework requires the disaggregation of all student performance data by major student subgroup as specified in RCW 28A.710.170.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The academic framework requires disaggregation of all student performance data by major student subgroups, such as gender, race and ethnicity, poverty status, special education status, and English language learner status consistent with the state's accountability system. 	
		5. The draft performance framework includes clear, valid and objective criteria for evaluating the financial performance and sustainability of the charter school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial framework defines the sources of financial data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, grounded in professional standards for sound financial operations and sustainability. The financial framework enables the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school's financial stability and viability based on short-term performance. The Performance Framework enables the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school's long-term financial stability. 	

		<p>6. The draft performance framework includes clear, valid and objective criteria for evaluating the organizational performance of the charter school, including governance, management and administration, and student and family engagement. The criteria should hold schools accountable for compliance with all applicable law and the terms of the charter contract, while respecting their primary responsibility and authority to manage their day-to-day operations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational framework defines the sources of organizational performance that will form the basis for ongoing and renewal evaluation, focusing on fulfillment of legal obligations and fiduciary duties. • The organizational framework articulates the essential elements of the educational program for which the authorizer will hold the school accountable. • The organizational framework defines financial management and oversight standards based on GAAP. • The organizational framework holds the governing board accountable for meeting statutory and board-established operating and reporting requirements. • The organizational framework provides for school compliance with student and employee rights and obligations. • The organizational framework establishes appropriate expectations related to the school environment, including health and safety, transportation, facilities, and handling of records. 	
--	--	---	--	--

DRAFT

SECTION V. RENEWAL, REVOCATION, AND NONRENEWAL PROCESSES

Section	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluators will Look for Evidence of the Following:	Rating (WD, PD, UD)	
5	Renewal, Revocation, and Nonrenewal Processes	<p>1. The plan illustrates how academic, organizational and financial data, based on the performance framework, will drive decisions whether to renew, revoke, or decline to renew a charter contract.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district presents a coherent vision for how performance information will be assessed and weighted in making decisions whether to renew, revoke or decline to renew a charter contract. • The plan provides for academic performance to be the highest priority in decisions whether to renew, revoke or decline to renew a charter contract. 	
		<p>2. The plan articulates a process for ongoing monitoring, oversight and reporting on school performance consistent with the expectations set forth in the charter contract and performance framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district has viable plans for monitoring academic performance and identifies valid information sources for measures not addressed in the state accountability system. • The district has viable plans for monitoring financial performance and identifies valid information sources including, but not limited to, annual financial audits. • The district has viable plans for monitoring organizational performance including distinguishing between information that will be self-reported, district-verified, and/or third-party verified. • The district has a viable plan for reporting on performance at least annually. 	
		<p>3. The plan sets reasonable and effective timelines for actions to renew, revoke or decline to renew a charter contract, including for notification of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The renewal process accounts for reporting schedules in key areas such as annual audit timelines and state assessments. 	

		<p>charter school board of the prospect of and reasons for revocation or nonrenewal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The renewal process includes realistic timing for key stages. • The renewal process provides for decision-making on a timeline that is sufficient for orderly closure of non-renewed schools and placement of students. • The revocation process will provide schools with adequate notice and opportunity to respond, including a formal or informal hearing. 	
		<p>4. The plan identifies interventions, short of revocation, in response to identified deficiencies in a charter school’s performance, based on the charter contract and the performance framework set forth in the charter contract.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intervention process provides for notification to schools of material violations of the terms of the charter contract and or standards set out in the performance frameworks. • The intervention process provides schools with reasonable opportunities to remedy identified problems. • The intervention process makes clear that the charter school board, not the authorizer, is responsible for correcting identified problems. 	
		<p>5. There are sound plans for communicating the standards for decisions on renewal, revocation and nonrenewal of charters to the charter school board and leadership during the term of the charter contract, and for providing guidance on the criteria for renewal in the renewal application.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractual basis for renewal, revocation and nonrenewal decisions will be outcomes related to standards set out in the performance frameworks. • The district commits to communicating the standards annually in the context of annual performance reports. • The district commits to communicating the standards at the outset of any renewal, revocation or nonrenewal decision. 	

		6. The plan clearly sets forth how opportunity will be provided for the charter school board to present evidence and submit testimony challenging the stated reasons for revocation or nonrenewal of a charter contract.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonrenewal and revocation processes provide schools an opportunity to submit written testimony and evidence in response to the identified bases for the decision. • Nonrenewal and revocation processes provide schools with a formal or informal hearing at which they have the opportunity to present evidence and submit testimony related to the identified bases for the decision. 	
		7. The plan considers under what exceptional circumstances a charter contract might be considered for renewal if, at the time of the renewal application, the charter school’s performance falls in the bottom quartile of schools on the Achievement Index developed by the State Board of Education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan identifies specific characteristics of schools for which there might be exceptional circumstances. • The plan articulates how performance related to mission- or school-specific measures might be considered in the assessment of “exceptional circumstances.” • The plan makes a presumption that circumstances are not exceptional and puts the burden of proof on schools for establishing exceptional circumstances. 	

DRAFT