



PHASE I PROSPECTUS APPLICATION RUBRIC

Office of Educational Opportunity

Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive

Madison, WI 53706

608-262-8887 | [wisconsin.edu/oeo](https://www.wisconsin.edu/oeo)

Prospectus Application Rubric for New Charter Schools

Background

The Office of Educational Opportunity (OEO) was created through the Wisconsin Legislature in 2015 as part of the biannual budget Act 55 and amended in 2017 to allow for statewide authorization of the operation of charter schools and serves as the review and monitoring office as defined by legislation.

We would like to extend our appreciation to the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Office of Charter Schools, National Association of Charter School Authorizers, and WI Resource Center for Charter Schools, whose applications and processes served as models. This application instantiates the OEO vision and core values.

As part of the Universities of Wisconsin, the OEO interprets its legislative responsibilities to authorize charter schools that have a potential to provide high quality education to all students and address the critical issues in education our state and local communities face.

The OEO vision is to authorize high performing charter schools that instill the Wisconsin Idea by incubating new educational opportunities, sharing what we learn with PK-20 stakeholders, and supporting efforts to close opportunity and achievement gaps. We connect stakeholders with the opportunity to create, lead, or attend high-quality public schools, while leveraging the expertise and resources from the university, state government, local practitioners, and national experts to improve K-12 practices.

Mission

The OEO exists to expand access to high-quality innovative educational opportunities for students, families, and communities across Wisconsin by authorizing and overseeing public charter schools that meet local needs, interests, and demands. It is our goal to improve the education outcomes for students, especially students historically underserved and who may not have access to high quality or community-desired educational options.

New School Priorities

The OEO aims to expand learning opportunities for students in Wisconsin; therefore, we seek high quality new school applications from individuals and groups who have the skill, capacity, and vision to initiate and sustain high quality, innovative public charter schools. Successful applications will present plans that provide all students, including students with disabilities and students identified as English learners, with a quality education that develops the whole child, ensures efficient use of public resources, and demonstrates best practices to increase educational equity.

The OEO is specifically interested in charter applications when one or more of the following conditions exists in the communities/local school districts it proposes to serve:

- The applicant proposes a new or innovative school model/academic program that aims to close opportunity and achievement gaps by deploying research-based education practices to increase educational equity. The applicant demonstrates needs not currently being addressed in local school district and how the proposed model/academic program will address them.
- A district has at least one school that received "Fails to Meet Expectations," consistent with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Report Card, for at least two consecutive years.

Consideration would only be given to prospectuses which target the grade levels of the district school(s) that Fails to Meet Expectations.

In addition, the OEO seeks charter school applications that prioritize the following additional statutory purposes as outlined in WI §118.40(3m)

- Give preference in awarding contracts for the operation of charter schools other than the charter school established under a contract with the director under sub. (2x) (cm) to those charter schools that serve children at risk, as defined in s. 118.153 (1) (a).

The OEO and Universities of Wisconsin consider the following core values to be essential to the development of charter schools authorized by the OEO:

Innovation: The Educational Program or its essential design elements should be innovative, grounded in research and/or theory, and has been or is likely to be rigorous, engaging, and effective for the anticipated student population.

Incubation: The Educational Program promises to be a leading incubator for innovative teaching methods, curricula, organizational design, technologies, and other ways to meet students' diverse needs, enabling school models to be custom-tailored to the specific values, cultures, and circumstances of their local communities.

Equity: The Educational Program comprehends and responds to the needs, shared challenges, and educational gaps in communities by providing high quality options for students and their families, particularly underserved populations. The proposed charter school population reflects the diversity of the community it plans to serve.

Collaboration: The charter school should be developed with and for the community it plans to serve. The proposed school should demonstrate clear input, interest, and collaboration between and among the families, community members, and local community organizations, including student voice when applicable.

Integrity: The administration and board of directors of the charter school should embody principles of effective leadership and demonstrate the ability to solve complex educational issues to achieve both academic and social outcomes for the students, families, and communities it serves.

Phase I: Prospectus Application Evaluation Rubric

Introduction

The Prospectus Evaluation Rubric (Rubric) provides the authorizer and prospectus evaluators with an objective means of determining quality in the charter school prospectus. The Rubric also provides a common language (specific criteria and indicators of quality) for evaluators to draw on throughout the entire prospectus evaluation process. The rubric also allows the prospectus writers a mechanism for reviewing their work prior to submission.

Criteria and indicators of quality are provided for each section of the prospectus. A proposal that sufficiently addresses the criteria in each section will receive a rating of either "Meets" or "Exceeds" for that section. It should be noted that a section rating of "Exceeds" signifies that the response is exemplary and exceeds the expectations of reviewers. A rating of "Does Not Meet" signifies that the response is limited, lacking detail and insufficiently meets, or does not demonstrate understanding of the criteria.

The prospectus evaluators must objectively review the extent to which the applicant responds to the criteria and rate according to the indicators of quality. Based on those individual criteria ratings, the evaluator then provides an overall rating for each prospectus category. It is appropriate for authorizers to prioritize and weight certain sections of the prospectus.

Opening and maintaining a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan and identifying highly capable individuals to execute it. It is not an endeavor for which strengths in some areas can compensate for material weaknesses in others. Therefore, to receive a recommendation for approval, the prospectus must maintain a "Meets" or "Exceeds" rating in all sections as determined by consensus of the Application Review Committee.

Rating Characteristics

The evaluation team assesses each prospectus against the Prospectus Evaluation Rubric. The following definitions guide the evaluators' ratings:

Exceeds

Clear and complete responses to all criteria. Consistently detailed, comprehensive explanations provided, including specific evidence that shows robust preparation. Presents a clear, explicit picture of how the school expects to operate. When applicable, responses connect cohesively to other sections of the prospectus. When applicable, the information/evidence demonstrates a high degree of capacity to implement the proposed program.

Meets

Clear and complete responses to all criteria. Sufficient explanations provided, including evidence that shows preparation. Presents a clear picture of how the school expects to operate. When applicable, responses connect to other sections of the prospectus. When applicable, the information/evidence provided demonstrates potential to implement the proposed program.

Does Not Meet

Unclear and/or incomplete responses to some or all criteria. The response provides partial explanations and lacks meaningful detail or requires additional information in one or more key areas. Responses lack connections to related sections. Responses demonstrate lack of preparation and/or raise substantial concerns about the applicant's understanding of, or ability to, implement the proposed program/or operate a charter school.

Prospectus Application Evaluation Evaluator Rubric

PROSPECTUS SCHOOL NAME:

REVIEWER NAME:

DATE:

Rating Characteristics

In general, the following definitions guide evaluator ratings:

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

OVERALL SECTION RATING

Section I: Vision & Mission	
Section II: Need, Demand & Evidence of Community Involvement	
Section III: Description of the School and Program	
Section IV: Introduction and Summary of the Educational Program	
Section V: Governance Structure	
Section VI: Financial Management & First Year Operation Plan	
Section VII: Potential Location of School	
Overall Rating	

SECTION I: VISION AND MISSION

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Q1. Clearly articulates reasons applicants desires to open a public charter school and identifies conditions the proposed charter school seeks to address.			
Q2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application provides a clear, concise, comprehensive and compelling vision and mission statements, identifying the students and community to be served. • Applicant illustrates what success will look like at capacity and fully operational; the long-term goals should articulate what the school hopes to achieve once it is at capacity and fully operational. All goals must be specific, measurable, action-oriented, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). • The applicant provides a clear and cohesive school plan, mission statement outlines how the school will operate and how it will achieve its long-term goals. 			
Q3. Applicant clearly articulates alignment with the mission/core values of OEO. Applicant provides a compelling plan and clearly states at least one OEO priority that the proposed school plans on addressing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The applicant proposes a new or innovative school model/academic program that aims to close opportunity and achievement gaps by deploying innovative education practices to increase educational equity. The applicant demonstrates specific needs not being addressed within the district and how this model/academic program plans to address it. OR <input type="checkbox"/> A district has at least one school that received “Fails to Meet Expectations” consistent with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Report Card data for at least two consecutive years. Consideration would only be given to prospectuses which target the grade levels of the district school(s) that Fails to Meet Expectations. 			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.
Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.
Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section II: Need, Demand & Evidence of Community Involvement

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Q1. Applicant clearly describes how the school’s founders have assessed family/community demand and need for the school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant demonstrates the need for the school in proposed location, referring to the reason(s) existing school models/programs are insufficient or inadequate. • The applicant can demonstrate the school has assessed family and community demand for the proposed school with significant evidence of adequate and diverse support for the school. Demand refers to the desire of prospective families to attend the proposed school. 			
Q2. Applicant describes the new and unique characteristics this school would provide to students that distinguish it relative to other public education options available to students in the area.			
Q3. Applicant articulates a clear, detailed, comprehensive, and reasonable plan on how the founders have and/or plan on engaging families and community members/organizations in the development of the school during its application and planning phase.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section III: Description of the School and Program

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Q1. Age range(s) and grades to be taught, applicant provides a clear rationale for said ages and grade levels using demographic trends.			
Q2. The applicant provides a comprehensive projected number of students, pupil teacher ratios and general staffing patterns during the first five years of operation that is reasonable against budget.			
Q3. Applicant clearly and comprehensively notes special issues or characteristics of the school (i.e., extended day/teacher model/organizational design/community partnerships) that demonstrate the innovation or incubation that is different from what is already being offered in the proposed community it plans to serve.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section IV: Introduction and Summary of the Educational Program

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>Q1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant clearly states how the educational program aligns to the school's mission. The applicant provides evidence the educational program proposed is innovative and can articulate how educational proposed educational program has a sound base in research, theory, and/or experience for the anticipated student population. The applicant has provided a clear description of how its planned education model will improve the educational outcomes for students who qualify for special education services, linguistically diverse students (English language learners) and those who have been historically underserved. 			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section V: Governance Structure

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Q1. The applicant clearly and comprehensively describes the governance structure/model of the proposed school (i.e., Carver Policy Governance Model also known as Policy Governance Model, Consensus Governance) and how it will interact with the principal/head of school and any advisory bodies.			
Q2. The applicant clearly and comprehensively explains how the proposed governance structure will help ensure that:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school will be an educational, financial and operational success; 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board will evaluate the success of the school, school leader and itself; 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be active representation of key stakeholders to effectively govern school, including parents/family members representative of the community it plans to serve (i.e., expertise in legal, K-12 education, public relations, HR, accounting/finance, health, fundraising, strategic planning, facilities, business administration). 			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section VI: Financial Management & First Year Operation Plan

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Q1. The response convincingly addresses the degree to which the school/campus budget will rely on variable income (e.g., grants, donations, fundraising). The description cohesively aligns to the educational program proposed.			
Q2. The applicant provided a clear and comprehensive plan describing how the proposed school will develop and maintain the financial capacity to successfully operate the proposed school.			
Q3. The applicant provided a detailed and comprehensive description of any existing and anticipated partnerships the school has or will have with community organizations, businesses, or other educational institutions, and the nature, purposes, terms, and scope of services of any such partnerships including any fee-based or in-kind commitments from community organizations or individuals that will enrich student learning opportunities.			
Q4: If applicable, applicants identify the person(s) preparing the full application and describe how any costs associated with developing the full new school application (if any) will be financed.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section VII: Potential Location of School

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Q1. The applicant has described the proposed geographic location of the school and explicitly noted the rationale for selecting the school location and how it aligns to the educational need, anticipated student population, and non-academic challenges the school is likely to encounter.			
Q2. The applicant has clearly and reasonably described the steps taken to identify potential school facilities.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Exceeds: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates high degree of capacity and potential to implement the proposed program.

Meets: Clear and complete response to all aspects, demonstrates potential.

Does Not Meet: Partial, lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

