PHASE I
NEW CHARTER SCHOOL PROSPECTUS APPLICATION RUBRIC

Office of Educational Opportunity
Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-8887 | www.wisconsin.edu/oeo

Phase I: Prospectus 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 "Approaches" for that section. 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" 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:

Meets
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.

Approaches
Responses address most criteria but lack full depth or detail in some areas. The explanation provides adequate information overall but would benefit from additional evidence or specifics in key sections. Some connections between related parts of the prospectus exist but could be strengthened. The information demonstrates basic capacity to implement the proposed program, though certain operational elements may require further development or clarification. Some aspects of school operations are presented in general terms rather than with specific, actionable plans.

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:
DATE:

Rating Characteristics

In general, the following definitions guide evaluator ratings:
Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: 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	**Approaches**	**Meets**
Q1. Clearly articulates reasons the applicant team desires to open a public charter school and identifies conditions the proposed charter school seeks to address.			
Q2. • 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. • The applicant proposes a new or innovative educational program grounded in evidence-based practices, that presents educational options to address specific needs that are not being addressed within the district. OR • 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:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section II: Need, Demand & Evidence of Community Involvement			
	Does Not Meet	**Approaches**	**Meets**
Q1. Applicant clearly describes how the school's founders have assessed family/community demand and need for the school. • The applicant demonstrates the need for the school in the proposed location, referring to the specific need(s) being addressed by the proposed school that are not being addressed within the district. • 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 articulates a clear, detailed, comprehensive, and reasonable plan on how the founders have engaged families and community members/organizations in the development of the school during its application process and planning year.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section III: Description of the School and Program			
	Does Not Meet	**Approaches**	**Meets**
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 community's existing traditional public-school options.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section IV: Introduction and Summary of the Educational Program			
	Does Not Meet	**Approaches**	**Meets**
Q1. • The applicant provides an overview of the curriculum and instructional design, the guiding educational philosophy, clearly stating how the educational program aligns to the school's mission. • The applicant provided a clear description of distinctive learning and teaching approaches that set their program apart, supported by compelling evidence for why those methods were selected. • The applicant reasonably explains how these evidence-based techniques address specific student needs and contribute to its educational model's unique value proposition. • 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:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section V: Governance Structure			
	Does Not Meet	**Approaches**	**Meets**
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: • The school will be an educational, financial and operational success; • The board will evaluate the success of the school, school leader and itself; • 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). • How the board will mitigate any potential or perceived conflict of interest between board members/founders and the school that may exist now or in the future.			
Strengths:			
Weaknesses:			
Questions:			
Section Rating:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section VI: Financial Management & First Year Operation Plan			
	Does Not Meet	**Approaches**	**Meets**
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 provides 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 provides 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:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.

Section VII: Potential Location of School			
	Does Not Meet	**Approaches**	**Meets**
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:			

Meets: Clear, complete, and compelling response to all aspects, demonstrates capacity and potential.
Approaches: Adequate response addressing most criteria, but requires further development in certain areas. Shows basic understanding and capacity.
Does Not Meet: Lacking details, minimal demonstration of understanding or capacity.