

Site Selection Review
Generation 24

GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Offers realistic attendance boundaries.	
Fair	1	Offers unrealistic attendance boundaries.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Provides a compelling rationale for the geographic location selected.	
Fair	1	Provides an inarticulate rationale for the geographic location	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets Standard and proposes an open-enrollment charter school campus that will be located in the Attendance Zone of a school district campus assigned an unacceptable performance rating under Section 39.054 for the two preceding schools years.	
Standard	2	Provides a specific location for the charter school campus.	
Fair	1	Provides an unspecific location of the charter school campus.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			

Site Selection Review
Generation 24

ENROLLMENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC PROJECTIONS			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Offers realistic enrollment projections in the first year of operation.	
Fair	1	Offers unrealistic enrollment projections in the first year of operation.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Cites realistic projections and accurate district data.	
Fair	1	Cites unrealistic projections and/or reports inaccurate district data.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets Standard and supplements response with historical, cultural, social, and/or academic factors that are unique to the proposed geographic boundaries.	
Standard	2	Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the community and anticipated student population(s).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets Standard and clearly aligns with the proposed instructional program.	
Standard	2	Identifies common and/or unique learning needs among the anticipated student population(s).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the description with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Proposes an allowable teacher to student ratio and describes a description of the process by which this ratio was determined	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Summary		Raw Anticipated Need Score	0

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

MISSION AND VISION			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Is articulated clearly and concisely.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Demonstrates the five attributes of innovation.	
Standard	2	Demonstrates some of the five attributes of innovation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Outlines a clear and robust decision making process for the creation of the entity's mission and vision.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and outlines research or experience to support the approach.	
Standard	2	Rationalizes the proposed approach for the student population.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and clearly distinguishes itself from educational/instructional models currently implemented within the geographic boundaries.	
Standard	2	Describes a foundational curriculum which clearly demonstrates alignment with TEKS and allows a student to demonstrate masters of TEKS standards.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports alignment with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Aligns the proposed curriculum with the general and unique needs of the target population and community.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the use of instructional strategies with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Describes specific instructional strategies and rationalizes their use with the proposed curricular model.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and identifies sufficient metrics that will determine success and/or necessary realignment.	
Standard	2	Describes a consistent and robust plan to evaluate the proposed curriculum and instructional strategies.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and identifies reasonable budgeted cost(s).	
Standard	2	Accounts for specific supplies, technology, and tools that will be needed to facilitate successful program implementation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Presents well-designed extracurricular activities and programs that are also consistent with the financial plan workbook.	
Standard	2	Provides an adequate rationale for not providing any special programs or extracurricular activities.	
Fair	1	Presents an overly broad design for extracurricular activities and programs OR fails to provide a rationale for not providing such activities.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

SPECIAL POPULATIONS			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and provides clear evidence to support the proposed plan.	
Standard	2	Presents detailed plan to implement all required screenings, accommodations, instruction, and placements for students requiring special education.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Demonstrates thorough understanding of state and federal requirements for the identification, instruction, and placements for students requiring special education.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and provides clear evidence to support the proposed plan.	
Standard	2	Presents detailed plans to ensure that English Language Learners will be taught the academic English that they will need for school purposes, and assessed to measure progress in learning the English language.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Demonstrates thorough understanding of the English Language Proficiency Standards [ELPS] and Texas Essential Language Proficiency Assessment System [TELPAS].	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Presents detailed plans to provide screenings, accommodations, instruction, and/or placements for gifted and talented students.	
Standard	2	Provides a clear rationale for the exclusion of such services.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Describes sufficient staffing to oversee supports for Special Education students, English Language Learners, and Gifted and Talented students with fidelity.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

ASSESSMENT AND ACADEMIC PROGRESS MONITORING			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Proposes specific and comprehensive assessment models to promote student achievement and demonstrates a clear understanding of the proposed model.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and discusses foreseeable strengths and/or weaknesses if applied to the anticipated student population.	
Standard	2	Rationalizes the use and applicability of the proposed assessment model(s).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports these roles with sufficient educational and/or experience requirements.	
Standard	2	Identifies specific roles and responsibilities of person(s), position(s), or entities that will be involved in planning, implementation, analysis, and reporting of data.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Details specific (1) assessment schedules, (2) sources of data, and (3) associated data collections.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and presents a robust plan to use assessment data for instructional improvement.	
Standard	2	Outlines a robust plan to use assessment data for the improvement of campus teaching and learning.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

SCHOOL CULTURE			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the approach with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Contains appropriate and effective strategies to support a school climate that will allow for fulfillment of educational goals.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the plan with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Offers a concrete plan for norming social/cultural expectations at the start of each semester as well as for students who enter mid-semester.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Establishes well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			

Education Plan Review
Generation 24

PROMOTION AND GRADUATION			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents specific promotion and retention requirements that are congruent with the proposed mission and vision.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports features with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Discusses additional features of the educational model and/or courses, outside of the required curriculum, that will create a viable and adequate process for helping students promote to the next grade level.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and identifies confirmed resources, partnerships, endorsements, or other opportunities.	
Standard	2	Identifies prospective external (and confirmed) resources, partnerships, endorsements, or other opportunities that will facilitate promotion and/or graduation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and identifies sufficient metrics that will determine success.	
Standard	2	Provides specific strategies that will assist students to transition between elementary, middle, high school, and/or post- graduation (where applicable to proposed grade span).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Describes and provides justification for the proposed matriculation rate in each year of operation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

TEACHER RECRUITMENT			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents a clear process for using the proposed methods to identify, recruit, and hire qualified teachers.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Includes a rationale for the proposed recruitment strategies/methods and establish its applicability to successful recruitment of staff with desired areas of expertise.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and clearly describes educational and/or experience requirements.	
Standard	2	Identifies specific roles and responsibilities of the person(s), position(s), and/or entities that will be involved in planning, implementation, and evaluation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and identifies sufficient metrics that will determine success.	
Standard	2	Presents specific strategies, activities, and schedules that will gauge recruitment effectiveness.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Present specific strategies to support unforeseen staff shortages of instructional staff.	
Standard	2	Addresses any foreseeable obstacles to successfully recruiting quality staff and provide clear strategies to overcome those obstacles.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Support the proposed professional development activities with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Describes the proposed professional development plan and discusses how these components align with the mission, vision, and proposed educational program.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Provides specific examples of embedded professional development activities (e.g., modeling, co-teaching).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and provides a description of desired educational and/or experience requirements.	
Standard	2	Identifies specific roles and responsibilities of the person(s), position(s), and/or entities that will be involved in planning, implementation, analysis, reporting, and evaluation of professional development activities.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Explains how the school calendar, daily schedule, and staffing structure will help facilitate the professional development plan.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Outlines evaluation processes, including instruments and protocols and substantiates their use with supportive research, theory and/or experience.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	References budget amounts that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	

Education Plan Review
Generation 24

PARENT ENGAGEMENT			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the plan with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Outlines plan to effectively engage parents from the time that the operator is approved.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Incorporates a feedback loop to surface the priorities and concerns of parents and the broader school community.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the plan with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Offers a plan to engage parents as partners in promoting student academic achievement.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Includes a plan to involve parents in the life of the school, once open, including to promote student academic achievement.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	

**Education Plan Review
Generation 24**

A DAY IN THE LIFE			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Provides a clear sequence of events throughout each student's school day.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and offers an evidence base for the proposed approach with research, theory, and/or experience to validate proposed supports.	
Standard	2	Establishes clear and reasonable support for each student's experience, instruction, and/or necessary accommodations.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports these roles with sufficient educational and/or experience requirements.	
Standard	2	Cite specific individual(s) and/or position(s) that will facilitate each proposed school day activity.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	

Summary	Raw Education Plan Score	0
	Total Anticipated Need and Education Plan Percent	0%

Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24

OUTREACH AND PUBLIC MEETINGS			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and implements robust and/or innovative strategies.	
Standard	2	Discusses method(s) of outreach used to engage potential students, parents, and families.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Presents a clear rationale for all strategies used for community outreach and/or advertising.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Demonstrates significant Board involvement with the planning and implementation of outreach activities.	
Fair	1	Minimal and/or ambiguous Board involvement.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	The majority of attendees at public meetings reside within five miles of the public meeting(s).	
Standard	2	The majority of attendees at public meetings reside within ten miles of the public meeting(s).	
Fair	1	Majority of attendees at public meetings reside within twenty or more miles of the public meeting(s).	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Describes outreach to both Texas State Board of Education	
Fair	1	Describes outreach to Texas State Board of Education	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

CAMPUS REQUEST AND GROWTH PLAN			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports process and determination with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Establishes measurable need(s) for the number of campuses requested.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports process and determination with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Illustrates a clear process for determining the number of campuses requested.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the proposed geographic area(s) and/or community(s) in relation to the number of requested campus(es).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports process and determination of strategic choice areas with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Identifies specific strategic choice areas that will be used to facilitate initial and primary campus development.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

CAMPUS FACILITY IDENTIFIED			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and explains how the facility will be an ideal setting to serve the needs of the target population.	
Standard	2	Provides a clear description of the facility.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and includes realistic/adequate alignment with enrollment growth and rollout.	
Standard	2	Describes how the facility meets the needs of the mission, vision, and educational model.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports decision making with market research, factors/considerations, timelines, relevant individuals/organizations that had a significant role in the process.	
Standard	2	Describes the process that was used to identify and select the proposed facility.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Provides a specific description of the purchase or leasing arrangements- including timeline(s), cost(s), and fee(s).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and includes timeline(s), cost(s), and fee(s).	
Standard	2	Provides a clear plan for any construction or renovations that must occur to ensure adequate facilities OR expresses or indicates that no construction or renovations are necessary.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Presents budget costs and financing arrangement(s) that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
Fair	1	Presents incongruent budget costs and financing arrangement(s).	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

CAMPUS FACILITY NOT IDENTIFIED			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and explains how the desired facility and community will be an ideal place to best serve the needs of the target population.	
Standard	2	Provides a clear description of the desired facility and community.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Describes how a potential facility would align with mission, vision, educational model, and proposed scope of operation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the process with results from market research and analysis.	
Standard	2	Provides a clear process for identifying and securing a facility.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and establishes clear qualifications and/or experience that is desired for these individuals.	
Standard	2	Identifies relevant individuals that will have significant roles in the facility selection and procurement process.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Provides a clear description of the anticipated purchase or leasing arrangements and/or construction or renovations that might occur to ensure adequate facilities.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Presents budget costs and financing arrangement(s) that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
Fair	1	Presents incongruent budget costs and financing arrangement(s).	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

TRANSPORTATION			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Presents a detailed transportation plan, or travel voucher program, and robust reasons to believe the charter school will establish neighborhood campus(es).	
Standard	2	Articulates compelling reasons why transportation will not be offered.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Presents clear transportation plans for students with IEP's.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Presents budget costs and financing arrangement(s) that align with the financial workbook.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

STUDENT RECRUITMENT			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and describes why targeted groups will be best served by the proposed mission, vision, and educational program.	
Standard	2	Identifies any groups to be targeted for student recruitment.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score 			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and rationalizes the use of the proposed strategies with research, theory, and/or experience.	
Standard	2	Presents specific strategies to effectively reach the community.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score 			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports these roles with sufficient educational and/or experience requirements.	
Standard	2	Identifies specific roles and responsibilities of person(s), position(s), or entities that will be involved in planning, implementation, and evaluation.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score 			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and outlines contingency plans if enrollment numbers are lower than expected.	
Standard	2	Presents specific strategies, activities, schedules, and metrics that will measure recruitment effectiveness.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score 			
Standard	2	References budget amounts that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
Fair	1	Provides incongruent budget amounts.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score 			

Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24

ADMISSION AND ENROLLMENT			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents an application period and application process that clearly supports fair and equitable opportunity for all students.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Describes a fair and equitable selection process in the event of oversubscription.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Contains enrollment requirements that are aligned with TEC §12.111(a)(6) and §12.1171.	
Fair	1	Contains enrollment requirements but are not aligned with TEC §12.111(a)(6) and §12.1171.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Includes a non-discrimination statement that satisfies TEC 12.111(a)(5).	
Fair	1	Includes a non-discrimination statement but it does not satisfy TEC 12.111(a)(5).	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

SCHOOL CALENDAR AND SCHEDULE			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents a clear alignment with between the school calendar and student needs and school goals.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Provides a clear description and rationale for the proposed school schedule.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24

START-UP PLAN			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and includes specific contingencies in the event of a budget shortfall.	
Standard	2	Outlines a detailed and comprehensive start-up plan that will promote a successful school opening.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Describes how the Board will monitor the creation, adoption, and implementation of the start-up plan and budget.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Outlines the costs associated with all start-up activities.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	1	Presents expenses and revenues that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
NA	0	Presents expenses and revenues that are not congruent with the financial workbook.	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Describes clear and appropriate strategies to mitigate fraud, waste, and abuse.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

CONTRACTED SERVICES			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and provides an extensive decision making process that led to an identified need for each service.	
Standard	2	Rationalizes the need for each proposed service.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Discusses the professional qualifications that will be required and expected of those to be retained for each service proposed.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Details specific and reasonable costs, timelines, and selection processes for all types of prospective vendors.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	1	Presents costs that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
NA	0	Presents costs that are not congruent with the financial workbook.	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

PUBLIC EDUCATION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (PEIMS)			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Provides clear education and experience requirements for the PEIMS coordinator position and a process for filling the role.	
Standard	2	Articulates clear reasons why a PEIMS coordinator will not be employed.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Describes a plan to train individuals who will fulfill PEIMS-related duties.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	1	Starting salary range is reasonable with respect to estimated student enrollment.	
NA	0	Starting salary range is unreasonable with respect to estimated student enrollment.	
		Score <input type="text"/>	

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

SUPERINTENDENT/CEO			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Provides a justification for the selection of a specific individual (as Superintendent) as the best candidate for the position OR identifies a rigorous criteria (and process) for the recruitment and selection of the Superintendent position.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Presents specific and applicable metrics that will evaluate and assess Superintendent performance.	
Standard	2	Presents general metrics that will evaluate and assess Superintendent performance.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	1	Starting salary range is reasonable with respect to estimated student enrollment.	
NA	0	Starting salary range is unreasonable with respect to estimated student enrollment.	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	References budget amounts that are congruent with the financial workbook.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

STAFF RECRUITMENT			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents a clear process for using the proposed methods to identify, recruit, and hire qualified support staff.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and establishes its applicability to successful recruitment of staff with desired areas of expertise.	
Standard	2	Includes a rationale for the proposed recruitment strategies/methods.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports these descriptions with sufficient educational and/or experience requirements.	
Standard	2	Identifies specific roles and responsibilities of person(s), position(s), or entities that will be involved in planning, implementation, and	
Fair	1	Presents overly broad or ambiguous roles and/or responsibilities.	
NA	0	Not addressed.	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and provides clear strategies to overcome those obstacles.	
Standard	2	Addresses any foreseeable obstacles to successfully recruit quality staff.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Presents specific strategies to deal with unforeseen staff shortages.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24**

BOARD OF DIRECTORS			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Provides a clear list of roles and responsibilities of the governing Board.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Discusses the composition of the governing Board, including how it will promote effective governance of the proposed school(s).	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	1	Presents a governance structure that is compliant with 19 TAC § 100.1113 and Texas Government Code §§ 573.021- 573.025, relating to Relationships by Consanguinity or Affinity.	
NA	0	Presents a governance structure that is not compliant with 19 TAC § 100.1113 and Texas Government Code §§ 573.021- 573.025, relating to Relationships by Consanguinity or Affinity.	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and is supported by a significant number of Board members with administrative and/or leadership roles in charter school operations.	
Standard	2	Provides strong evidence that the proposed governance structure will be effective.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Describes the relationship between the governing Board and the charter school, including reporting schedules.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Demonstrates a consistent and sufficient evaluation schedule and metrics for Board effectiveness.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	

Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents specific and applicable metrics that will evaluate and assess academic performance indicators.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Demonstrates a consistent and sufficient evaluation schedule.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Standard	2	Identify specific thresholds/performance levels that will determine success or need for intervention.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	
Exceptional	3	Identifies multiple Board members that have demonstrable experience and competency to assess academic performance.	
Standard	2	Identifies one Board member that has demonstrable experience in assessing academic performance.	
Fair	1	Provides Board member(s) that lack demonstrable experience.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score	

Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents specific and applicable metrics that will evaluate and assess financial performance indicators.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Demonstrates a consistent and sufficient evaluation schedule.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Standard	2	Identify specific thresholds/performance levels that will determine success or need for intervention.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	
Exceptional	3	Identifies multiple Board members that have demonstrable experience and competency to assess financial performance.	
Standard	2	Identifies one Board member that has demonstrable experience in assessing financial performance.	
Fair	1	Provides Board member(s) that lack demonstrable experience.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
		Score <input type="text"/>	

Finance, Operations, and Governance Plan Review
Generation 24

BUDGET			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Presents expenditures that cover the (1) Educational Plan, and (2) Operational Plan, and (3) all Business Operations that are discussed in the application.	
Fair	1	Presents expenditures that do not cover one or more of the following: (1) Educational Plan, or (2) Operational Plan, or (3) Business Operations that are discussed in the application.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Provides a clear description of assumptions and revenue estimates (including but not limited to) the basis of calculations for revenue projections, staffing levels, and expenditures.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Presents Average Daily Attendance (ADA) estimates that are congruent with the estimated student demographics, count, and grade level.	
Fair	1	Presents Average Daily Attendance (ADA) estimates that are not congruent with the estimated student demographics, count, and grade level.	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Addresses the source of all anticipated income and makes reasonable assumptions around the level of commitment and availability of all variable funds.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Describes all repayment terms for borrowed funds.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Outlines strong contingency planning to be implemented in the event that anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Summary	Raw Financial, Operations, and Governance Plan Score		0
	Total Financial, Operations, and Governance Plan Percent		0%

**Out of State Operator Addendum Review
Generation 24**

VISION AND GROWTH			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and supports the plan by a solid rationale, specifically related to how expansion into Texas is a good fit.	
Standard	2	Presents a clear plan for growth of the charter network.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Establishes measurable impact goals.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Provides demographics (by state) that are currently being served and draws comparisons to the proposed Texas community.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and articulates applicable solutions to challenges associated with operating a school in Texas.	
Standard	2	Establishes a capacity to learn from past challenges;	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Provides a compelling rationale for any modifications to the existing educational model to serve Texas students.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Out of State Operator Addendum Review
Generation 24**

LEADERSHIP			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and demonstrates the capacity to lead the short and long-term success of the proposed school(s) as part of the growing network.	
Standard	2	Establishes a capable network leadership team with defined roles and responsibilities	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Exceptional	3	Meets the standard and describes a clear structure for the provision of support services.	
Standard	2	Details all specific services to be provided, including associated costs and how they will be allocated across campuses	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			
Standard	2	Presents a clear plan for management of the relationships between the governing board and the secondary board.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score <input type="text"/>			

**Out of State Operator Addendum Review
Generation 24**

PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE			
Rating	Score	Criteria	Evidence to Substantiate Rating
Standard	2	Demonstrates strong student academic performance among a student population similar to the proposed school.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Demonstrates a strong financial model	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Standard	2	Establishes the capacity to learn from past challenges/mistakes demonstrated by: (1) failed openings; (2) delayed openings; (3) resolution of performance deficiencies; and/or (4) violations that have led to formal authorizer intervention within the last five years.	
Fair	1	Insufficient and/or overly broad	
NA	0	Not addressed	
Score			
Summary		Raw Out of State Operator Addendum Score	0
		Total Out of State Operator Addendum Percent	0%