

VENTURE GRANT SCORING RUBRIC		
Hall Co. Regional STEM	Possible Points	Reviewer Score
Review Date: July 14, 2011	100	80
<b>Section 1: Partnership Overview</b>	<b>10 points</b>	
<b>(a) The extent to which one member within the partnership has experience implementing complex projects.</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>At least one partner has relevant experience implementing complex, large-scale projects (0-4).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(b) The extent to which one member within the partnership has experience with charter schools and developing/implementing education programs that led to positive student outcomes.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>At least one partner has experience that pertains directly to charter schools (0-3), and there is evidence that the selected educational program led to the types of positive academic student outcomes emphasized within the state's RTT application (0-3).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>Section 2: Need for the Project</b>	<b>25 points</b>	
<b>(a) The extent to which the project targets a population/geographic location of demonstrated need.</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>The rationale behind site selection demonstrates in-depth knowledge of community demographics (0-5) and educational needs of targeted populations (0-5).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(b) The extent to which the charter school represents an exceptional approach to Priority 4 (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need; serves a community of need; provides students with unique learning opportunities and/or directs them toward high-tech, in-demand careers through partnerships with high-tech industry partners and/or post-secondary institutions).</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>
<i>The applicant clearly articulates an exceptional approach to Priority 4 by addressing a largely unmet need while serving a community of need (0-5), and providing students with unique learning opportunities and/or directs them toward high-tech, in-demand careers (0-5), and providing partnerships with high-tech industry partners and/or post-secondary institutions (0-5).</i>		
Reviewer Comments: The applicant addresses an unmet need and serves a community of need, but there is not enough detail included with regard to the types of unique learning opportunities that will be available to students within the school's attendance zone.		
<b>Section 3: Quality of Project Design</b>	<b>20 points</b>	
<b>(a) The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a viable plan for assessing need when determining population and number of people served by the charter school (number of LEAs, schools, K-12 students and economically disadvantaged students, teachers and leaders, etc.).</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The applicant describes a viable plan for assessing need when selecting a target population (0-3)</i>		

Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(b) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that the strategy for developing the charter school is supported by evidence-based findings or a reasonable hypothesis that the charter school will have a statistically significant, substantial and important effect on improving student outcomes.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The proposal outlines a clear strategy for developing the charter school that is supported by evidenced-based findings or a reasonable hypothesis (0-2) that will have a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes (0-3).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(c) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates a feasible plan to create a successful petition for a new charter school.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Applicant displays knowledge of curriculum programming (1), assessment methods (1), potential facility sites (1), federal accountability requirements (cannot be waived) (1), clear and rigorous performance measures and objectives (2).</i>		
Reviewer Comments: The applicant demonstrates knowledge of curriculum planning and acknowledges required participation on all state assessments; however, exceeding the state average on said assessments is not up to the expected level of rigor. Generally, the school will be expected to exceed the highest performing district within its attendance zone.		
<b>(d) The extent to which the project advances the state's Race to the Top strategy and/or other plans to improve student performance.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>The project advances/aligns state RT3 strategy (i.e. using Common Core, measuring student growth, etc.) (1).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(e) The extent to which the completed Scope of Work demonstrates a clear project design plan.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
The applicant provides a clearly outlined and fully completed scope of work (0-5).		
Reviewer Comments: Some steps outlined within the SOW need further detail (travel plans, composition of the committees that will contribute to the development of the petition), and considering the intent to have a tri-county attendance zone-- the petition should include plans for the development of inter-governmental agreements between White, Lumpkin, and Hall counties. Finally, there is mention of 'feeder schools' that currently funnel into NHHS (site of proposed charter school); this raises a concern about open-enrollment. Should NHHS become a regional STEM charter, it will be open to all high school students in its attendance zone (which I assume would also include at least portions of Lumpkin and White Counties); therefore--it will no longer have traditional feeder schools.		
<b>Section 4: Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>	<b>10 points</b>	
<b>(a) The extent to which the partnership identifies potential outcomes aligned with the four long-term goals of the Innovation Fund.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>The school has an organizational mission that aligns with and enables the four long-term goals (1); does not have a mission that aligns with and enables the four long-term goals (0)</i>		

Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(b) The extent to which the partnership is able to leverage resources in order to implement the plan for the charter school.</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Applicant describes how identified resources will be leveraged in order to implement the plan for the charter school (0-3.)</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(c) The extent to which the completed Project Evaluation Table demonstrates a clear evaluation plan.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Applicant identifies data collection method (0-2), provides additional indicators beyond those required (0-2), sets aggressive student progress goals (0-2).</i>		
Reviewer Comments: As mentioned previously, the student progress goals are not up to the expected level of rigor. Further, no additional indicators beyond those required were included within the proposal.		
<b>Section 5: Quality of Management Plan and Personnel</b>	<b>20 points</b>	
<b>(a) The partnership's capacity to achieve the objectives of the charter school development plan on time and within budget.</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The partnership possesses the capacity to achieve the objectives as described in the charter school development plan (0-2) on time (1) and within budget (1).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(b) The qualifications, relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>The proposal provides a thorough description of project leadership's training and experience (0-4) and how that experience can be leveraged to enable the success of the charter school (0-4).</i>		
Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(c) The leadership structure and clearly defined responsibilities for meeting timelines and milestones.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The applicant acknowledges the need for a strong governing board within the leadership structure (0-2), clearly delineates the responsibilities of all parties involved in the partnership (0-3), and describes how the leadership structure will enable the organization to meet timelines and milestones (0-3)</i>		
Reviewer Comments: Details surrounding petition development committees (who's on them, and is there adequate representation from all counties/communities involved?) as well as how the counties plan to share responsibilities for students (transportation--if provided, data agreements, etc.) need fleshing out. Additionally, the SOW indicates the petition will only be submitted to a single local BOE (this will likely be Hall Co. BOE, but it isn't clear and may not actually suffice considering they'll draw students from multiple districts).		
<b>Section 6: Quality of Sustainability Plan</b>	<b>15 points</b>	
<b>(a) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates the availability of resources needed to implement the plan beyond the length of the grant, with or without future Innovation Fund support.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The applicant addresses the need for a long-term strategic plan that contemplates the utilization of additional resources to ensure the organization's sustainability outside of the initial grant period (through additional funding, outreach, etc.) (0-5)</i>		

Reviewer Comments:		
<b>(b) Demonstrated commitment from additional partners or funders to advance the plan.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The applicant provides evidence of firm support from partners or funders (letters, agreements, contracts, etc.) detailing levels of involvement and support to be provided by all parties involved) (0-5)</i>		
Reviewer Comments: The applicant mentions initial conversations and commitments gained but does not demonstrate strong evidence of this support.		
<b>(c) Evidence of broad support from community stakeholders that are critical to the charter school's long-term success.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
The proposal contains evidence of broad support from community stakeholders (0-5)		
Reviewer Comments: The applicant references community support but does not demonstrate strong evidence of this support.		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>