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**Neighborhood Advisory Council (NAC) Member Evaluation Form**

**INTRODUCTION**

Thank you for dedicating your time, effort, and expertise to help review proposals for new charter and contract schools submitted in response to the annual New Schools Request for Proposals (RFP). Through your participation in this review process, you will play an integral role in helping determine which proposed schools are recommended for approval to Chicago Public Schools’ (CPS) Board of Education.

**EVALUATION STANDARDS & RATINGS**

This evaluation form includes the evaluation criteria that you will use to rate the quality of the proposal response for your assigned sections. You will rate each evaluation criterion as “meets” or “does not meet” the standard according to the following guidelines:

**Meets the Standard –** The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues and demonstrates the design team’s capacity to implement its plan. It addresses the topics with specific and accurate information, aligns with the mission and goals of the school, and presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

**Does Not Meet the Standard –** The response does not demonstrate that the design team has the capacity to implement its plan. The response is incomplete, lacks meaningful detail or otherwise raises significant concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant’s ability to carry it out.

Review each evaluation criterion in your assigned sections and rate the proposal as “meets” or “does not meet” the standard on that evaluation criterion. Strong responses will include all or most of the characteristics listed underneath the evaluation criterion (if applicable).

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

For each rating, cite evidence from the proposal pertaining to your analysis of the section under the “Strengths” and “Concerns” sections. It is acceptable to rate an evaluation criterion as “meets” the standard overall but still cite some “concerns” in addition to “strengths;” conversely, it is acceptable to rate an evaluation criterion as “does not meet” the standard but also cite “strengths” in addition to “concerns.”

When citing evidence from the proposal, include page numbers for easy reference. If you have additional questions about that section of the proposal after reviewing the materials, include them in the “Key Questions” section.

**TWO-TIERED REVIEW**

Note that some sections are allowed updates in Tier 2: these sections are identified in the evaluation form as “\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information” under the evaluation criterion. In these sections, you can choose to provide an initial rating of “meets” or “does not meet”, but may need to update this rating when Tier 2 materials have been received (August 10, 2015) and reviewed. However, you are encouraged to begin to cite evidence and/or include questions for these sections based on your review of the Tier 1 proposal materials.

If you have any questions as you are completing your review, do not hesitate to reach out to your NAC facilitator or Subject Matter Expert (SME) directly.

**Domain 1: PARENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND SUPPORT**

***Key Question: Has the applicant conducted robust engagement and garnered authentic parent and community support, establishing a strong foundation for opening and operating a school with engaged and empowered families and communities?***

**\*\*All sub-sections in Domain 1 may be updated with Tier 2 information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.1.a. Targeted Communit(ies):** The applicant has developed a nuanced understanding of the targeted communit(ies), informed by conversations with community members and a variety of methods of formal and informal research.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:**  | * The applicant identifies the possible location(s) of the proposed school(s) and cites specific street boundaries where the school intends to focus student recruitment efforts, should the school be approved to open.
* The applicant provides the requested background information on the proposed target communit(ies) for all of the above metrics.
* The history of the targeted community is concise, includes key events from at least the last few decades, and identifies political, economic, demographic, and community-specific trends that are important to understand when seeking to serve students, families, and community members in the targeted communit(ies).
* The design team includes and/or has consulted with individuals with close ties to the community to become more familiar with the targeted communit(ies). The design team solicited advice from community members and participated in various meetings, events, and/or volunteer opportunities to help develop an outreach plan.
* The proposal explains how the design team received feedback from community members on the existing assets and educational and other support needs within the targeted communit(ies).
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.1.b. Community Fit:** The educational vision for the proposed school has been adapted to reflect the unique assets and needs of the community. The proposal presents a compelling rationale for why the proposed school is a good fit for the community.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** | * The applicant received feedback from the community early in the process of developing an educational vision for their proposed school and/or determining how to adapt an existing model to meet the unique needs of the community.
* The proposal explains how the proposed school(s) would connect with and build upon existing assets in the targeted communit(ies), as well as help meet educational and/or support needs. The description includes a compelling rationale for why the proposed school(s) are a good fit for the communit(ies).
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.2.a. Evidence of Notifying Key Community Stakeholders:** The applicant has conducted multiple methods of outreach. The community is generally aware of the proposed new school. Stakeholders understand how to review the proposal, volunteer to serve on a NAC, and submit public comment.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** | * The applicant has notified at least an estimated 10 percent of individuals residing within the intended recruitment boundary of the proposed new school, as well as 50 percent of residents, organizations, and businesses located within a four-block radius of the proposed facilit(ies). All notification materials and methods include:
	+ Information on how individuals can provide feedback or ask questions about the proposed school
	+ (If distributed prior to Tier 1 proposal submission) A link to the CPS website where individuals can sign up to serve on Neighborhood Advisory Councils ([www.cps.edu/2014NAC](http://www.cps.edu/2014NAC))
	+ (If distributed between Tier 1 and 2 proposal submissions) Dates, times, and locations for the NAC Community Forum and Community Public Hearing
	+ A link to the CPS website where proposals will be publicly posted for review (www.cps.edu/2014RFP)
* In the proposal narrative and/or an attachment, the applicant provides evidence of having conducted all three methods of outreach to all of the aldermen, state representatives, and state senators in the intended recruitment boundary:
	+ Requesting a meeting (or listing meetings already held)
	+ Attending the elected officials’ ward or district nights
	+ Sending formal notification of the proposed new school
* The design team has met with key community organizations, businesses, and leaders from all of the targeted communities within their recruitment boundary to notify them of the proposed school.
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.2.b. Seeking Community Feedback:** Through the process of consulting with community stakeholders, the applicant has continued to adapt the school model to more effectively serve its unique targeted student population.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** | * The proposal presents evidence that community residents have attended community meetings hosted by the applicant. The community meetings offered attendees the opportunity to provide feedback on the educational vision for the proposed school.
* Applicants conducted canvassing and outreach efforts on the ground across the communities within the recruitment boundar(ies) to help refine their educational vision. The strategy for on-the-ground outreach is culturally sensitive, informative, and interactive.
* The proposal outlines key pieces of feedback received from different members of the community and explains which pieces of feedback were incorporated into plans for the proposed school, which were not, and why.
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.3.a. Evidence of Support from Key Community Stakeholders:** The evidence of support presents a compelling case that students will choose to attend the school, and that community members believe the school will positively impact the community.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** | * The proposal describes some of the key supporters and champions of the proposed school in the neighborhood, including parents or caregivers who may choose to enroll their students, and evidences the support with personalized letters outlining why the community members believe the proposed school will be an asset to the community.
* The proposal includes a sufficient number of letters of intent to enroll for age-eligible children to comprise at least half of the first-year enrollment capacity.
* The proposal cites and attaches any letters of support from elected officials within the recruitment boundary.
* There are community-based organizations, businesses, and/or leaders from the targeted communit(ies) within the recruitment boundaries who support the proposed school. The support of each organization is evidenced by a letter outlining the reasons for their support.
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.3.b. Risk Factors:** The proposal openly acknowledges opposition to the proposed school.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** |  |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.4.a. Continued Outreach Prior to School Opening:** The applicant's continued outreach and engagement strategy leading up to school opening will help ensure that the school successfully opens on time, ready to serve students and the community on day one.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** |  |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **1.4.b. Vision for Long-Term Collaboration with Parents and the Community:** The proposal presents a clear vision for how the school will develop a mutually beneficial relationship with the community, supported by ongoing dialogue and partnerships. \*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** | * As required by Illinois Charter Schools Law (105 ILCS 5/27A-7 a10), the proposal describes the nature and extent of parent and community involvement in the governance and operation of the charter school. If the governance plan does not include community member(s) and parent(s) on the Board, there are clear mechanism(s) for parents and community members to provide feedback and/or express an objection or concern to the school and Board on an ongoing basis.
* The applicant has secured partnerships with local community-based organizations, businesses, community groups, institutions of higher education, etc. that will support the students and families it intends to serve across the targeted communit(ies) within the recruitment boundary. These partnerships are evidenced by letters of support outlining the nature of the partnership. If any partnerships are integral to implementing the school model, the applicant includes a draft contract with specific scope of services outlined. The proposal cites who will be responsible for overseeing community partnerships.
* The proposal presents a clear vision for how the proposed school will positively contribute to the community, outlining any services, resources, programs, or volunteers that the school will offer to the families of students and/or community members.
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

**Domain 4: ECONOMIC SOUNDNESS**

***Key Question: Does the proposal present a sound fiscal plan and policies to ensure responsible management of public funds?***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | 4.1.a. Financial Forms and Budget Narrative: The financial forms are complete, include clear and reasonable assumptions, and reflect sustainability and financial health. All proposed programs and services are reflected in the budget. The budget narrative clearly articulates how spending is aligned with the school’s mission, vision, philosophy, and development.***Next Generation*** *blended learning applicants account for all unique costs associated with the implementation of their model.*\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** |  |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **4.1.b. Development Plan:** The development plan is based on reasonable assumptions of need for additional revenue and identifies viable funders, including evidence of their interest. The plan is diversified with contingency plans for anticipated revenue losses.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** |  |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **4.2.a. Financial Controls and Monitoring:** The proposal cites specific practices, policies, and assigned responsibilities for ensuring fiscal soundness and legal compliance. Collectively, the proposed financial controls are sufficient to ensure proper use of public funds. |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** |  |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating:**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **4.3.a. Facility Option(s):** The proposed facility option(s) reflect identified space requirements and are viable and available in the proposed opening timeline.\*\*May be updated with Tier 2 information  |
| **A strong response that meets the standard will have all or most of the following characteristics:** | * Identified space requirements adequately address the programmatic and operational needs of the school (as evidenced by an adequate number of classrooms, specialized spaces, and administrative spaces). Space requirements also reflect any special programmatic features and are adequate to accommodate any proposed growth.
* The proposed facilities reflect identified space requirements and are viable and available in the proposed opening timeline. The facilities plan includes a cost estimate for each location, evidence of interest from each facility’s owner(s), and clearly articulates a plan for completing renovations necessary at proposed facilities to make them school ready, including providing construction estimates and timelines, identifying potential funding sources, achieving ADA compliance, and appropriately addressing any risks associated with the proposed site or plan.
* The facility plan specifically identifies and/or provides a clear timeline for securing two possible viable and available independent facilities, or one fully secured facility that will feasibly permit school use in time for the planned Year 1 opening. Proposed site(s) will accommodate the projected space needs throughout the entire five-year period of the contract. If not, the design team has identified a reasonable facility plan to meet space needs thereafter. Risks associated with the proposed plan are identified and addressed with appropriate contingency plans.
 |

**Select one and then provide support for the rating (to be selected in Tier 2):**

Top of Form

* Meets the Standard
* Does Not Meet the Standard

**Strengths:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Concerns:**

* Insert evidence here
* Insert evidence here

**Key questions:**

* Insert questions here
* Insert questions here