

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

Name of Applicant: Allegiant Preparatory Academy
Overall Ranking: 57.3 out of 71

| OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points) | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 0 points Applicant opts not to address this element, OR narrative does not focus upon any of the designated priority areas (Early Childhood, Postsecondary, or Rural) | 1 point Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described | 2 points Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described | 3 points Area of focus is clearly defined and <i>all three</i> elements fully addressed: (1) Expected targets and outcomes are clearly described; (2) Targets/outcomes are supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and accessible goals; and (3) Unique populations are clearly defined and described |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 0 | | | |
| Comments: Applicant did not apply for competitive preference priority. | | | |

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

| 1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | 1-2 points Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element | 3-5 points At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element | 6 points (1 point per element) <i>All six elements are fully developed and described.</i> (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21 st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.6 | | | |
| Comments: Vision is clear, need is explained through test score examples and communication evident in explanation of meetings with community members and stakeholders. Curriculum Framework is clearly described, as well as evidence-based instructional practices with comparisons from other charter schools in similar demographic areas. Specific strategies will support all students and the applicant provides an extensive plan for preparing students for college/career with development of 21 st Century skills. Sustainability is adequately explained. | | | |

| 2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points) | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | 1-2 points Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program | 3-4 points Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program | 5-6 points Key personnel are identified and their strong qualifications are clearly described and relevant to the proposed program. Team members appear to exhibit exceptional expertise and the previous successful experience needed to bring about academic growth and student achievement. Applicants that intend to REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range. |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 6 | | | |
| Comments: All members are completely introduced and appear to be exceptional candidates for this charter school initiative (strong background in school leadership, development and management). Their diverse | | | |

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

expertise should lead to the overall success desired by the applicant.

3. CHARTER SCHOOL GOALS & COMMUNICATION PLAN (Up to 9 Points Total)

A. Charter School Goals (up to 7 points for this element, under Part A)

| 0 points | 1-2 points | 3-5 points | 6-7 points |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p> | <p>Goal descriptions are partial, vague or unclear; <u>or</u> applicant has only identified one or two goals; <u>and/or</u> goals are not aligned to proposal priorities (e.g., STEM, Early Childhood, etc.)</p> | <p>No less than three specific, measurable goals are identified. Some goals may not appear rigorous. Methods for measuring success toward goals described but may be somewhat unclear. Some key proposal priorities (e.g., STEM) do not have aligned goals.</p> | <p>No less than three specific, measurable goals are clearly described. Academic outcomes of all students (all grade levels served) will be addressed. All goals appear rigorous, yet attainable. Applicant specifies who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurement. Applicant MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment to be scored within the 6-7 point range.</p> |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.3

Comments:
 Three specific and measurable goals are identified; however, the timeline for goal attainment is omitted, e.g., annually; by the end of Year X. (Page 17)

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)

| 0 points | 1 point | 2 points |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Communication plan regarding goals not addressed</p> | <p>A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)</p> | <p>A communication plan that has been well thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders (staff, students, families) has been articulated with specificity</p> |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6

Comments:
 There are multiple avenues planned to convey the goals to families, staff and community. A communication plan for/with students is omitted (except where it involves families generally).

4. USE of CSP FUNDING (Up to 6 Points)

A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal (up to 4 points, for Part A)

| 0 points | 1 point | 2-3 points | 4 points |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p><u>OR</u>, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and</p> | <p>Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal.</p> <p>Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the</p> | <p>Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal.</p> <p>Most combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with</p> | <p>Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives.</p> <p>The combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p> <p>Applicant MUST adhere to maximum of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K</p> |

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals. | <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals. | the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals. | for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range. |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.3 | | | |
| <p>Comments: Budget narrative provides descriptions/rationale for line items which are aligned to anticipated initiatives. Budget and <i>Planning</i> and <i>Implementation</i> worksheets have like totals, and are less than the maximum grant level permitted.</p> | | | |
| B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B) | | | |
| 0 Points Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is either not provided, inappropriate, or not adequately described | | 1 Point Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described | |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .6 | | | |
| <p>Comments: R1: Applicant explains how grant-funded elements will be sustained beyond the grant-funding period.</p> | | | |
| C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C) | | | |
| 0 Points Many costs appear either unreasonable, or unallowable, or unnecessary (as they cannot be directly tied to activities or personnel described within the applicant's proposal narratives) | | 1 Point All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary | |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .6 | | | |
| <p>Comments: Most costs appear reasonable. There are a few items that appear to be unallowable (administrative salaries during Implementation Years 1 & 2).</p> | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points) | |
| Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points) | |
| A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. If the school uses an EMO/CMO , applicant <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected | |
| B. Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together) | |
| C. Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations | |
| D. Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective | |
| E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. <i>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</i> | |
| F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements. | |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.3 | |
| <p>Comments: 5a) Complete response for governance structure. 5b) Response does not address staff or any other leadership responsibilities. 5c) Applicant describes process for selecting board members, but does not discuss board diversity/expertise. 5d) Governance training is clearly defined. 5e) School does not use an EMO/CMO. 5f) Marian University is initially contracted to assist with data and reporting.</p> | |

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

6. STUDENT RECRUITMENT & ADMISSIONS PROCESSES (Up to 3 Points)

| 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points |
|--|---|--|--|
| No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | Student recruitment plan description is partial, vague or unclear. Evidence to show compliance with IC 20-24-5 is not offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not present. | Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. A public lottery process is adequately described. | A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and there is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described. |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3

Comments:

Plan provides a multi-pronged student recruitment approach and offers solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5.

7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (Up to 6 Points)

| 0 points | 1-2 points | 3-4 points | 5-6 points |
|--|---|---|---|
| No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate. | Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups. | <i>All five student groups</i> are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); <u>and</u> the applicant <i>descriptions are viewed as exemplary</i> , demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points). |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.6

Comments:

The groups addressed by the applicant are complete; however, the needs of low-income and neglected & delinquent students are not addressed. The applicant does note that the school's demographics will draw from schools "serving socially and educationally underserved student populations," many of who will need multiple tiers of supports (MTSS).

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

| 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points |
|--|---|---|---|
| No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear | Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained | Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.3

Comments:

Applicant provides description of outreach to prospective parents. Teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is not fully explained.

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)

A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

| 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points |
|--|--|---|
| No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear | A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2

Comments:

R10: All processes are clearly explained.

B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)

| 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points |
|--|--|---|
| No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO explanation not fully-developed (if applicable) | Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable). |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6

Comments:

The budget process is fully described; however the process to follow asset purchase and implementation is not less clearly articulated.

C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)

| 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points |
|--|---|---|
| No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement | Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3

Comments:

Applicant clearly states that CSP grant expenses will be sustained by basic State and federal funds after Year 3; specific examples of federal funding types are not described, e.g., Title I, Title II.

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)

| 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points |
|---|--|---|---|
| Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan | One of the three anticipated elements is provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; or (c) transportation plan | Two of the three anticipated elements are provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; and/or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and/or (c) transportation plan | All three elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school |

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6

Comments:

Applicant addresses two of the three required elements within this section: facility security and consideration of transportation. How enrollment impacts facility needs is not presented.

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

| 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points |
|--|--|--|--|
| None of the required signatures have been obtained and submitted with the proposal | <i>One</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, or project contact person, or board president | <i>Two</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, and/or project contact person, and/or board president | <i>All</i> three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3 | | | |
| Comments: All three required signatures have been submitted. | | | |

| 12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points) | |
|---|--|
| Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below) | |
| A. | Charter Application to Authorizer (for new or replication proposals) <i>or</i> Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal) |
| B. | Budget Worksheet |
| C. | Most recent <i>Expanded Annual Performance Report</i> (IDOE Compass) <i>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</i> |
| D. | Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <i>or</i> proof that application for such status has been made |
| E. | Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy |
| F. | Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <i>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</i> |
| G. | School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom) |
| H. | School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 8 | |
| Comments: All anticipated appendices items are included. | |

| 13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points) | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 0 points | 1point | 2 points | 3 points |
| Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate. | Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence. OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit. | Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Generally, information was easily located. | Applicant's proposal narrative clearly presented, following prescribed format, making the location of information and anticipated key elements readily available. Applicant did not exceed 30-page narrative limit. |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6 | | | |
| Comments: Sequence and limitations were followed. Recommend that applicant includes information within the proposal itself, rather than directing reviewers to an Appendix item or attachment. | | | |

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

| Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores | Points Possible | Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optional Competitive Preference Priority | 3 | 0 Did not apply |
| 1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes | 6 | 5.6 |
| 2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers | 6 | 6 |
| 3A. Charter School Goals | 7 | 4.3 |
| 3B. Goals Communication Plan | 2 | 1.6 |
| 4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets | 4 | 3.3 |
| 4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation | 1 | .6 |
| 4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary | 1 | .6 |
| 5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships | 6 | 4.3 |
| 6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes | 3 | 3 |
| 7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students | 6 | 4.6 |
| 8. Community Outreach Activities | 3 | 2.3 |
| 9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance | 2 | 2 |
| 9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management | 2 | 1.6 |
| 9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations | 2 | 1.3 |
| 10. Facilities & Transportation | 3 | 2.6 |
| 11. Signed Charter School Assurances | 3 | 3 |
| 12. Required Appendices | 8 | 8 |
| 13. Overall Organization of Proposal | 3 | 2.6 |
| TOTAL POINTS | 71 Total Points Possible | 57.3 |