

Name of Applicant: The Hope Academy

Overall Ranking:

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1point	2 points	3 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)	Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	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 : 1

Comments:

The selection to "OPEN" Hope Academy and the description in the first section of the grant indicates that the school is already in operation. The Indiana Graduation Pathways Requirement are incorrectly used as goals. These criteria for Core 40 Diploma, Employability and Postsecondary Competencies are not well developed. The mission and purpose of the school is needed but the capacity of the leadership team at this time does not appear to have set clear and measurable goals with benchmarks for success. There is a clear need establish for Indiana students and students in national surveys, as well as some statistics from the IDOE, but these statistics are not aligned with the targeted population of 40 students to start with a total enrollment of 50 in year three. Capacity of the leadership team to design and carry out this proposal is questionable (discussion about partnering with UIndy to "grow out" its services and to incubate the collegiate recovery program). This appears to focus as much on collegiate recovery as the high school students to be the clients of the school.

Unique population is fully described. Although these are quantitative goals, the applicant has not specified measurable targets, e.g., anticipated percentages of students attaining goals. Applicant did not exceed two-page limitation.

Applicant describes the expected target or outcome of the postsecondary focus to be having students graduate with core 40 diplomas. The applicant provides a description to ensure students are meeting the minimum standards for the Indiana diploma. No clear description of a specific focus on college and career readiness plan is provided with quantitative or qualitative data to support outcomes with the targeted population of students. The applicant does provide a description of a unique population. Clear plan for secondary readiness, pathway selection, partnerships with CTE schools, or other college and career curriculum provided would have strengthened the argument.

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)

0 points	1-2 points	3-5 points	6 points (1 point per element)
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. <i>1 point per element</i>	At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. <i>1 point per element</i>	<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: 4

Comments:

There is a compelling mission of the school listed in the application. There is reference to "growing the population" of students at Hope in previous years, but not clear how this is an initial application for "opening" a school. It appears that Hope is searching for a new location on the north side of Indianapolis to replicate the Hope Academy located somewhere else. This appears to be more of an "expansion" project. Although most of the six elements are mentioned, the level of specificity is lacking (i.e. no specific strategies were listed to meet or teach the Indiana Academic Standards. There is no reference to the 21st Century Skills or evidence-based instructional practices listed. The 10 guiding principles are listed but a very general and not specific enough to determine how the guiding principles will be implemented in the school.

Vision statement provided. Needs described, are specific to Indiana, and not the school or surrounding school community area (applicant states that "statistically, more students in Indianapolis are in need of Hope's programming," but does not substantiate that need). Hope's new enrollment specialist focused communication efforts to web/parents, treatment providers, returning students, Fairbanks referrals, and Probation/Department of Child Services (doubling enrollment). Curriculum framework, is vaguely described; Guiding Principles--and their application-- are more specific. Needs of students with disabilities/English learners addressed at the most basic levels; anticipated gifted/talented students' supports center on potential partnerships. Minimal descriptors provided for preparing students with 21st century skills/college readiness.

The applicant's vision is clearly described. The applicant provides quantitative data to support the need for this model of school and a communication plan that has shown to be effective in the prior year. The applicant provides a description of the curriculum framework. Guiding principles are described with limited detail of the specifics that will be used to guide the curriculum framework. Key instructional practices were either not supported with efficient detail or not supported with research for the target population. The specifics of the day to day curriculum framework and instructional practices are unclear from the description provided on pages. The applicant provides a description of planned strategies to ensure all learners are able to achieve the targets. The applicant provides a vague description of how 21st century skills will be encouraged and developed with the target population. Applicant could have provided details of how the curriculum will require students to learn 21st century communication skills, use of problem-solving and critical thinking through the curriculum framework, or what soft skills will be of focus and how the attainment of said skills will be tracked, monitored, and encouraged to strengthen argument. Applicant provides a description of the sustainability of the school and the use of the CSP funds to help start but not sustain.

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points	1-2points	3-4 points	5-6 points
<p>No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program</p>	<p>Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Applicants that intend to REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3</p>			

Comments:

The planning year for the Hope Academy appears to have only one leadership position to design and develop the location, the curriculum, the staff and the curriculum. Although Ms. Gardner has an impressive background, the capacity of one person planning to open a new charter is not realistic.

The expertise of two key individuals described on page 30 (Rachelle Gardner, COO of Hope Academy and Marissa Manlove, Board Chair) is undeniable -- and highly commendable. For purposes of the CSP proposal, however, the applicant has not described its key personnel/qualifications of team members needed to bring about academic growth and student achievement of the proposed new charter school.

The applicant provides names and qualifications for the founder and board chair. All key personnel descriptions would have strengthened the argument. The applicant provides prior years' student performance data that is well below the acceptable rates of graduation for Indiana students. The applicant does not address this variance nor is a comparative data set provided for other similar-type students in Indiana or national schools. The performance data was not scored due to this being an application for "opening" a new charter school and data is not required for this selection.

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	1-2points	3-5 points	6-7 points
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	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.)	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.	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.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3

Comments:

There are four goals listed, but they are not designed as SMART goals by which administrators and teachers could collect statistics and compare them over time.

Hope Academy's overarching goals include attaining fiscal sustainability; broadening access to more Indianapolis students; and establishing transitional planning goals. Their CSP goals include: increasing graduation rate to 75%; increasing DAP scores to national average; incubating a collegiate recovery program; and establishing relationships to ensure fiscal sustainability. The applicant has not provided SMART goals, nor has it identified a student achievement goal, aligned to a State assessment measure (as required).

The applicant provides names and qualifications for the founder and board chair. More points would have been awarded if all key personnel had been included. The applicant provides prior years' student performance data that is well below the acceptable rates of graduation for Indiana students. The applicant does not address this variance nor is a comparative data set provided for other similar-type students in Indiana or national schools.

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
0 points Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	1point A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	2 points 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
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1		
<p>Comments: Recruitment plans are not necessarily a communications plan for the community in which the facility will be located.</p> <p>New enrollment specialist's (successful) efforts to increase recruitment/retention of students is described--as its vehicle for community awareness of school's goals. The applicant's communication plan relevant to CSP goals, however, has not been addressed in this section.</p> <p>The applicant describes four goals for the purpose of the CSP grant. Goals 1-3 are specific and measurable. Goal number 4 lacks specificity. One academic goal is listed, specific to 4-year cohort seniors only. No goals are listed that include the state content assessments for high school or achievement of graduation pathways which could have also been described as a goal for a certain percentage of graduates not needing a graduation waiver. The description provided of who will do what for each goal is vague and lacks appropriate detail of the plan to achieve described goals.</p>		

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 No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal. <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. There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	1point Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal. Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	2-3 points Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal. Most combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	4 points Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives. The combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals. Applicant MUST adhere to maximum of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3			

Comments:

The budget narrative is very minimal. There is a general description of the Year #1, Yr. 2 and Yr. 3 and Yr 4 Sustainability funding's mentioned, but that does not appear to be reflected in the Budget Summary or Budget Planning Sheets. For instance, there are funds for a Service Dog at \$10,000 but no mention of the purpose of a service dog in the narrative. Also, there is an expenditure for 80 laptops for students and teachers, but there are only 45 maximum students in year #3. There is no answer to the question on #5 in the budgeting section of the grant. The Salary of \$123,000 for the school's director for the first year does not seem RAN approvable. Salary and benefits are unclear. Budget items are misplaced within categories, e.g., Planning Year: Costs for non-cert admin (\$55, 270) are shown in Other/Operation & Maintenance; \$10K shown in Professional Services/Operation and Maintenance is for attendance at national conference (Improvement of Instruction/Other Purchased Services). Sometimes, needed budget details are not adequately explained, e.g., Planning Year "new bus;" Year 2 "Leadership Consultant" and the "CELL Collegiate Recovery" costs.

B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B)

0 Points	1 Point
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	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: 1

Comments:

Applicant provides a description of how the school is fiscally managed. The applicant failed to provide information showing how the program would continue to sustain the program after the CSP funds are used up. No sustainability budget is provided in the budget worksheet. The applicant lists over \$500k in salary needs over the course of the CSP grant, with no teachers in the list of salaries. On page 14, the applicant indicates the total enrollment target in year 3 will be 50 students. To pay the employees only listed in the CSP grant, the school would need to ensure over \$11k per enrolled student. No funding streams are mentioned in the sustainability description provided on page 31.

C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C)

0 Points	1 Point
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)	All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 0

Comments:

While it appears that most proposed expenditures are allocable and necessary for the proposed program, there are some exceptions. Most notably, the applicant proposes funding in Years 1 and 2 for the school principal. This is not permissible, using CSP funding. Other costs require IDOE review, e.g., Year 1 Nurse; Year 2 Guidance Counselor. Applicant adheres to spending limitations for each proposed funding year. Some costs, although, allocable have not been adequately substantiated within the CSP proposal narratives - to justify the relevance/importance of the expenditure, e.g., 80 laptops, new bus, grant writer, service dog). The narrative references "necessary maintenance, repair, or upkeep of building and equipment" -- but those costs are not described/justified within the Budget Worksheets.

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019

The applicant provides a description of the costs planned for the CSP funds being reasonable, allowable, and necessary. The reviewer notes that the salary rates of leadership personnel, number of leadership personnel, and lack of teachers listed in the budget worksheet provide some evidence to consider if costs are reasonable or unreasonable.

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 *also* 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

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019

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. IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6
Comments: There is reference to the Governing Board make up and their responsibilities. There are statements about how the school will operate and how leaders will make decisions. There is a minimal statement about how board members will be selected. There are expectations for board training through "Board on Track" which is not explained but assumed to be an on-line training program. There is a concern that there could be as few as three board members governing this school although there is a reference to no more than 15 board members. There is strong reference to governing rules when selecting materials and contracts. There is much specificity in the list of reports that are required and the method by which reports must be filed. Applicant addresses board empowerment but does not address school/staff empowerment for daily decision making.

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

0 points	1point	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: 2

Comments:
Hope participates in Enroll Indy; enrollment is open to all students--with priority given to those living within designated school boundaries There is minimal information about student recruitment except for compliance statements. It was noted by the reviewer that a statement was included that "...most students are placed in Hope's program" although that statement was not explained. There is reference to a public lottery system should there be more applicants that space. There is an extensive explanation about how Hope will service student with special needs. Argument could have been strengthened had the applicant described a multi-pronged recruitment plan to attract appropriate referrals.

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

Comments:

There is extensive explanation of the five groups of students and how they will be served. It was noted by the reviewer that Hope will become the school that works with consortium students who need a program of recovery which is encouraging. Applicant provides basic identification and placement strategies anticipated for students with disabilities and English learners. Although reference is made to a larger consortium of schools serving the needs of homeless and delinquent students, specific strategies for addressing their unique needs (beyond substance abuse supports) are not identified. While the school's "Continuous Learning Plan" (mentioned but not defined) seems to entail continuous student monitoring and daily progress checks, specific strategies for supporting special population learner needs are not adequately addressed in this section.

Applicant provides a description addressing the specific needs of student populations in four of the five categories: special needs, homeless, EL, neglected & delinquent. Low-income students were not specifically addressed by the applicant.

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES				(Up to 3 Points)
0 points	1point	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

Comments:

There is evidence that conversations have been happening with community partners such as IPS and other townships school who need an alternative to suspension and expulsion. However, there was little reference to conversations with parents and teachers who have the potential to work in the school. As one of the first charters in Indianapolis--supported by both political parties of the City Council, Fairbanks served as the anchor for the school. With the support of Fairbanks, Hope is now launching into its own organization and expanding its offerings. As such, community partnerships are a central component, whereby robust conversations with community partners have broadened accessibility to its programming as a way to meet the needs of students with substance abuse issues. Conversations with IPS and township schools have occurred. Likewise, discussions are taking place between Hope Academy and: (a) the University of Indianapolis to prepare for incubating the collegiate recovery program; (b) healthcare systems; and (c) philanthropic partners to obtain support. The applicant has not addressed parents' involvement in the planning and design process. Applicant provides a description of community support of launching the new charter school from community partners such as Fairbanks and U of I. Clear evidence of parent, teacher, and current or former student involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is lacking. Applicant providing more evidence of involvement from current staff members, students, parents would have strengthened argument.

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)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019

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: 1		
<p>Comments: The Hope application indicates that it will plan for maintaining internal controls and has indicated some third party assistance that may be needed (CIES and CELL) but there is little explanation of specific contracts of expectations until the school has begun. It is encouraging that the Board will work in subcommittees to complete some of the work of the board, but there is still a concern that there could be only three people consisting of the board of directors. The applicant has not addressed record retention expectations.</p> <p>Applicant provides a description of financial practices that will be used by the school. A description of internal controls and how records will be maintained is lacking. The applicant notes that these "back office services" have been handled by their partner, Fairbanks, in the past and the school is working to form new relationships to take on these roles upon transition and opening of the new school. The applicant provides a description of the roles of the finance committee. Description for internal controls, board process for expenditure approval, process for compensation for goods and services, process for preparing payments, signatory authority and account reconciliation would have strengthened argument.</p>		
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	Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO	Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019

Application	explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1		
<p>Comments: The section of the grant application concerning grant management is minimal with some factual statements about complying but no detail about tracking purchases. Grant management is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders appear responsible for all aspects of this grant.</p>		
C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)		
0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	2 Points Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1		
<p>Comments: There is a minimal explanation of how state/federal funds will support the school operations and student achievement. Minimal references are made to other funding sources, e.g., Alternative Education, ADM funding and private dollars. Applicant states that a 7-year sustainability budget has been created using the additional state tuition funds and alternative education funds provided by the state. The applicant states that more detail can be found in the sustainability portion of the CSP budget. The reviewer was unable to locate a sustainability section in the provided budget worksheet.</p>		

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	1point <i>One</i> 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	2 points <i>Two</i> 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	3 points All <i>three</i> elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; <u>and</u> (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 0			
<p>Comments: It is clear that Hope Academy will still be housed at Fairbanks who will continue to support back office operations, but it is not clear how the school will operate on its own in a new facility. There is no reference to the current facilities safe, secure and use of facilities. Although there is reference to Miller Transportation Services, only half of the students have access to this transportation with no indication of how the other 50% of the students are transported.</p> <p>Within this section, the applicant has not addressed required elements to describe: (a) how the facility is safe and secure; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs. Within the Budget Worksheets, the applicant has proposed a \$40K CSP expenditure for a new bus but provides no detail as to how/for whom it will be used to support the program.</p>			

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

0 points	1point	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 included.

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) *or* Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)
- B. Budget Worksheet
- C. Most recent *Expanded Annual Performance Report* (IDOE Compass)
NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).
- D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, *or* proof that application for such status has been made
- E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy
- F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization.
NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).
- 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. *NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).*

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 7

Comments:
 The required elements are included and meet minimal expectations..

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: 3

Comments:
 The grant application was completed in the sequence requested, but with minimal explanations in most sections. The information was hard to follow. The Charter School Application had much more detail, but it was not reflected and summarized in the grant application. There were many "blank" pages that the reviewer

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019

could not see. The reviewer could certainly see the need for this type of school but this application is not convincing enough that there is capacity for it to operate outside the Fairbanks facility at this time. Applicant adhered to prescribed format, allowing reviewer to locate required elements. Page limitations were not exceeded. The appendices were difficult to navigate.

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019

Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements	Points Earned	Points Possible
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)	1	3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	4	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	3	6
3A. Charter School Goals	3	7
3B. Goals Communication Plan	1	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	3	4
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	0	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	2	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	4	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	2	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	1	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	1	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations		
10. Facilities & Transportation	0	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	7	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
TOTAL POINTS	46	68