

**Name of Applicant:**

**Overall Ranking:**

**OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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 : 3**

**Comments:**

The Excel Center for Adult Learning's academic content and coursework is aligned with the Indiana College and Career Readiness standards (p. 12). Electives include opportunities to earn certifications in high growth, in demand sectors of the local economy (p. 12). Students must participate in at least 1 dual credit or industry certification course while pursuing a diploma (p. 12). This allows them to graduate having earned college credit or an industry certification (p. 12). The school provided an extensive list of workforce certifications aligned to job market demands The school has a target of 80% of students completing at least 1 dual credit or industry certification course. Although this is a replication, no data was provided about past performance on this measure. The applicant describes how the target outcome will impact their unique population, adults who have dropped out of school.

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-5 points</b>	<b>6 points (1 point per element)</b>
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 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5**

**Comments:**

Vision: Provide adults with the opportunity and support to earn a high school diploma and begin post-secondary education while developing career paths (p. 14). To change lives every day by empowering people to increase their independence (p. 14). Need: Need is not clear in the write-up. There is a robust write-up of the many ways they are connecting with the community, i.e. outreach to current and prospective partner organizations, news media, public information meetings, website, social media, and word of mouth (p. 15). Curriculum Framework: Relationships, Relevance, and Rigor (p. 15). The Excel Center promotes strong relationships between peers and staff (p. 15). The promote student-led goals and students work at their own pace (p. 15). They focus on career readiness and have coaches available to support students (p. 15). Key academic classes are offered as well as a basic skills lab for those who are significantly behind (p. 15). Some credits are available through credit recovery (p. 15). The foundation of the

approach is from 3 books titled, Developing Critical Thinker, Mentoring Adult Learners and Mentor: Guiding the Journey of Adult Learners (p. 16). Specific Strategies: Flexible coursework, individualized attention (p. 19). Coaches provide support based on needs (p.19 ). IEPs and 504s are developed as appropriate (p. 19). ELL and gifted students receive specialized instruction (p. 19). All students strive to attain a Core 40 Diploma (p. 20). 21st Century Skills: Skills are grouped into four categories-strong mastery of core subjects and knowledge of 21st century issues, life and career skills, learning and innovation skills and information, media and technology skills (p. 20). Through its approach, students have exposure to career paths that will lead to good jobs (p. 20). Sustainment: the GEI finance team will ensure activities supported by CSP funds are in the budget for subsequent years (p. 21). These funds will help the school to upgrade technology and furniture (p. 21).

Applicant provides relevant and evidence-based instructional resources and methodologies. Subgroups are identified and strategies for support to these populations are clearly articulated. The Vision, 21st Century Skills and Curriculum Framework are aligned and in support of the expected outcomes/goals. Sustainability is properly addressed. The vision is clearly defined. The process for identifying the need for new schools was defined, but no specifics were provided about the need to expand the Indy locations- the expansion applicant. The curriculum is designed around relationship, relevance and rigor. Coursework is individualized and flexible to meet the needs of adult learners. Because many adult learners also have special education needs, the school's flexible model will accommodate students "where they are." To build 21st Century workforce skills, the school embeds Indiana academic standards into real-world workplace contexts, enabling students to see connections between coursework and their careers. CSP funds were not available at the time the school opened, and current CSP funds will be used for costs related to increased enrollment- including expanded technology, additional furniture. These expenses will be absorbed into the school's general budget in future years.

**2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	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 <b>REPLICATE</b> or <b>EXPAND</b> must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5**

**Comments:**

The Excel Schools key personnel are experienced and well qualified to lead this school to success. Excel Centers as an organization have scored an A or B in the state's adult accountability system (p. 21).

Key personnel are identified and connection is shown to how they will contribute to the success of the school. APR is shared and discussed for all current charters.

The key personnel from Goodwill are clearly defined and highly qualified. However, no school level leadership was identified for the expanding Indianapolis locations. There are currently 15 Excel campuses statewide, all currently have a state accountability grade of an A or B. The application appears to be an expansion of the Indianapolis locations (Decatur, Michigan St, Meadows and Shadeland). A combined grade is provided for this group of schools. The applicant also include grades from Excel centers statewide. The applicant provided network level performance data but not specific to the Indianapolis sites. One annual performance report was included as an attachment, for school corp 9910.

<b>3. CHARTER SCHOOL GOALS &amp; COMMUNICATION PLAN (Up to 9 Points Total)</b>			
<b>A. Charter School Goals</b> (up to 7 points for this element, under Part A)			
<b>0 points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1-2points</b> 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.)	<b>3-5 points</b> 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.	<b>6-7 points</b> 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 <b>MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment</b> to be scored within the 6-7 point range.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> All three goals are specific, measurable and attainable based on previous year's data (p. 28). One is focused on graduation rate, one on meeting diploma requirements for a Core 40 diploma, and one on earning college credit or an industry certification (p. 28).  Goals are rigorous and support the vision of the school and expansion. No state assessment was included in the goals. Three goals are identified and well defined, including graduation rate, diploma quality and earning college credit. No goal specifies a link to a state assessment, but the diploma quality goal projects that 90% of graduates will earn a Core 40 diploma without a waiver. Clear measurements are defined, but not timeframes or persons of responsibility.			

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

<b>B. Communication Plan</b> (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<b>0 points</b> Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	<b>1point</b> A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	<b>2 points</b> 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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>  Goals will be communicated to staff through professional development and staff meetings (p. 29). Students will attend an orientation where goals are clearly communicated (p. 29). Goals are also reviewed in classroom with coaches. Goals are shared with the community by Community Advisory Teams (p. 29). The Board will engage with community members (p. 29). Communicating with parents was not mentioned, but since most students are already adults, a plan for that may not be needed. The communication plan includes regular communication with staff, student orientations, individual student counseling, and a Community Advisory Team that provides input to the school about local community conditions.		

<b>4. USE of CSP FUNDING</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>(Up to 6 Points)</b></span>			
<b>A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal</b> (up to 4 points, for Part A)			
<b>0 points</b> 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 &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>1point</b> 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 &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>2-3 points</b> Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal.  Most combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>4 points</b> 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 &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.  Applicant <b>MUST adhere to maximum</b> of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 4</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>  Budget worksheet totals match the numbers on the funding requested (p. 9). The budget narrative is clear about how the CSP funds will be used, i.e. technology needs, classroom needs. These needs directly support the curricular framework and are similar in scope to the needs identified in other Excel Schools based on anticipated enrollment (p. 30). Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for all line items and are directly aligned to projected costs described within the grant application.  The budget includes supplies and technology required for increased enrollment. These are general			

educational expenses. The narrative does not detail how these expenses relate to the application goals.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>
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:** N/A,

Applicant sufficiently and succinctly described the plan and capacity to continue the program after CSP funds expire. The school will be able to sustain the grant funded activities through the state funding resulting from the expanded enrollment.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>
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: 1**

**Comments:**

All costs are reasonable, allocable and necessary to carry out the curricular focus of the school. They are based on the needs of other Excel Schools in the network (p. 30). These costs will pay for items that will not be needed after the life of the grant (p. 31). All expenses are supplies and technology expenses related to increased student enrollment.

**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. <b>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</b>
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>Governance is GEI is the largest charter school network in Indiana. It has a robust administrative central office that supports all functions of the school (p. 31). The Senior Director has oversight of all schools. He reports to the VP of mission and education who reports to the president and CEO (p. 31). The GEI Board focuses on long term matters like establishing the key performance indicators, establishing policy, approving long term plans, approving annual plans and budgets, any actions that obligate the school, ensuring financial solvency, interpreting the schools to the community, assessing performance, and ensuring that all schools are in compliance with applicable laws, contracts, regulations and charters (p. 31). The school director hires all staff and oversees day to day operations (p. 31). Life coaches help students with non-academic challenges (p. 31). All school directors meet together regularly and lead teachers, life coaches, teachers of record, college and career readiness specialists, and site coordinators also meet regularly for peer-learning (p. 31). Board members are selected by the Governance Committee which is comprised of three GEI Board members and the CEO. When openings occur, the governing committee asks board members for suggestions of prospective members with a focus on members who bring expertise in finance, education, law and business and who have strong community ties. Prospective members are presented to the board for approval (p. 31). Board Training: The board has operated for over 16 years and is well-versed in industry, public policy, education, and finance and workforce development (p. 32). Each board member receives training from the CEO and VP of Mission and Education which covers different aspects of the schools including history, expectations and an overview of progress (p. 32). The Board chair also meets with new members and leads an annual retreat (p. 32). No conflict of interest exists (p. 32). The Excel School will ensure compliance by employing dedicated specialists who are responsible for submitting all student-level data to the Dept. of Education through the STN website (p. 32). Excel schools have 15 years of experience submitting data and meeting federal and state reporting requirements (p. 33).</p> <p>The six elements for school governance and board relations is clearly outlined and shows a direct, intentional connection between school, work and community. School leadership has the authority to manage the day-to-day operations of the school. The board focuses on long term planning and oversight. The process for selecting new board members was defined, as was board training. However, the board training appeared mostly internal from GEI and the Board chair. No evidence was provided that board members received any third-party training. The network provides reporting specialists to ensure compliance with state and federal reporting.</p>

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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:**

The school is open to all students who apply when seats are available (p. 33). They recruit by forming strong ties with community partners who act as referral sources, spread awareness through social media, email blasts and a website and host events and open houses in community locations (p. 33). If more students apply than there are openings, the school holds a public lottery which is publicly posted and announced (p. 33). Numbers are drawn at random with students

selected given the opportunity to enroll (p. 33). The school does not offer preference slots (p. 34).

Students are primarily recruited through "word of mouth," community open houses and online media. There is no mention of recruitment efforts for diverse populations, including non-English speakers.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
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: 5**

**Comments:**

Special Education: The Excel Center will comply with all IDEA and Article 7 requirements, i.e. contacting the student's previous school for the IEP or 504 plan. They will be assigned a teacher of record who will complete required paperwork and students will be included within the general education population with support as needed (p. 34). Students can also receive one on one assistance or work in the General Skills Lab (p. 34). Life coaches work with students to create individualized learning plans and help them manage them (p. 34). Coursework for all students is flexible and includes 8 week terms, small group instruction, and remediation and certification courses (p. 35). Other needed services, i.e. speech and language therapist, occupational therapy, and physical therapy will be contracted out (p. 35). Behavior modification supports like coping strategies, social stories, and anger management will help remove barriers (p. 35). Accommodations will be provided as appropriate (p. 35). In addition to coaches, a dedicated transition specialist will help students with social and job skills for the 21st century workplace (p. 36). English Language Learners: They are identified at enrollment and will complete the WIDA to determine level of support (p. 36). The school uses Burlington English primarily for this population (p. 38). Some courses are available in Spanish (p. 38). Teachers with ELL students meet regularly to learn of new methods of teaching effectively (p. 38). Low-income/Homeless/Delinquent: The coaching model used at the school provides wrap around services for students in these situations which typically come from resources in students' own communities (p. 39). Those needing significant intervention will be included in the RTI process to determine the level of intervention required (p. 39). The Reading Inventory and Excel-Designed Math Assessment will provide baseline data (p. 39). Teacher effectiveness is measured and if below 80%, they re-design the curriculum or instructional approach (p. 40).

Applicant addresses all subgroups thoroughly. The addition of the Life Coach, providing wrap-around service to all students with deep nonacademic needs creates a robust and thoughtful response to helping ensure success for all students.

The process for identifying and supporting special education students is well defined. The school's flexible model allows for individualized learning for special education students, just as it does for all students. Vocational rehab services are also provided. English language learners are identified and assessed for appropriate services. ELL students with Lexile levels below 1000 are enrolled in a Competency English course. The school contracts, when necessary, to support the learning needs of English Language learners who speak any language other than Spanish. Wrap around supports through coaching are provided to students dealing with unstable housing. No description is provided for how homeless delinquent students, or neglected youth (under 18) are identified.

**8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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: 3**

**Comments:**

The Community Advisory Team from each center promotes the school within the community. Local directors maintain community and business partnerships through Rotary and Chamber of Commerce memberships (p. 41). School staff hold an annual block party with social services available. The school director holds info sessions, parent meetings and distributes flyers to other schools in the area (p. 41). Coaches maintain relationships with the FSSA office, Housing Agency, community centers and local churches (several are listed) (p. 41). Staff go door to door and visit local business to distribute flyers and information (p. 41). Staff also attend 1st Saturday events at Goodwill locations to recruit (p. 41). The college and career readiness specialist has partnerships with local career centers (p. 41). The school has ties to numerous area businesses and industries to support student opportunities (p. 41). Gleaners Food Bank and Second Helpings provide lunch to students twice weekly (p. 41). Note: Parents are typically not involved since this is an adult high school (p. 40). When a student is not an adult, the school works with and includes parents in the same way a traditional high school does (p. 41).

While the applicant's charter school serves mostly 18+ year olds, the application contains sufficient evidence for parent and community involvement as well as established community partnerships that help to further the vision and goals of the school.

The school has a Community Advisory Team made up of staff, students, community members, business leaders, and social service providers. This group facilitates two-way communication between the school and community. Parent engagement is minimal because the school serves adult learners. As an expanding school, the applicant detailed specific examples of community outreach efforts.

**9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)**

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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:**

GEI follows the accounting principles of the State Board of Accounts. Day to day financial management is provided by GEI's director of financial operations who also acts as the asst. treasurer of the Board (p. 42). Payroll is managed by GEI for all employees (p. 42). All schools under their purview are audited annually by Greenwalt CPA (p. 42). Budget development includes stakeholders and developed with the Dir. of Fin. Operations, School Director, Senior Dir. of the Excel Network, and VP of Mission and Education Initiatives (p. 42). The Board must review and adopt the budget (p. 42). Control over internal financial controls and record maintenance protocols include proper segregation of duties, following established policies and procedures for authorization and processing of disbursements, and ensuring funds are held in federally insured, no speculative, commercial banks or credit unions (p. 42). All schools in the network are in strong financial positions (p. 42).



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

Key players, stakeholders, checks/balances and record maintenance is fully described.

The internal controls are briefly and generally defined. The board's role in internal controls is not specified.  
 Record retention is not described

<b>B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management</b> (up to 2 points, Part B)		
<b>0 Points</b> No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter	<b>1 Point</b> Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO	<b>2 Points</b> 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: 2**

**Comments:**

GEI will manage the grant with the support of the finance and management teams of GCSI and GEI p. 43). The budget was developed by GEI staff (p. 43). Most expenditures are for information technology, resources and furniture needed to expand the school (p. 43). Products and services will be selected through the bid process to ensure the best price (p. 43). The school director will approve every purchase and requests will flow through the accounting department (p. 43). Grant management process is robust and clearly described.

The school leader approves all purchases pertaining to the CSP grant. No information is provided on how expenditures and equipment will be tracked.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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**

**Comments:**

The Excel Center is sustainable with state funding once grant money is expended (p. 43). Then, the will rely on adult learner funding and other state and federal grants to pay staff, offer professional development and purchase needed equipment (p. 43).

While it is clear in the application that state funding is used to support the current school, the description of what state and federal funds will be used post-grant period is vague. The school will operate off of Adult learner funding and other state and federal sources after the CSP funds expire. Minimal detail is provided.

**10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	<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	<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	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: 3**

**Comments:**

The facility is safe and staff/students regularly participate in fire, tornado and lockdown drills (p. 43). The school has an acceptable use policy for all technology and internet use (p. 43). GCSI also has a Safety, Loss Prevention, and Security Department that manages safety in facilities (p. 43). Each location is regularly audited and all have high-resolution digital security camera systems installed (p. 43).Facilities are located in areas with high concentrations of dropouts and sensitive to the availability of transportation, i.e. on bus routes, access to public transportation, etc. (p.

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

44). The management staff ensures that buildings comply with state and local health and safety requirements (p. 44).

A sample safety plan for one of their locations was included as an attachment. The narrative briefly describes safety measures. There is no mention of ADA compliance for the facility. Transportation is not provided.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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 signatures are present.**

**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:**

All required appendix elements are present but they are not labeled well which required a lot of looking. The budget worksheet is in the attachment and not included in the application appendix.

**13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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**

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

**Comments:**

The narrative portion of the application was very well organized and succinct.

The appendices were not labeled clearly. It did not exceed the 30 page limit.

The applicant's proposal is clearly presented and followed the prescribed format.

The location of information was easy to follow and well communicated throughout.

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

Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements	Points Possible	Points Earned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)</li> </ul>		3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	4
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &	1	1
Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary		
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	5
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record	2	2
Maintenance	2	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant	2	1
Management		
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations		
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	7
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>65</b>