

Name of Applicant: Excel Center Shelbyville

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 : 3

Comments:
 The applicant provided detailed overview of the program. All three elements were clearly stated. Expected outcome was supported by quantitative, specific measures that "80% of graduates will graduate having either earned a college credit or an industry certification" (p. 13). Unique population were clearly defined that "students who have previously dropped out of school" have made the choice to return to school.
 The application clearly defines the unique population and has established an expected outcome with an accompanying measure. Targets however, were not supported by qualitative or quantitative data.
 Applicant clearly defines the target population as adult students who dropped out of high school and are returning to The Excel Center to earn a diploma. Their model is unique and highly suited to the focus priority of post-secondary education, specifically college and career readiness. The applicant provides specific targeted outcomes for the student population which include career certifications and/or college credits. Measurable goal for the outcome is established.

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: 5

Comments:
 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.
 1) The applicant clearly described its mission and vision to "empower people to increase their independence and reach their potential through education, health, and employment" (p. 14). 2) The applicant proposed

questionnaires to access the needs of the community and described a well-thought communication plan whenever a new school opens. However, it is a general process. The applicant failed to provide supportive data and evidence that the needs assessment within this specific community has been conducted. 3) The applicant fully described its curriculum and instructional approach supported with research and evidence cited (p. 16). The approach is highly individualized and differentiated evidenced by "uses a 'one student at a time' method where each student establishes his or her educational goals and moves at his or her own pace" (p. 15). 4) The applicant fully described its plan to meet the needs of students with disabilities and ELs. For example, "Each Excel Center student creates an educational plan with his or her life coach. This structure allows students with special needs to receive appropriate support in conjunction with their own Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or Section 504 Plans" (p. 19). In addition, "The self-paced nature of the program serves both those with learning disabilities or limited English proficiency who may need to take one class at a time..." (p. 19). Teachers are required to select grouping techniques to facilitate student small group rotation as a way of providing collaborative opportunities. 5) The applicant provided a framework including competencies and skills that prepare students to enter the workforce (p. 20). In addition, the applicant proposed graduation requirement that includes participation in at least one dual credit or industry certification course preparing students to be college and career ready (p. 21). 6) The applicant addressed this criteria that the applicant has a plan to work with the GEI's finance team to ensure all activities to be continued (p. 21). In addition, the dollars budgeted within this grant application would provide for technology and furniture to meet the increased and expanded population. That would be no longer needed after the grant expires.

While the purpose of the Excel Center was clearly explained, the narrative did not develop a need for this particular location. Data related to dropout rates, % of students with or without a high school diploma, etc. was not included. A solid marketing plan was laid out in the application. The curriculum portion of the narrative was very detailed and researched based. Specific populations were also clearly addressed in the application.

a) Applicant provides a clear vision and mission. (Acronym "GEI" is not clarified, but assumed to be Goodwill Education Initiatives.) b) Applicant provides a multi-faceted communication plan, but does not specifically address the need for this school within this community. c) Applicant provides evidence base for a curricular framework that focuses on the needs of adult students, including block schedules, embedded remediation, shorter academic terms with year-round scheduling, a simplified registration process that offers multiple opportunities for support and individualized education plans. d) Applicant discusses instructional strategies for adult learners as central to the mission of high school completion and the goal of a Core 40 diploma, including instructional differentiation, accommodations for special needs, and assistance with a life coach, free childcare and transportation. e) Applicant partners with Ivy Tech and provides several career certifications in addition to providing information various high-value career opportunities. f) CSP supported activities will be absorbed by general budget, though most expenditures are one-time costs.

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points	1-2points	3-4 points	5-6 points
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 REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6			

Comments:

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 applicant identified the key personnel who possess strong qualification and extended experience in all areas such as academic, finance, operation, special education, marketing, data analysis, etc. (p. 22-25). The applicant presented a leadership team with expertise that would most likely to launch and operate a successful charter school.

b) The applicant provided annual performance report for each school for the past two years that all schools but one obtained "A" grade. It is clear that the model would most likely deliver strong academic growth and student achievement. In addition, the applicant stated that no contracts for charter schools have been terminated (p. 28), indicating no significant issues have occurred in the past in its operations.

The section of the application identified key stakeholders aligned to a strong track record of achievement. The annual performance report was provided and data was broken down within the application.

a) Key organizational, network-level personnel are identified and qualifications are relevant to the development of the program. Key school-level personnel are not identified. b) Graduation data and school grades for existing schools are provided. Network level data is also provided.

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: 5

Comments:

Goals are rigorous and support the vision of the school and expansion. No state assessment was included in the goals.

The applicant proposed three specific and measurable goals. However, none of them included student achievement data from the State content assessment. It is unclear whether these goals are rigorous or not because no state graduation data were included to have a comparison. For example, "At least 90% of all graduates will have met all State diploma requirements" (p. 29), yet the State graduation rate was not provided to access whether the 90% is rigorous or not.

Goals were clear and measurable. The goals did not directly specify a measure relating to a state content assessment which was required to receive the highest score. While a goal did mention Core 40, specific tests aligned to Core 40 targets were not noted. The two remaining goals were relevant to the mission of the

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

school and set a specific focus for the Excel Centers program.

Applicant provides three specific and measurable goals that are unique to their adult high school model. These goals have been approved by the Indiana State Board of Education as alternative accountability metrics for their model. Applicant goals meet proposal priorities and are rigorous.

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

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<p>0 points Communication plan regarding goals not addressed</p>	<p>1point A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2</p>		
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Communication plan is well thought out and includes all stakeholders.</p> <p>The applicant provided a detailed communication plan that staff would be informed about the school's goals through professional development; students would be informed through Excel and students' life coaches. The Community Advisory Team provides a platform to the community soliciting input and feedback from the community (p. e29-30).</p> <p>A communication plan for connecting goals is in place for students and community, but does not specifically address communication to families. Additionally, the communication plan has limited details in describing how, when and where goals will be communicated outside of the committees noted.</p> <p>Applicant provides communication plan articulated with some specificity.</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)			
<p>0 points 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 the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>1point 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 <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>2-3 points 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 the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>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.</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 for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3</p>			

Comments:

Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for all line items and are directly aligned to projected costs described within the grant application.

The applicant provided a detailed budget narrative. All line items are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives (p. 30-31 & Budget file). The grant funding would supplement the technology purchases.

The budget submitted is a 2 year budget. The narrative does not break down the expenses over the two years and also does not address purchases for specific categories such as instructional supplies. The narrative also discusses a 3 year stabilization plan; however, not funds are projected for the 3rd year of the grant application. Purchases noted are generic as it relates to the required detailed description

Budget narrative explains the need for further technology to enable expanded, productive services to students. More detail on the items to be purchased is offered with line items in budget. Budget narrative is limited in details regarding specific expenditures (does not offer explanation of specific items or totals).

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 sufficiently and succinctly described the plan and capacity to continue the program after CSP funds expire.

The applicant described that the school would maintain required capacity through supports provided by the central office. In addition, the applicant has been in existence that the risk factor has been minimized (p. 31).

The sustainability plan is clear and is modeled after other successful replications/expansions.

Sustainability is described generally. Items to be purchased are not mentioned as one time expenditures.

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: 1

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

Comments:

Costs are reasonable, allocable and necessary to ensure the expected outcomes and goals of the charter school are met. The applicant provided descriptions of the items that are technology devices, which are reasonable, allocable and necessary (Budget) aligned with the proposed activities.

Costs align to the requirement and standards set forth in the grant application.

No narrative is supplied for 4c, however, the budget worksheet provides a description of the equipment to be purchased. These costs appear to be reasonable, allocable and necessary.

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: 5
Comments: <p>The six elements for school governance and board relations is clearly outlined and shows a direct, intentional connection between school, work and community. The applicant provided the structure of the board including reporting structure. Specific responsibilities of the board are clearly defined. b) The applicant clearly stated the responsibilities of each school personnel. For example, "The school Director has a high level of autonomy for hiring his or her staff overseeing day-to-day operations...Life Coaches, who help students address their non-academic life challenges and help create school schedules..." (p. 32). c) Though the applicant described the process and highlighted the expertise areas such as finance, education, law, etc. that the board would look for. It was general lacking details on clearly defined expectations, credentials, and diversity (p. 32). For example, "Care is taken to always have board members...along with strong community ties"(p. 32), there are 15 schools operated currently, each community may have its unique characteristics. It is ambiguous what to look for as "strong community tie" specifically related to this proposed school. d) The board members receive in-house trainings conducted by the CEO and Vice President (p. 33). There are three board members and CEO in the board structure, though they have over 45 years of experience combined, receiving new trainings may be necessary to keep informed about new regulations, policies, and laws. No other trainings were proposed to obtain from the authorizers or external experts. f) The applicant defined the data submission process through the STN website and the school's student information system to generate data needed (p. 33).</p> <p>5a) Applicant describes the role of the board of directors, but does not explain relationship of school director or administrative staff. 5b) Applicant generally describes the role of the school director and his/her administration. 5c-d) Board selection process and training is briefly described. 5e) Applicant does not reference specific reports, but provides information on the process for accurate and timely submission of reports.</p>

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: 3

Comments:

Lottery process is fair and reasonable. Student recruitment plan is multi-pronged and appeals to various applicants of SES and demographic stature.

The applicant clearly articulated its recruitment plan in compliance with IC 20-24-5. The applicant plans to recruit students through social media marketing, email blasts, and hosting events, etc. (p. 34). The lottery process is clearly described (p. 34).

A student recruitment plan is provided, however, recruitment strategies are general and are not specific to partners, timeline, and calendars/dates. The recruitment plan does align to Indiana Code.

Applicant provides a multi-pronged approach to recruiting students, compliance with IC 20-24-5 and a reasonable public lottery process.

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: 6

Comments:

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 applicant addressed each of the five groups sufficiently with detailed plans including methods of evaluating / assessing and monitoring progress to increase their academic performance (p. 34 - 41). In addition, the applicant presented its strategies in employing and training qualified staff to meet each group's various needs.

This section of the grant was very detailed in how supports and services would be provided to special education and ENL students. The other three subgroups were systematically categorized together, not taking in to account specific services and requirements needed to support these subgroups individually.

A continuum of services is provided for students with special education needs. Identification of adult students with special needs depends to some extent upon self-reporting or teacher/student concerns. TORs will maintain IEPs and 504 plans as reported by students or identified through the provision of educational services and students will receive extensive individualized instruction in the least restrictive environment (with embedded flexibility and individualized instruction/curriculum). Transition plans will be maintained and include transition assessments and Vocational Rehabilitation services, if needed. Applicant includes plans for service to EL students and meeting the needs of low-income, homeless, neglected and delinquent students through individualized coaching and local partnerships for student services.

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

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

0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1point Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear	2 points Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained	3 points 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			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The applicant fully described the outreach activities that the school has conducted so far such as "the school director provides information sessions, Life Coaches develop and maintain relationships with the local services, school staff regularly goes door-to-door in neighborhoods..." (p. 42-43).</p> <p>The description is an overview and does not offer details required to obtain the highest ranking. Evidence such as a timeline, calendars, etc... were not clearly stated.</p> <p>Community Advisory Teams are made up of community members, leaders, staff, students and social service providers. Applicant does not describe how the CAT interacts (when they meet and how they work together in support of the school.) However, the applicant provides a multi-pronged approach to community outreach and involvement.</p>			

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)

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

0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear	2 Points A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2		
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Key players, stakeholders, checks/balances and record maintenance is fully described.</p> <p>The applicant described the outcomes to ensure all schools are "in a strong financial position and in good fiscal health" (p. 43). However, no descriptions on policy or process were presented, such as record retention procedures and other related financial policies. The plan was vague and unclear.</p> <p>Outline meets SBOA guidelines for checks and balances.</p> <p>Applicant provides a general description of the internal controls and record maintenance - for ex: "disbursement properly authorized and processed in accordance with established policies and procedures" (pg.43), but the plan itself is not clearly articulated.</p>		

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

B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)		
0 Points No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter	1 Point Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO	2 Points 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		
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Grant management process is robust and clearly described.</p> <p>The applicant described a process that GEI will manage the grant (p. 43). It stated that "Every request for purchase will flow through GEI's accounting department, and every purchase must have approval from the School Director" (p. 44). It is unclear whether the School Director would be responsible for all aspects of grant or partially responsible. It is ambiguous where the responsibility falls for tracking purchases.</p> <p>Process aligns to SBOA process and aligns to the budget presented in the application.</p> <p>School leader management of the CSP grant is more inferred than explained. However, the grant is to be used for equipment which "must have the approval of the school director." (pg. 44)</p>		
C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)		
<p style="text-align: center;">0 Points</p> <p>No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1 Point</p> <p>Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2 Points</p> <p>Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement</p>
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1		
<p>Comments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The applicant provided limited explanation that "the Excel Center has been designed to be sustainable solely on state funding..." (p. 44). No further explanation nor details were provided to describe how other State and federal funds will support the operation.</p> <p>This specific grant is used for items of depreciation. The grant does not address the life span of technology and how it will sustain technology and depreciated purchases at the end of their lifespan (typically 3-5 years). While it does state that state funding will be used, a plan for depreciated purchases was not included.</p>		

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1point	2 points	3 points
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: 2

Comments:

The applicant described its facility plan that is safe, secure and sustainable. Also, the applicant addressed its transportation plan considering "whether bus routes or other means of transportation will allow students with limited resources to attend school regularly" (p. 45). Further, the applicant addressed in details describing its transportation plan to meet the unique needs of its students. The applicant did not address how enrollment impacts facility needs. Due to the nature of the school's mission and vision, all major elements in this section were covered and addressed.

Applicant describes the safety of the facility more in terms of building and equipment, than student safety. Applicant does not connect enrollment to facility needs in terms of numbers, but does connect in terms of community needs. Students transportation needs have been considered with determination of location.

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 3 signatures are 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) <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, <u>or</u> 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)

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

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: 8
Comments: All components 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			
Comments: The applicant's proposal is clearly presented and followed the prescribed format. The location of information was easy to follow and well communicated throughout. Applicant's narrative was clearly presented, following prescribed elements, though attachments were not indexed or well marked.			

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
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)	N/A--3	3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	6
3A. Charter School Goals	7	5
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2
TOTAL POINTS	68	63