

Name of Applicant: Herron Preparatory Academy

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

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)			
<p>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. <i>1 point per element</i></p>	<p>3-5 points At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. <i>1 point per element</i></p>	<p>6 points (1 point per element) <i>All six elements are fully developed and described.</i> (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</p>
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Vision for racially and socioeconomically diverse college-prep school is clear and detailed; b) Applicant cites clear evidence of need but has not yet developed full communications plan (will work with communications professional to develop that plan); c) Applicant provides detailed curriculum map but continues to have many details still under development and does not cite evidence of success; d) Academic strategies are detailed and clear, and are designed for diverse student needs; e) Applicant emphasizes broad liberal education to address 21st century skills/employability; f) Applicant describes (section 4) first year costs for start-up.</p> <p>The applicant has a well thought out plan regarding the need of the school. Additionally, they have a well thought out plan on how they will effectively address the educational needs of the students they serve.</p> <p>Applicant clearly defines vision of the school as a replication of an existing model. Evidence based programs and alignment to Indiana Academic Standards is provided within a defined curriculum framework. Ongoing strategies to align and adapt the replication model to the school's grade span is evident. Supports for demographic groups are identified. Carefully developed plans are articulated for 21st Century Skills and the increased rigor of College and Career academics. Weakness was in the needs analysis for the charter school replication. The information given was broad and did not specifically align to a supply and demand analysis or overall communication plan given an exact target location has yet to be identified. In addition, sustainability was not fully described within the section. While the school does have a network resource,</p>			

utilizing general fund tuition support is not a guaranteed revenue stream.

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: 3

Comments:

Applicant provides detailed personnel descriptions, including strong credentials, detailed management plan and extensive track record of success.

The applicant only names one key person, the president of the home office. In their application identifies the titles of the key personnel who will run the school and whom they will answer too. However, they do not identify their roles.

Applicant identifies an organizational chart for replication; however, does not identify all current individual's experience and impact to the new school. Appendix only shows names and titles but does not give depth and breadth of qualifications to manage multiple campuses. Applicant does include data that supports the replication of the model but all data is high school and this specific school is K-8. Curriculum and demographic student body will not align to exact same data points.

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)

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3

Comments:
 Applicant has provided two reasonable goals pertaining to growth in language and math, as measured by NWEA; but third goal (staff familiarity with curriculum approach) and fourth goal (percentage of students referred for discipline) do not reflect student outcome goals. Nor does applicant include any goals tied to state assessments nor to the broader mission outcomes of the school.

Applicant has identified a total of four goals. Per the application, one goal must be aligned to State content assessment (ILEARN or IREAD). The applicant failed to write one of their goals to include state assessments. Goals 1 and 2 do not identify the method they will use to meet these goals. The application only identifies the assessment given and the expectation. Additionally, in goal 3, who are they going to determine effectiveness of the faculty in addressing the value of classical education. Goals in general are vague and unclear.

Goal descriptions are not true SMART goals. NWEA goals have multiple measures within requiring dual data points so they are not specific. Rubric for teacher evaluation of Classic Education Articulation needs to be identified in order to meet 100% measure so therefore it is not specific in nature. There is no goal for a State Content Assessment listed.

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		
Comments: Applicant states that goals will be communicated with stakeholders but does not describe a plan for how that will be accomplished. Applicant has included all stakeholders identified in the application, which includes staff, students, and families. The applicant also included school leadership and the OEI. The communication plan is very vague and lacks variety by means of communicating goals with all stakeholders. Communication plan regarding goals has been established for all stakeholders and includes multiple methods of engagement.		

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: 4			
Comments: Applicant has provided detailed budget, within guidelines, that is focused on start-up and expansion activities, and which are consistent with operational and curricular plans. The applicant will utilize the funds for one-time startup cost for their K-8 academy. The budget and narrative have addressed most of these costs and are considered reasonable. Budget Narrative does align by overall total and description but is vague in itemized expenditures.			

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	
<p>Comments: Applicant will rely on student enrollment increases and general fund revenues to continue capacity beyond grant period.</p> <p>Applicant states the academy will be a slow-grow model, adding one elementary and one middle school grade each year. The application states the grant will cover certain start of costs. However, they do not include a narrative of how they will cover those costs after the first year. Also, they do not include any details how they will maintain the growth of the school to cover the ongoing cost associated with salaries covered by the grant.</p> <p>Applicants does not describe how to sustain funding other than through general fund tuition support. Does not provide any detail for sustainability or alternatives if enrollment targets are not met.</p>	
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	
<p>Comments: Costs for staff, curriculum resources and computers all seem reasonable and appropriate. All costs appear to be reasonable and allowable to include hiring of integral staff, purchase of curriculum and assessment materials, and purchase of computer equipment.</p>	

5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)	
Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)	
A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. If the school uses an EMO/CMO , applicant <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected	

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

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
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has sufficiently addressed all governance issues. Goals and process for selecting new board members are clear, but applicant does not address any vetting process for the selection and final decisions appear concentrated in the executive committee, rather than full board. Applicant does not use an EMO/CMO. Applicant describes most of the components appropriately. However, they described what they seek in new board members, but they failed to identify the logistics in selecting board members.</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: 2

Comments:
 Student recruitment plan is vague, noting primarily the staff involved and compliance with applicable laws - but nothing on strategy. Applicant will participate in Enroll Indy. The application refers to their enrollment officer with the Indianapolis Classical Schools, but provides no details on their recruitment plan.

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

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

<p>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points 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.</p>	<p>3-4 points 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.</p>	<p>5-6 points <i>All five student groups are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); and the applicant descriptions are viewed as exemplary, demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).</i></p>
--	---	---	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 4

Comments:
 Applicant addresses needs for each student group with details on both staffing and programmatic support structures. Applicant fully explains how they will support special education and English Learners. The applicant doesn't fully explain how they will serve low-income and homeless students. They mention a few items and only mention they will be in compliance with all applicable laws. While these subgroups are mentioned, supports and services are not identified to meet the needs of the student or to improve daily challenges.

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

<p>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1point Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3 points Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented</p>
--	---	---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2

Comments:
 Applicant provides detailed approaches for engagement of current parents; but strategies for community outreach are vague (noting only that staff are involved). Applicant provides data on a survey regarding why they chose Indianapolis Classical Schools. However, they did not include any information how parents and the community were included in the planning process of the grant or school. Applicant describes high level planning and support from parents and community. A survey was conducted which establishes outreach but ongoing implementation is vague. Specific events are not listed only generalizations. Exact communication style for new K-8 model should be developed.

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)

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

<p>0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>2 Points A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated</p>
--	---	---

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1

Comments:

Applicant describes extensive involvement and regular review by board of directors; but specific processes (i.e., segregation of duties, approval of expenditures, record retention, etc.) are not described. The day to day financial management of the school is the responsibility of the Indianapolis Classical Schools operations. However, the board is actively involved. Also, they have a detailed means of financial oversight with their Fiduciary Committee, with ultimate responsibility to the full board. Applicant provides a narrative regarding financial oversight but detail describing day to day operational internal controls and complete systemic process is lacking.

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

Comments:
 Applicant explains whom will be responsible for the management of the grant, and how it is ultimately responsible for all purchases. Oversight is concentrated with school leader and president; other processes for oversight are vague or unaddressed.

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: 2

Comments:
 Grant Management is described but overall detail and process of tracking expenditures and allocation of funds is not evident. Applicant describes primary reliance on state funds for operations beyond initial, rolling start-up costs. Grant will cover one-time start-up costs. Salaries will eventually be covered by the general annual budgets supported by state supported tuition.

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: 2

Comments:
 As of the date of the grant, the applicant has not identified a facility. However, they are aware of the needs of students with disabilities and seeks to find a facility that will serve all students. Additionally, the applicant seeks to determine how their students will be best served by transportation, but will provide transportation once they determine where their students live.

--

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 signatures have been secured.

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: 5

Comments:

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:
 Responses were easily located and contained within narrative limits. Application is well organized. Responses were not fully developed.

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



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)	0-3	0
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	3
3A. Charter School Goals	7	3
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	4
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &	1	1
Operation 4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	4
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record	2	1
Maintenance 9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible	2	1
for Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations		
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	5
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
TOTAL POINTS	68	48