

**Name of Applicant: The PATH School**

<b>OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score : 0</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>			
Applicant did not apply for optional competitive preference points.			

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>			
<p>Vision: The vision of The PATH School (TPS) is to build strong communities by ensuring all scholars leave The PATH School with the tools to guide them toward future success (p. 18). Need: The school is located within a area dominated by low performing schools in some of the worst neighborhoods in Indianapolis (p. 18). It is a high need area with 70% of students receiving F/R meals, and 85% of 3rd graders did not pass I-Read. Communication Plan: Canvassing events, one-on-one meetings, and community events, e-newsletters, and social media (p. 19). Curriculum Framework and Key Practices: Wraparound support that includes an academic counselor, special educator, therapist/social worker and transition specialist. Each team supports 100-150 students (p.19). The Path School will utilize a strengths-based model focused on academic, social and emotional growth. Build/Experience/Collaborate/Reflect create the parameters in which learning will take place (p. 19).Evidenced-based curriculum includes, Ready Mathematics and I-Ready, Wit &amp; Wisdom, Wilson Foundations and Geodes, and FOSS, a research-based science curriculum (p. 20). They also plan to engage community partners. Specific Strategies: Ready for Rigor framework, culturally aware teaching pedagogy, 120 minute math and language arts blocks, and social/emotional and experiential learning to engage learners (p. 25). For students with disabilities will be included in the general education classroom and receive targeted support. Academic counselors will support teachers and students through small groups inside and outside of the classroom. Enrichment throughout the week will support those with significant needs. A multi-tiered system of support that includes instruction, assessment and intervention helps to ensure high-quality instruction (p. 25). A chart depicting the tiers is included on p. 26. English language learners will complete a home language survey at enrollment. This coupled with previous WIDA data will help teachers create an individual learning plan. Communication to parents will be in their native language. For all students, a Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol model will be employed as well as a reteach</p>			

model to bring students up to grade level in English/language arts (p. 27). Development of 21st Century skills: The Build/Experience/Collaborate/Reflect learning model is designed to support the growth of college and/or career readiness skills (p. 29). Experiential learning, and social/emotional programming incorporate skill learning that is important to employers (p. 30). How to sustain once CSP funds are no longer available: per pupil funding, Title I funding, increased enrollment, and using a train-the-trainer model for staff training (p. 31).

The applicant clearly described the vision and mission of the school (p. 18). b) The applicant conducted needs assessment evidenced by the academic performance data compiled from the target student population in the community (p. 18). In addition, the applicant plans to routinely inform community through canvassing events, face-to-face meetings, and social media (p. 19). c) The applicant described the education model of a PATH team to support student learning (p. 19). In addition, the applicant listed publisher textbook resources as its "curricula" (p. 19) and discussed pedagogy explicitly (p. 19-23)

d) The applicant discussed its strategies in detail to meet the needs of all students including students with disabilities, ELLs, and students who are below the grade level (p. 23-31) using block schedule, small groups, MTSS, etc. e) The applicant described its approach explicitly such as using "Responsive Classroom Approach" and practices guided by the school's teaching and learning model "BECR" (p.29). f) The applicant fully described how to sustain activities when CSP funds are no longer needed. For example, the applicant intended to use "train -the-trainer model" to build its capacity. The staffing costs will fall into general fund costs in the first year of per pupil funding.

Applicant fully describes all six elements (Pages 19-31). Significant need is demonstrated and strategies for building community awareness are standard practices anticipated. The school's proposed education model includes wraparound supports whereby each student is supported by a PATH Team (an academic counselor, a special educator, a therapist/social worker, and a transition specialist) -- with each PATH team supporting 100-150 students. The roles of each team member -- and how they also support specific functions/classroom teachers is clearly articulated. Research-based, Indiana standards-aligned curricula are identified and described--as well as pedagogy strategies to be used by classroom teachers (including requiring teachers to bring in experts, relevant to unit of study, to expose students to careers/authentic learning). Anticipated rigorous academic instruction (with 120 minute blocks for ELA & for math), social/emotional awareness/support (Responsive Classroom/whole class; Tribes curriculum/small group/cooperative work; and Empowering Minds curriculum for individual students), experiential learning, supports for students with disabilities and EL students/SIOP Model, MTSS, weekly/scheduled Reteach lessons, interim assessment monitoring/support, and culturally relevant practices are all evidenced. CSP funding supports start-up and capacity needs; as such, applicant can sustain activities beyond grant funding.

<b>2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS</b>				<b>(Up to 6 Points)</b>
<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.	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3</b>				

**Comments:**

Executive Director, Alicia Hervey has an extensive background in raising the effectiveness of poorly performing schools (p. 32). Her work in a local charter school received both state and national recognition (p. 32). The assistant head of school's background is less impressive, although she worked as an interventionist and classroom teacher and is pursuing a master's in educational leadership (p. 32).

The applicant provided descriptions demonstrating the qualifications of key personnel. Though the applicant stated that "Ms. Hervey helped launch a turnaround high school... The next year, she went on to become principal of the turnaround high school..." (p. 32), it appeared that all her turnaround school experience was in high school. The proposed school serves students K-6 targeting the community with low performance history, the applicant lacked sufficient and convincing evidence that the key personnel has extensive experience in serving elementary students and closing their achievement gaps. The challenges the elementary schools face may be different from high schools'. Each age/grade group has its own unique characteristics and challenges. It may not be generalize assuming that successful high school experience could extend to elementary K-6. Though the proposed assistant principal has experience in elementary grades, but limited evidence were provided to demonstrate the capacity of the assistant principal in increasing the student performance of low performing schools.

Page 32. Alicia Hervey is the Executive Director and Tia Taylor will serve as the Assistant Head of School. With 25 years as a teacher and education leader (variety of roles/settings), Ms. Hervey's background and demonstrated achievements are clearly described and relevant to the proposed program. Ms. Taylor has served as a classroom teacher and like Ms. Hervey is enrolled in the Relay Graduate School of Education's National Principal Academy Fellowship. Taylor is also currently pursuing her Master of Education in Educational Leadership in the Urban Education Principal Program at IUPUI. Solid description is provided demonstrating expertise of Ms. Hervey, but similar detail is not presented within this proposal for Ms. Taylor. Note: The applicant addresses item 2(b) which is not applicable to their proposal, since they are not replicating or expanding an existing charter school. (Pages 32-34)

**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)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2points</b>	<b>3-5 points</b>	<b>6-7 points</b>
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 <b>MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment</b> to be scored within the 6-7 point range.

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6**

**Comments:**

The Path School has clearly identified goals that are specific and measurable. Three are focused on academics, one on family participation and one on retention of students. Two of the academic growth goals are specific to students who attend a minimum of 162 days of school. Given the population, this may minimize the number of students the goal applies to due to student absences, transience, etc. (p. 34-35).

The applicant proposed five specific and measureable goals. Two of them have included state content

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

assessment. All goals appear rigorous, yet attainable such as "85% of scholars ...will make one full year of growth in reading and mathematics based on their I-Ready scores" (p. 34).

Five specific, diverse and measurable goals are identified by applicant (pages 34-35), aligned to proposal objectives. Family participation in PATH team meetings and retention of students from year-to-year are included (Goals 3 & 4). Goal 5 includes student performance on ILEARN (based on combined ELA/math pass rates -- a more strenuous measure), but this goal does not apply until after baseline data year (i.e., cannot be measured until spring/summer of 2022). This, however, is offset by Goal 1 whereby 85% of students attending school a minimum of 162 days will make one full year of growth in reading and mathematics (based on i-Ready scores annually administered fall, winter, spring). Applicant also will measure annual social/emotional growth of students via DESSA scores (Goal 2).

<b>B. Communication Plan</b> (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>
Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	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>		
<p>School goals and attainment of goals will be reviewed at quarterly authorizer evaluations (p. 35). Goals will be communicated to parents, families and staff through team meetings, family newsletters, visual data boards, staff meetings and monthly board meetings. Teachers will also have the means to share data with students (p. 35). Annually, a parents, scholar and teacher survey will solicit feedback on goals (p. 35). A metrics dashboard will be available to the Board of Directors and will highlight progress on operational and academic goals (p. 35).</p> <p>The communication plan has been well thought including multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders via monthly board meeting, staff meeting, e-newsletter, stakeholder surveys, etc. (p. 35). That "TPS will host parent nights/conferences throughout the year to revisit school goals, scholar progress, and school operations and will share our progress toward our goals at these community meetings" provides a good example of communicating its goals with the stakeholders.</p> <p>A variety of communication avenues reach all stakeholders: quarterly evaluations with authorizer/Mayor's Office of Education Innovation to discuss progress on goals; communications with parents/families &amp; staff during PATH team meetings; family newsletters; visual data board; important events. Parent nights/conferences throughout year and school e-newsletter to parent/staff/community/external partners also solicit stakeholder feedback (as well as annual surveys). School personnel will attend local neighborhood meetings to collaborate and gain feedback. Metrics dashboard (used by Board of Directors) will track progress toward targets and goals --both academically and operationally.</p>		

<b>4. USE of CSP FUNDING</b>	<b>(Up to 6 Points)</b>
<b>A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal</b> (up to 4 points, for Part A)	

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

<p><b>0 points</b>          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 &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p><b>1point</b>          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 &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p><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.</p> <p>Most combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p><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.</p> <p>The combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p> <p>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.</p>
---	---	---	---

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 4**

**Comments:**

The budget narrative is detailed, nicely organized for clarity and all items are directly aligned to anticipated cost described in the proposal narrative (pp. 35-40). The applicant's planning year budget does not exceed the \$300K maximum (p. 35). The overall budget does not exceed \$900K).

The applicant provided detailed budget narrative descriptions; all line items are directly aligned to the proposed activities (p. 35 - 40). In each phase (Planning and Implementation), the applicant broke down the budget into each category such as travel, property and equipment to support each proposed goals.

The applicant provides detailed explanations of anticipated CSP expenditures in both the application narrative (page 35+) and within the attached Excel budget worksheets. Expenditures are directly linked to grant initiatives and goals. Budget totals stay within required spending limitations--both for Planning year and for full Implementation years' costs.

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

<p><b>0 Points</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</p>	<p><b>1 Point</b>          Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p>
---	---

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1**

**Comments:**

The school's CSP grant budget is focused on start-up costs and developing the intellectual capital within the staff to bring about the desired results based on their goals (pp. 35-40). "The PATH School is strictly using CSP funds for start-up needs and to supplement as enrollment grows over the course of three years. Software purchases will be maintained through Title I funding. Upkeep of technology will come from the \$500 per scholar of capital projects funding. Professional development will come from general fund and Title I or Title II

funds. By receiving CSP funds over three years, the school will be able to grow and serve all scholars well. TPS intentionally focused money toward salary within the planning year only" (p. 40). A more detailed explanation of how the school will sustain after the CSP grant is noted on p. 31.

It stated that "The PATH School is strictly using CSP funds for start-up needs and to supplement as enrollment grows over the course of three years" (p. 40). Yet, in the "Grades Levels to be Served" (p. 13), the applicant listed the projected enrollment of 450 students for the first year, and the same for the following years. These two statements did not align. It is unclear whether the budget break-down projects to support the maximum capacity of 450 students from Day 1 or the gradually increased number of students. In any case, marketing materials may be still needed after Year 3. The applicant did not elaborate further on how these costs can be covered.

As CSP funding is proposed solely for start-up needs and staff capacity building, the applicant should be able to sustain the program via State and federal resources, e.g., software purchases via Title I; PD via Title I/II; technology upkeep via capital projects funding. Salary expenditures, via CSP, occur solely within the planning year.

**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:**

Comparing the costs to the allowable cost guidance and account and object code guidance, it appears that all or nearly all costs appear reasonable, allocable and necessary, specifically, travel for professional development, property and equipment, supplies, contractual and personnel positions (pp. 35-40).

The applicant provided detailed descriptions on items categorized under "travel, property and equipment, supplies, contractual", etc. (Budget Worksheets). All costs proposed in both phases (Planning and Implementation) are reasonable, allocable, and necessary.

Nearly all costs appear reasonable, allocable and necessary. Across the budget years, CSP funds will enable the purchase of 540 student Chromebooks. With an estimated enrollment of 450 students, this total appears reasonable (given the inevitable need to repair/replace student Chromebooks). Across this same period, 56 staff Chromebooks will be purchased (10 Planning Year; 16 Year 1; 20 Year 2; and 10 Year 3). The number of Chromebooks for K-6 staff appears high, but may--in fact--be substantiated by the school leaders.

**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

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

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**

<p>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></p>
<p>F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.</p>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6</b></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>The Path School has applied for a 501(C)3 and will be governed by at least a 7 members board of directors (pp. 41-42) and will have oversight of business operations, property and general school matters. They have the right to hire/fire the Head of School and are responsible for vision oversight, mission alignment, school performance, policy construction, public relations and implementation of the organizational plan of action (p. 41). Each current member of the BOD is listed by name and title with experience, expertise, and reason chosen identified. Brad Jacklin will serve as chairperson (p. 41). Only 5 members were identified in the application (p. 41). An organization chart is provided in Attachment W which shows the Head of School as lead with the Asst. HOS, Lead Social Worker, Lead Transition Spec., Lead SPED, Dir. of Operations, and Lead Academic Counselor as subordinates. The Lead Academic Counselor works primarily subordinate academic counselors who work with teachers (p. 272). The HOS reports to the BOD. The rest of the staff reports to the HOS. Daily decision-making regarding the operations, academic excellence and financial management of the school is the responsibility of the HOS (p. 41). A weekly early release day will provide an opportunity for staff collaboration and development. Initial Board members were selected from existing networks of invested individuals. Subsequent board members will be chosen from invested community members (p. 42). The Board is working with the HOS to develop board member expectations and standards which include, "focus relentlessly on scholar achievement, ensure exceptional school leadership, commit to exemplary governance, act strategically, raise and use resources wisely, maintain legal and regulatory compliance. Additionally, board members should agree to sign and abide by all board policies" (p. 42). Board training and development will be delivered by Charter Board Partners who will provide annual board training, boot camp style (p. 42). Continuous Board training will be both formal and informal with an annual retreat and in one on one meetings with the HOS (p. 42). There is no known conflict of interest between charter school leadership and any board of director member (p. 42). The Paths School will utilize the services of the Center for Innovative Solutions for all state reporting within the oversight of the HOS and Dir. of Operations (p. 43). The school also plans to purchase a student information system to track scholar data and ensure reports are submitted on time. A calendar will also support timely submission of reports (p. 43).</p> <p>The applicant clearly addressed the board structure (p. 41) and the responsibilities of the board including how the school operates such as person responsible to make daily decisions. The applicant described the board member selection process as well as its related trainings and development. The applicant proposed to work with the Center for Innovative Education Solutions for all state reporting (p. 43).</p> <p>Page 40+. (a) No EMO and the seven professionally diverse Board members are vested with the oversight of business operations, property, and general school matters (hire/fire Head of School; school performance; policy, etc.). (b) Head of School reports directly to Board and staff report to Head of School. School leadership makes daily decisions regarding operations, academic excellence of financial management. Staff time for collaboration, e.g., academics/social-emotional learning; data meetings; PD embedded in schedules. (c) Board candidate's vetted and current members/Head of School &amp; Executive Director meet with prospective members for discussion prior to final board approval. School is working with Charter Board Partners to establish board standards. (d) Charter Board Partners provides initial training (how to run a public meeting, state requirements, roles, finance considerations); continuous board training is both formal (annual board retreat/Charter Board Partners training) and informal (quarterly 1:1 meetings between board members and Head of School; site visits; classroom tours). (e) Not applicable; no EMO). (f) In collaboration with CIES, leadership will establish systems to ensure all State and federal reporting occurs on timely basis.</p>

--

<b>6. STUDENT RECRUITMENT &amp; ADMISSIONS PROCESSES</b>	<b>(Up to 3 Points)</b>
--	-------------------------

<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: 2**

**Comments:**

The Path School considers itself a re-start and will recruit existing students by meeting with existing students and families before the end of the school year. They will hold community outreach events with local churches and community centers. The leadership team will also canvass the neighborhood to ensure awareness should their children be attending another school. They will utilize Enroll Indy and market the school via postcards, flyers and other giveaways. They will comply with all applicable state and federal laws and will not limit admission based on "intellectual ability, athletic ability, disability, race, creed, national origin, religion, ancestry, or any other criteria" (p. 43). The Path School will participate in Enroll Indy to level the playing field and accept scholars throughout the year as space allows (p. 43). Concern: Nowhere does the school mention a public lottery.

The applicant presented a multi-pronged recruitment plan using community events, social media, postcards, flyers and other swag (p. 43). The applicant described its lottery process using Enroll Indy system (p. 43).

As a restart school, PATH will prioritize retaining current IPS students and recruit new community students via outreach events with local churches and community centers; canvassing neighborhood to engage stakeholders and build awareness of changes at the school; social media; and marketing efforts. Will participate in Enroll Indy public lottery registration process. Admission practices will comply with applicable State and federal laws (IDEA, Title VI/Civil Rights; Section 504; Title II/Disabilities Act). Note: applicant does not address optional enrollment preferences relevant to Pre-k students, free/reduced lunch students, or board/school employee family members.

<b>7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS</b>	<b>(Up to 6 Points)</b>
---	-------------------------

<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 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).</i>

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6**

**Comments:**

For students with disabilities, the PATH school will follow IDEA and Article 7, educate students in the least restrictive environment, and create a special education team (lead and teachers) to ensure annual IEP reviews and compliant paperwork (p.44). They plan to contract therapists and counselors as needed (p. 44). Low income students will receive free/reduced meals and engage with community partners to meet specific family needs and point them to available resources (p. 45). Their transition staff member will assist families in selecting the best fit high school (p. 45). ESL students will be evaluated so that an individual learning plan can be developed (p. 45). TPS leadership will reach out to the community for help translating documents and communicating information to families in their native languages (p. 45). Homeless, Neglected and/or Delinquent Scholars will receive free/reduced meals, be protected from discrimination, and follow the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act with fidelity (p. 46). The use of Responsive Classroom, Tribes, and Empowering Minds to facilitate trusting relationships (p. 46). Two on-site social workers/therapists will be available to provide mental health services (p. 46).

The applicant sufficiently addressed its plans to meet the needs of all five groups. In addition, the applicant included its plans to meet the needs of students who are below grade levels and gifted and talented students (p. 46), which is above and beyond the requirement to be addressed in the application.

Page 44+. Applicant addresses supports for all five anticipated student groups--as well as students below grade level and those identified as gifted/talented (e.g., additional opportunities for experiential learning/elective coursework; Model United Nations). The overall design of the school enhances efforts to meet the needs of all, via PATH teams (composed of an academic counselor; social worker/therapist; special educator; and transition specialist). Solid support descriptions are provided for students with disabilities; EL students; homeless and N/D students. The applicant's descriptions for low-income student support focuses primarily on family/community resources/supports. Specific strategies for addressing the needs of any student requiring additional academic/social-emotional support are provided--and embedded within the school's model and schedule (e.g., MTSS). The school's plan to employ Responsive Classroom, Tribes and Empowering Minds building-wide further support the needs of special population student groups.

<b>8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES</b>				<b>(Up to 3 Points)</b>
<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: 2**

**Comments:**

The PATH school has already begun meeting with potential community partners regarding the planning and design of the school (p. 47). Once a site is determined by IPS, the school will host family meetings at the school in the community and perform home visits (p. 47). These meetings will help them identify priorities. They will hold open houses and community days at the school and engage parents and community volunteers in the process (p. 47). They plan to seek partnerships with the Children's Museum, the Indiana Repertory Theater, the Indianapolis Zoo, Camp Tecumseh, Jameson Camp, Asante Children's Theater, local churches and universities (p. 47). Concern: Nothing about teacher involvement in this process has been provided.

The applicant stated that "The PATH School has met with a number of potential community partners to inform the planning and design of the school..."(p. 47) but lacked evidence to demonstrate the community involvement. The applicant well explained its intention to involve all stakeholders in the planning and

designing of the proposed school but vague or unclear evidenced by "Some will serve in our athletic program, while some will assist us..." (p. 47).

Page 47. Meetings with potential community partners have been held to inform planning and design, although the actual school site has not yet been designated through the IPS matching process. Once that occurs, PATH will host family meetings at the school, in the community and in the homes of family members (to inform and solicit input). Individual PATH team meetings will be held for parents who will be returning to the school. The identification of community partners is viewed as vital, since some will serve as experts for classroom units of study; some in the school's enrichment programs/Rites of Passage Program (for students in Grades 4-6); some for athletic programs; others for assisting families through financial planning workshops; and some for providing rewards for student scholars.

**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: 1**

**Comments:**

The PATH school is working with the Center for Innovation Education Solutions to develop the budget, long term planning and to provide oversight of accounting and state reporting (p. 47). The BOD, HOS and financial consultant will establish budgetary controls and policies and procedures will be set by the State Board of Accounts (p.47). The BOD and HOS will monitor monthly expenses, year to date budget details and maintain oversight of the budget. (p. 48). The HOS and Director of Operations will work under the guidance of the consultant to make and approve day to day decisions (p. 48). A monthly report will be reviewed by the BOD and Board Treasurer (p. 48). Concern: It is unclear who signs checks, the plan for record retention, or how/who will be responsible for compensation for goods and services.

The applicant stated its intentions to work with the financial consultant and the Board of Directors to abide by the State Board of Accounts (p. 48). For example, "TPS will also set financial policies and procedures outlining thresholds for approval and an invoice approval process. TPS will use QuickBooks to manage day-to-day financial operations" (p. 48). Software and tools are to carryout established policies and process. It lacked details in articulating the process and system that how internal control can be maintained with the assistance of using software and tools.

School will collaborate with CIES to develop working budget, long-term financial planning, and to provide financial oversight of its accounting and State reporting. Budget and financial controls will be established in accordance with Board, Head of School and the finance consultant (CIES). Board will approve accounting policies and procedures--aligned to expectations of SBOA. CIES will provide monthly finance reports, reviewed and approved by Board of Directors and Board Treasurer. Schools will adhere to SBOA Internal Controls standards. Will use QuickBooks to manage day-to-day financial operations. Important assurances have been provided by applicant, but few specifics/examples, e.g., segregation of duties/sign-off authority; invoicing expectations; record retention requirements; inventory (particularly in anticipation of significant equipment/furniture purchases). Pages 47-48.

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

<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).
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>		
<p><b>Comments:</b>  The school will work with the financial consultant and accounting software for grant management (p. 48). Expenditures will be tracked by class/fund. Expenditures/receipts will be kept in a binder organized by reimbursement (p. 48). The Executive Director will be responsible for grant management (p. 48). Concern: This section is fairly vague and it is somewhat unclear who is ultimately responsible. Is the Executive Director the same as the HOS? They also refer to the school working with the financial consultant?</p> <p>The applicant stated its intentions to work with the financial consultant for oversight (p. 48). The applicant stated "Grant management will take place on sight with use of the school's accounting system" (p. 48). However, it lacked details in articulating the process and system.</p> <p>Page 48. School will track grant expenditures by class/fund--with all expenditures maintained in a separate binder, organized by reimbursement and the approved grant budget. Executive Director will ultimately be responsible for all aspects of grant management.</p>		
<b>C. Other State &amp; Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)</b>		
<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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>		
<p><b>Comments:</b>  State and federal funds will sustain the school beyond the grant to include the general fund, special education funds, Title III, Title I and Title II professional development funds (p. 48). Concern: There is no information on the budget for Sustainability Year (see budget tabs Years 4 and 5). Page 287 does include some calculations regarding what they might expect to receive during sustainability years.</p> <p>The applicant stated that the state general fund would cover the operation cost (p. 48) and Title funds would cover professional development. However, no further details were provided. The descriptions were minimal statements without further elaboration.</p> <p>General funds will support all general school operations, materials and staffing. Other incomes will include special education, Title III, Title I and Title II PD monies. Special education/Title III funds will be used for qualified personnel services, with remaining funds used toward specific accommodation or needs of individual students. General/minimal descriptions provided by applicant on page 48.</p>		

<b>10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION</b>	<b>(Up to 3 Points)</b>
--	-------------------------

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

<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: 2**

**Comments:**  
 As a re-start school, they will work with IPS to identify a facility that meets the Quality Review timeline. IPS will maintain the facility and does not charge rent (p. 48). TPS will provide input on which facilities meet the model, student enrollment and safety needs of the school (p. 48). For transportation need, they anticipate most students will walk, but they will work with IPS and IndyGo for transportation support of students who need it. Concern: Only safety and transportation are covered in the application.

The applicant expressed its intentions to work with Indianapolis Public Schools to ensure the facility is safe, secure and sustainable as well as the transportation needs are met (p. 48). However, no further details were provided to describe the process of ensuring safe facility such as routine walkthroughs, student’s pickup and drop-off procedures, which is important for an elementary school serving grades K-6. The applicant did not address how enrollment impacts facility needs.

Page 48. As a restart school, IPS provides the building ultimately selected for The Path School. PATH will ensure the matched school aligns to targeted school enrollment, determine if any renovations are needed to accommodate the model, and to bring the building up to current safety codes. (Applicant does not further provide other locally-determined safety expectations, e.g., drop off policies; controlled school access; anticipated safety drills. They are, however, a year out from opening the school.). PATH anticipates that as a neighborhood school, many students will walk -- but they will partner with IPS to provide student transportation within school boundaries. Other options will also be considered for students outside of the IPS transportation service area, e.g., IndyGO passes. PATH has budgeted (not CSP funds) to support such efforts to ensure all students have equitable access.

**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	All three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3**

**Comments:**  
 The technical review checklist confirms that all required signatures are present. Actual signatures are located on pp. 10 & 12.

**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)

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

B. Budget Worksheet
C. Most recent <i>Expanded Annual Performance Report</i> (IDOE Compass) <b>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</b>
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. <b>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</b>
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. <b>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).</b>
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 8</b>
<b>Comments:</b> All required elements are present for a NEW school.

**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: 2**

**Comments:**  
The application followed the requested sequence and stayed within the page limitations, but there were areas in which information was vague, limited, or missing. Page numbers were not clearly labelled.

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>		0
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	3
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 4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record	2	1
Maintenance	2	1
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant	2	1
Management		
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations		
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>57</b>