

**Name of Applicant: Rooted School**

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
Applicant opts not to address this element, OR narrative does not focus upon any of the designated priority areas (Early Childhood, Postsecondary, or Rural)	Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	Area of focus is clearly defined and <i>all three</i> elements fully addressed: (1) Expected targets and outcomes are clearly described; (2) Targets/outcomes are supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and accessible goals; and (3) Unique populations are clearly defined and described

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score : 3**

**Comments:**

Applicant seeks competitive preference priority points under the post-secondary category. Clear measurable goals for expected targets and outcomes are described. These goals include meeting learning outcomes on industry-focused projects, obtaining industry certifications, graduating high school, meeting targets on SAT and/or ACT, on-track for high wage job (less specific and measurable), and acceptance to four-year college/university (18).

Specific subgroups of African-American students and Latinx students are identified as targets for the post-secondary efforts as the school will guide them "to meet the rigorous demands of the college of their choice while partnering with local companies to expose students to the world of work" (17).

The focus areas for this application of this proposed charter school is post-secondary in a high school environment, including grade 9 first and then expanding to 10-12 over the next few years. There are six SMART goals (outcome/targets) by which the charter school will assess its success. (p. 18) There is a clear need described in an analysis of the demographics of this far east side Indianapolis neighborhood, identified with a majority of minority populations, high poverty rates and high unemployment rates in the area.

The applicant provided a clear description and fully addressed all elements required to so postsecondary priority. The applicant provided expected targets and outcomes for students aligned to Indiana's postsecondary readiness goals, aligned the goals with data to support that the goals are accessible and provided an argument that the school would service a unique population of students, pg 17-18.

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-5 points</b>	<b>6 points (1 point per element)</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <i>1 point per element</i>	At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <i>1 point per element</i>	<i>All six elements are fully developed and described.</i> (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6**

**Comments:**

The vision of the charter school is "to increase the talent supply is fast-tracking its most financially insecure youth to higher paying jobs" (18).

2) The need for the charter school is rooted in the national problem of racial wealth inequality. Indianapolis is also among the nation's leading cities in increasing poverty among children. With a poverty rate of 29% and an unemployment rate of 14%, the school's developers believe that the importance of post-secondary education warrants a school that can better prepare students. Communication is described utilizing social media, family nights, weekly open houses, distributing marketing materials, and neighborhood canvassing (18).

3) Curriculum framework is described as aligned to national, state, and common core standards. ELA and Math Curriculum are highly rated by EdReports.org. Curriculum is specified for core subject areas and described in appropriate detail to include Agile Mind (Math), Expeditionary Learning (ELA), Brown University (Social Studies), and Agile Mind (Science). Evidence-based instructional strategies are indicated and described in appropriate detail.

4) Specific strategies to support all learners include a strong understanding of UDL. A framework for working with Students with Disabilities is described which reflects an understanding of legal requirements and best practices.

5) The school will offer Pre-Career Level skills in technology and employability that are described for each grade level. These reflect both hard and soft skills that make students more employable post-graduation (27).

6) Sustainability of the school post-CSP is affirmed based on the one-time startup nature of the requested funds and the ability to use Title I and per pupil funds in future years to cover all operating costs (28).

Applicant envisions pathway for achieving tech-based jobs in underserved area but is vague on how that vision will be accomplished; b) Applicant addresses poverty and racial disparities in the broader Indianapolis community but does not address specific educational needs or the needs of applicant's specific service area, but applicant does address communications that will be accomplished, primarily, through the networks of Eastern Star Church; c) Applicant provides extensive curriculum plans and research sources; d) (FULL) Applicant provides general strategies for addressing specific needs of individual children; e) (FULL) Applicant plans a heavy focus on workforce skills, including industry credentials; f) Applicant's proposed expenses are one-time/start-up focused.

This proposed charter school has very lofty goals, but a plausible plan to achieve the goals and objectives set for themselves. If successful, this school has the potential to change the lives of students and the future of the communities in this far east side neighborhood by partnering with local businesses and a local church congregation. (p.20) The developers describe a comprehensive curriculum to be developed in conjunction with local tech companies who need competent employees with skills to succeed in their businesses. It will be interesting to review this "dynamic" curriculum revised by need, although there are certain components of the curriculum that are selected initially to be implemented (Agile Minds, Expeditionary Learning, Choices, Project Based Learning) characterized by blended learning environments and personalized, real world problem solving. (p. 22-23) Learning plans are proposed to include small group instruction, project based Exhibitions and internships with local businesses. (p. 24) The curriculum will be designed around the concept of Universal Design for Learning (UDL.) Plans to prepare both students with disabilities and English Language Learners are included in the instructional design. Students with exceptional needs, included gifted and talented students, will be supported with the 360 Student Support Team. (p. 26) Students will be offered industry certifications with a project based learning environment. A detailed plan for each year of their 9-12 experiences is described, supports noted and culminating in a capstone project and personal portfolio, including a possible internship in a local business. (p. 27) The budget included mostly "startup" costs and using state per pupil funding, Title I and CTE supplemental funds under the direction of the Founder and CEO as well as the Founding School leader recognized with awards and extensive experience in private and public education.

The applicant provided a clear description and fully addressed all elements required to so postsecondary

priority. The applicant provided expected targets and outcomes for students aligned to Indiana's postsecondary readiness goals, aligned the goals with data to support that the goals are accessible and provided an argument that the school would service a unique population of students, pg 17-18.

The applicants provides, on pages 18 and 19, a fully developed vision for the proposed school. The communication plan and need for the school focused on the unique mission proposed by the applicant for the target population of students is fully described on pages 19 and 20. The applicant provides an in-depth description of the curriculum framework and delivery of instruction methodologies on pages 20-24 of the application. The applicant did not provide evidence to show that the specific curriculum frameworks are cross walked to the Indiana State Standards, however the evidence was provided to support the instructional delivery frameworks for the intended outcomes for the specific targeted population. The applicant provides an in-depth description of how it plans to ensure all students, including students with specific special needs, are able to meet the Indiana Standards for graduation on pages 24-27. On page 27, the applicant provides a fully developed plan for each year of high school to ensure students are prepared for college or the workforce with 21st Century Skills. On page 28, the applicant provides a description of the sustainability of the model beyond the funding of the CSP grant.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	Key personnel are identified and their strong qualifications are clearly described and relevant to the proposed program. Team members appear to exhibit exceptional expertise and the previous successful experience needed to bring about academic growth and student achievement.  Applicants that intend to <b>REPLICATE</b> or <b>EXPAND</b> must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 4**

**Comments:**

Key personnel involved in the expansion are identified along with information to illustrate strong qualifications for effective charter school management. Background information provided for Founding School Leader, Founder and CEO, and COO. Each have significant experience, training, and background knowledge that is likely to lead to academic growth and student achievement for enrollees in the school (28,29).

Research basis for career preparation aligned to employer needs is provided. The model is created in collaboration with companies to identify in-demand job skills that can be supported by the school's educational programming. A list of consulted researched models is provided (30).

Applicant provides background on three key personnel, including the founder, with notes vague notes regarding each person's background and successes. However, the backgrounds provided do not demonstrate a tie to the stated mission of helping students achieve technology-based industry credentials. Additionally, it is noted that two key staff have experience through Rooted School New Orleans, but applicant does not provide any evidence of the performance outcomes for that school.

The three leadership positions appear to have extensive background in public and private education and the experience from the first Rooted School in New Orleans with statistics to support successful operation and student academic achievement. There are well documented biographies (see appendices) and multiple letters

of support (see appendices) from both the initial school site and the local communities and in Indianapolis to support the efforts of the leadership team to open and successfully achieve their goals. The only concern the reviewer has is the SMART goals in the vision on page 18 and the specific goals of the goal on page 31 do not align.

On pages 28-29, the applicant provides names and descriptions of the strong qualifications for the founding school leader, the parent organizations' CEO and COO. The applicant did not provide any information about the organizing board members. More points would have been awarded in this section had the board members been included as key personnel in the opening of the charter school. The applicant provides a well-developed explanation for the proposed model along with evidence to support on pages 29-31.

**3. CHARTER SCHOOL GOALS & COMMUNICATION PLAN (Up to 9 Points Total)**

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

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6**

**Comments:**

Five measurable goals for the school are provided, each specific and measurable (31). The goals cover the Biology iLearn assessment, industry certified credentials, ACT exam, acceptance into a four-year college or university, community college, and/or entry-level job position, and growth according to the Achieve 3000 series (31). Assessments do not restrict to certain subgroups, indicating that all students will be included in the metrics.

Applicant provides five specific goals that are each focused on academic outcomes; however, some of the goals are not very rigorous (i.e., just 50% of students passing Biology on ILEARN, or 60% meeting ACT benchmark of 21 - given that ACT identifies 22-23 as minimum needed in Math, Reading and Science to succeed with post-secondary coursework).

Five goals are specifically stated in terms of percentage of student success rates with measureable assessments identified. (p. 31) The application would have been stronger if there were references to the SMART Goals stated in the vision on page 18 and compared to initial and later expectations on the assessments indicated.

The applicant provides 5 specific and measurable goals on page 31 of the application. Goals include academic outcomes aligned with the Indiana State Accountability Plan for High Schools, including a goal

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

aligned to the Biology iLearn assessment and ACT assessment, an approved graduation pathway. All goals appear to be rigorous and each grade level of student is addressed by at least one goal. An adequate description of who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurements is not presented in the application—adding this would have strengthened the application.

<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>Communication plan includes quarterly meetings with the Mayor's Office of Education Innovation. Board to receive monthly updates at meetings and Board Tracker, and parents are to receive updates at monthly town hall meetings (31).</p> <p>Applicant assures broad communications with authorizer, board member and parents but offers only minimal reporting requirements (authorizer) or vague strategies (monthly board meetings and parent newsletters, town halls and surveys).</p> <p>Part of the communications plan are school board updates, town hall meetings for the public, newsletters for parents, trimester surveys of parent perception data. (p. 31-32) A Rooted School Advisory Council with representative parents, families and community members are slated to create forums to share feedback about how the school and the students are progressing. (p. 32)</p> <p>The applicant provides a description of the communication plan on pages 31 and 32 of the application. The communication plan is underdeveloped at this point. The applicant provides a description of a plan to develop a plan including all stakeholders.</p>		

**4. USE of CSP FUNDING (Up to 6 Points)**

<b>A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal</b> (up to 4 points, for Part A)			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2-3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>
<p>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>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>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>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: 3**

**Comments:**

A budget narrative with appropriate level of detail is provided for the Planning Year and Years 1 through 4 (32-37). Descriptions are provided for all items and are aligned with costs described in the proposal narratives. The budget worksheet totals are in agreement with the Budget Summary worksheet totals.

The budget requests the maximum of \$300,000 in the Planning Year and \$900,000 total for the five years of the project.

Applicant's budget is very specific, down to identified model numbers for each piece of equipment. Budget also anticipates technology costs that are specific to CTE and other training focused on industry credentials, consistent with the school's vision.

In the Planning Year Budget the School Leader salary is \$85,000 and in the actual budget summary the salary appears to be \$55,000. This could be the addition of the Director of Technology and the Salary for a Sp. Ed. teacher. Not sure as the explanation in the Budget documents does not give enough information to know what was added to what in the personnel column. Except for the school leader's positions, the other personnel positions are not outlined on the narrative for the budget pages. Otherwise the costs appears to appropriate and reasonable as startup costs for the potential charter school. The school narrative also repeats the costs of the technology devices and much of the software in each year. The reviewer questions whether the school would be continuing to purchase computer per student each year of school.

On pages 32-37, the applicant provides an in-depth budget narrative for each line item included in the proposed budget for use of CSP funds. The applicant adheres to the rules of the CSP grant by not requesting more than \$300k in the planning year and no more than \$900k total. The budget narrative, totals listed for each year, and the budget worksheet do not have matching data. For example, Year 3 of implementation shows a total of \$126,600, the line items included in the narrative add up to \$132,350 and the budget worksheet shows \$120,600.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>
Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is either not provided, inappropriate, or not adequately described	Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1**

**Comments:**

General sustainability after the expiration of the CSP grant is described. General maintenance and upkeep and technology will come from capitol projects funding. State and federal per pupil funding will cover CTE curricula. Online academic platforms will be funded through state and federal per pupil funds, with some Title I funding as well (37).

Budget focuses on one-time start-up costs, especially for initial staff and purchase of technology; continuing expenses to be covered by general fund, Title I and capital projects funds (if available to charter schools?).

The application clearly lists the funding sources for various outlays for salaries, software purchases, maintenance and upkeep of technology, CTE curriculum components, online academic platforms like Achieve 3000 will come from state and federal per pupil funding, from Title I funds, from CPF and from local general fund sources. (p. 37)

On page 37, the applicant provides a description of the sustainability of the school on public funds alone, without the CSP funds. A sustainability budget was not provided as evidence.

**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:**

Costs appear mostly reasonable, allocable, and necessary to implement the vision of the school and educational programming described. \$24,000 for IT Support in general curriculum needs more explanation to be better understood and evaluated (37).

Costs are generally reasonable; although, 1) budget includes substantial discrepancy between salaries of the founder and other key leadership staff; and 2) ramp up of 90 computers per year, each year, may assume enrollment increases that are overly optimistic.

All of the expenses appear to be reasonable, allocable and necessary for startup costs for the school to serve 75 students in the fall of 2020 and growing by 75 students each of the next three years.

The budget worksheet and budget narrative provide evidence to support that all or nearly all costs appear to be reasonable, allocable and necessary to support the mission of the school.

**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

<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>5a) Governance structure of the school is described with the local board having the authority to hire and terminate the School Leader. The school will be registered as a 501(c) 3 non-profit (38).</p> <p>5b) Proposal includes affirmation that the school leader "responsible for daily decision making regarding the operations, academics, and financial management" of the school. School leader reports to the Board and Leadership Team consists of School Leader, Director of School Operations, Assistant Principal, and Director of Technology (38-39).</p> <p>5c) Process for selecting board members is described including cultivating prospects, initial outreach, active meeting, and decision-making process (39).</p> <p>5d) Board Training is described to include Initial and Continuous Training opportunities. Initial training will be outsourced to a group such as Charter Board Partners to create an initial boot camp on core operating principles and procedure. Continuous training is described very broadly, but a sufficient description that indicates flexibility of training design based on an assessment of needs is indicated.</p> <p>5e) Board maintains fiduciary responsibility for school operations. Rooted School Education serves as the ESP. Proper conflict of interest policy statements are referenced.</p> <p>5f) Contracted services with the Center for Innovation Education Solutions will handle all State reporting, in coordination with the School Leader and Operations Manager (40). School Leader holds ultimate responsibility for ensuring that all reporting requirements are met (40).</p> <p>There is a detailed list of operational procedures and expectations available in the Management and Support Services Agreement between Rooted School Foundation, the original Rooted School in New Orleans and Rooted Indy in Appendix 12. It is clearly states that proprietary information will stay confidential and Rooted School will collect a fee from Rooted Indy equal to 5% of the Rooted Indy's revenues. (p. 4 of agreement.) It is reported that Rooted Indy has applied for but has not yet received its 501 (c) 3 status. The school board chair and many of the school board members have been selected and have submitted resumes' and letters of intent to the school authorizer (Mayor's Office.) It is clear that the school board members will be trained by a third party group with expertise in such training. (p. 39-40) Rooted School New Orleans does have all the required Tax Exempt requirements needed to operate their management company as listed in Attachment 15 (p. 1) Rooted Indy will use a third part manager for all state reporting, listing CIES as prompting the school leaders as reports are due.</p> <p>On pages 38-40, the applicant provides a detailed description of the governance model, selection and training processes as well as assurance no conflict of interest will be tolerated. All six components are fully answered.</p>

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>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Student recruitment plan description is partial, vague or unclear. Evidence to show compliance with IC 20-24-5 is not offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not present.	Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. A public lottery process is adequately described.	A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and there is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3**

**Comments:**

The school's recruitment plan is described in appropriate detail to include Middle School pitches, newspaper op-eds and features, social media, open house, and community events/fairs/festivals (41). Applicant affirms a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and compliance with all applicable state and federal statutes (40-41). Basic affirmations of a lottery process are provided in the event that enrollment exceeds capacity (41).

Applicant describes a multi-pronged student recruitment strategy and will participate in Enroll Indy.

The school has a multi-pronged approach to recruitment of students including building relationships with area middle schools to increase the public awareness of Rooted Indy as a viable option for students matriculating to high school. Rooted Indy also lists the newspaper and local Indianapolis publications such as the Indianapolis Business Journal (IBJ.) A social media blitz and Open Houses at the school will be conducted to pitch the school as a viable alternative for high school enrollment. The school will follow the public lottery process that other charter school use in Indianapolis.

On pages 40 and 41, the applicant provides a description of the recruitment plan, enrollment strategies and lottery process. The recruitment plan includes a multi-pronged approach and provides a plan for community involvement and engagement with other schools in the area. The description of the lottery process is lacking in detail. The applicant does include the priorities that will be used if necessary.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate.	Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups.	<i>All five student groups 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: 5**

**Comments:**

Plans for complying with state and federal laws for providing services to all students include a description of supports for students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and Homeless/Neglected/Delinquent Students, along with Comprehensive Mental Health Services (42-44).

Strategies are described in appropriate detail and reflect an understanding of best practices in working with particular subgroups. Low-income students as a subgroup are not specifically addressed in this section of the application.

Applicant describes a multi-pronged student recruitment strategy and will participate in Enroll Indy.

Applicant addresses all five student groups with sufficient detail, but does not offer plans that can be described as "exemplary"

Rooted Indy has a plan to serve students with disabilities in an equitable manner. (p. 42) The school's 360 Student Support Team will be in charge of planning and carrying out and monitoring the methods and lessons appropriate for all exceptionalities, including students with IEP's, those needing accelerated learning opportunities because they are identified as gifted and talented and English Language Learners, Homeless, Neglected or Delinquent students. For mental health services, the school intends to hire a full time counselor when the school has peak enrollments in their fourth year.

The applicant addresses four of the five students groups on pages 42-44. Low income students are not specifically addressed in this section of the application. This particular group of students, however, is addressed in the overall mission of the program and its targeted population. More points would have been awarded here had the applicant acknowledged this group in this section and referred back to the target population.

<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	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3</b>				
<b>Comments:</b>				
<p>The applicant affirms "multiple meetings with community leaders, industry partners and social service organizations in order to design and plan for the school (that) fits the needs" of the students served (44). Surveys and focus groups were utilized which further evidences the input of parents and community members on the initial planning and design of the school.</p> <p>This section further describes ongoing efforts that the school will make to involve parents in the educational process to include Rooted's version of a PTO, My Rooted. This programs solicits input from parents and community members regarding school programming and policies (45).</p> <p>Applicant describes a broad range of communications and engagement activities, including community outreach during the school development, advisory committees and functional committees for ongoing operations.</p> <p>Rooted Indy has the mission to involve the community in the school design and curriculum expectations connected to local business employment needs. (p. 44) The Rooted School Advisory Council includes parents, families and community members to help guide the school in the design of the school and parent involvement activities. (p. 45)</p>				

On page 44, the applicant provides a description of how the community and other stakeholders were originally engaged in the development of the school. The description is vague and no evidence of actionable items from those meetings are mentioned in the description. The applicant also provides a plan to engage parents and involve them heavily in the school, once open. This plan of parent engagement is well developed and multi-pronged.

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

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2**

**Comments:**

A Director of Finance and Operations will work with onsite Office Manager on procurement and payroll activities. A list of purchasing procedures reflecting an understanding of strong internal financial controls is indicated. These include specific policies on contracts, purchase orders, and vendors (46).

Applicant provides detailed policies and processes for financial management, including specific roles of board and personnel and details consistent with state reporting laws.

Rooted School will provide detailed a personnel handbook and Financial Policies and Procedures Handbooks and will train personnel on the expectation and requirements for monitoring funds and the operations of the school as required by the State Board of Accounts. (p. 46)

The applicant provides a well described process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance, pg. 46-47.

**B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)**

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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).
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>		
<p>Rooted School Indy will be responsible for grant management. Approval of grant expenditures by the School Leader is indicated. The applicant affirms that the school leader is ultimately responsible for all aspects of grant management (47).</p> <p>Process for grant oversight includes multiple staff and layers, incorporating detailed processes for general financial management.</p> <p>Rooted School will employ a third party advisor to complete transactions and the use of funds. The governing board will monitor and approve expenditure of the school. (p. 47)</p> <p>Grant management processes are fully described and decision-making, budget and tracking purchases for CSP funds are connected to the leaders of the charter school and not the CMO or other agencies, pg 47.</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: 2</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>		
<p>Proposal affirms that the school will use state and federal funds to support school operations after the terms of the CSP grant. Operations, materials, and staffing will be funded through general fund. Title I, II, III, IV funding will support at-risk population and the initiatives and plans outside the CSP are tied to school goals 1, 3, and 4 (47).</p> <p>Applicant will rely on general state funds and additional federal funds for continuing expenses; but the details of those plans (sources, amounts and reasons that qualification is expected) are not provided.</p> <p>Minimal explanations were included in the application to describe the use of other federal funds to support the school personnel and operations. (p. 47)</p> <p>The applicant provides, on pg 47, a description for how other State and federal funds will support the school operations and achievement goals.</p>		

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

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: 1**

**Comments:**

The safety and security of the school is not found to be well-described. The applicant affirms that the facility costs will be sustainable as no capital projects are planned. However, the nature of the lease agreement with Eastern Star Church is not described to further illustrate sustainability. Alternative plans for variances in enrollment are not described. Broad plans for providing transportation are indicated, affirming the school's commitment to preventing transportation from being a barrier to access (48). Applicant anticipates using existing facilities but does not describe the details of those facilities (# or size of classrooms, support facilities, safety measures, etc). Applicant does offer multiple options for transportation, including potential bus funded through this grant.

The Rooted School Application does not identify and building space for the school although the application indicates they may use a local church, Eastern Star Church, as the location for the school. The reviewer could not find information describing the school as a safe, secure and sustainable space for student learning. (p. 49) The plan for student enrollment over the next four years is described in the Rooted School Application for Charter status. A general statement about transportation is included in the application but not specific enough to determine adequate planning.

On page 48, the applicant provides information on the selected location for the school. The applicant indicates that there is no need for capital projects to update the space. The applicant does not provide evidence that the facility, which is a co-location plan with an existing church, is safe, secure and sustainable for the enrollment projections of the school. More points would have been awarded her if the applicant would have provided information on the safety of students while in the building during the school day, the number of classes available to serve the projected enrollments, size of classrooms space, etc. An appropriate transportation plan is provided on page 48.

**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:**

Signed assurances are provided by the charter school authorizer (10) and the project contact and board president (12).

In attachment 22, the assurances page includes one signature (unreadable) signed on May 30, 2019 (p. 42) The other two signature were found on the page 12 of the application.

--

<b>12. REQUIRED APPENDICES</b>	<b>(Up to 8 Points)</b>
<b>Eight Required Appendix Elements</b> (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) <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 of these elements are included in over 400 pages reviewed.	

<b>13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL</b>				<b>(Up to 3 Points)</b>
<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.	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2</b>				
<b>Comments:</b>				
Applicant's proposal narrative is clearly presented and follows prescribed format. The information and key elements were located as expected. The narrative met the 30-page limit.				
Rooted School's application was over 400 pages and included so many documents, it was hard to reference all of the elements. The application was very thorough but exceeded the 30 page limit.				
The applicant’s proposal narrative is well organized and falls within the required page limits. The appendices, however, lacked page numbers and running headers to assist the reviewer in locating specific information easily.				

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

Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements	Points Possible	Points Earned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)</li> </ul>		3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	4
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
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	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	5
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record	2	2
Maintenance 9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for	2	2
Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations		
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	1
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>63</b>