

**Name of Applicant: Believe Circle City**

**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:**

Focus area is Post-Secondary Program. Expected academic and non-academic targets and outcomes are clearly defined and measurable. While focusing on academic acceleration (dual credit), critical life skills needed for success will be simultaneously supported across students' high school experience. Across four years, Purpose Pathways will be explored, developed and planned (through students' pursuit of college degree or earning necessary career credentials via postsecondary training). Applicant does not exceed two-page limit (application pages 17-18).

On pages 17-18 the applicant provides a detailed explanation of the plan to focus on postsecondary. Expected targets are discussed at the bottom of page 18 and include students that have been historically "under-estimated." The applicant does not provide details, other than historically low iLEARN scores for the students located in the area targeted by the applicant. The specific academic and non-academic targets are offered in detail. The applicant, however, does not support these expected targets with qualitative or quantitative data to show that the expected outcomes are accessible goals for the targeted population of students. The applicant defines the targeted population of students as "historically under-estimated", page 17, but does not define what makes this group of students historically under-estimated. The applicant offers data to show that the target population of students has a low pass rate on standardized exams and state they expect their program to dramatically increase these proficiency rates but no evidence-based research or data is provided to back up the assertion, nor is the applicant planning to target students in grade levels required to take the mentioned standardized exams. Additional information on how the applicant plans to fill the gap from K-8 content and/or assess true knowledge if there is evidence that the low pass rates are false measures in content and skill proficiency is required in order to score this section higher. In addition, research to show that placing underperforming 8th grade students directly in to AP courses in 9th grade would support the applicant's claim that the model provides an accessible goal.

Applicant identified focus area for postsecondary. Applicant describes overall model and will serve students grades 9-12. Expected targets and outcomes are described for both academic and non-academic areas. (p. 17-19)

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

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

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

<p><b>0 points</b>          No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p><b>1-2 points</b>          Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.   <i>1 point per element</i></p>	<p><b>3-5 points</b>          At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.   <i>1 point per element</i></p>	<p><b>6 points (1 point per element)</b>  <i>All six elements are fully developed and described. (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 &amp; Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</i></p>
--	--	--	--

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5**

**Comments:**

All six of the required elements are fully developed and described within the applicant's proposal on pages 19-29. Exemplary details are provided, most notably for the Needs/Communication Plan; Curriculum Framework/Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; and Specific Strategies for Supporting all students.

The applicant provides a detailed vision statement and explanation of vision implementation, including focus on accelerated learning and college and career preparation, on page 19. On page 20, the applicant claims the data show gaps between children of color and their white peers in this specific, targeted region of Indianapolis, but no data to support the claim are provided. In addition, the applicant states there is an "opening for a new, innovative, and high performing high school in either target region". Data provided to support this claim, pg 20 was that IPS recently closed a school in the area, and that the larger schools near the area have large gaps in 10th grade achievement for the target population. Data to include all schools in the area, large and small, that schools in the area are now overcrowded or underperforming, or students are traveling unreasonable distances to have access to high quality schools or data to show the lack of access to high quality schools would have been helpful here. A clear communication plan is outlined on page 21. The applicant provides a description of the intended curriculum on pages 21-23. The applicant provided a link to an evidence-based study in support of the use of MVP. The study, however, as well as the detailed description of the curriculum material in Appendix 12, indicate that MVP was created to be a supplemental resource and not as a fully inclusive math curriculum. In addition, the study provided shows that MVP is not aligned with CCSS, contradicting the applicant's statement that it is. The applicant did not provide any data to show that this curriculum specifically works with the target population of students that have historically underperformed. "The textbook for Integrated Pathway Secondary Mathematics 1 assumes that students enrolled in the course have been properly prepared." (Appendix 12). The applicant indicated Achievement First will be used as the ELA curriculum. The evidence linked in the document provided data to show student growth towards proficiency in 4th and 8th grades. The applicant plans to service 9-12th grades. More conclusive evidence that both the Math and ELA curriculum is aligned to Indiana's standards, is evidence-based with the applicant's specific target population, and effective when starting the use at 9th grade or higher. The applicant provides a detailed description of how all students will be supported through intervention, data tracking, standards-based assessments, and progress monitoring on pages 23-27. On page 28, the applicant describes their model that focuses on Acceleration, Autonomy, and Agency and how this model aligns with the necessary for 21st century skills. On the top of page 29, the applicant provided a description of planning to use the CSP funds for initial setup and capacity building, but not to sustain efforts. The applicant did not identify specific funding streams to provide the sustainability but that they would be working on that over the course of the grant. Applicant should identify possible funding sources to provide sustainability.

Applicant includes clear description of vision for charter school. Applicant provides a description of the target community and how the charter school will fill a need in the community (provide the only early college career preparatory high school in the area) that is not currently being addressed. Applicant provides some detail on how information about the school will be shared with the community and identified some initial first steps. Curriculum identified is aligned to Indiana State standards and the applicant describes how curriculum is aligned to vision of the school. Plan allows for differentiation based on student need and progress and collaboration with university partner. Applicant provides a clear plan for supporting students in

meeting or exceeding standards including use of standardized assessments, weekly data meetings, ongoing communication with students and families, and employing the multi-tiered systems of support. Applicant identifies how the three-part curriculum: acceleration, autonomy, and agency guide students through coursework that provides students opportunity to develop 21st-century skills. Applicant did not provide a clear description of how the school will sustain activities after the CSP funds are no longer needed. (pp. 19-29)

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

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

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5**

**Comments:**

Believe Circle City High School anticipates opening fall 2020, and therefore the key personnel, detailed on the proposal's pages 29-30, center on the school's founder and the expertise of her current influencers. The founder and executive director has a proven track record as the Managing Director of Secondary Education at KIPP DC, founding principal for Muchin College Prep (ranked as a Tier 1+ HS in Chicago), and as a Mind Trust fellow. Her fellowship group provides input and feedback on key academic and support design decisions. Members of this group include experienced and successful KIPP middle and high school principals/assistant principal and curriculum specialist; dean of college counseling (expertise in college access and social/emotional learning); dean of students (schedules, curriculum & parent engagement); the highest performing English teacher in the Noble Network; an expert in school culture, and the senior director of School Incubation (The Mind Trust). Team members' expertise appears to directly align to the diverse needs of the proposed high school. Applicant also notes that board members have been carefully selected for their expertise (page 32), i.e., education, finance, HR, accountability and systems and building management. Anticipated key school leadership roles (e.g., Principal, Operations Leader) are described on page 32.

The applicant provides a list of key personnel, their strong qualifications are clearly described and are relevant to the proposed program (pg 29-32). The data provided to support the strength of both the school leader and several key personnel were for middle school students while the applicant is targeting high school only. The applicant would have received full points had specific high school data been cited so as to be directly relative to the applicant's targeted population.

Executive Director (ED) has experience in leading successful, high performing charter schools and appears to have strong qualifications for running proposed program. ED worked closely with team of national leaders to support the design of the program. Proposed board of directors and Executive director's resumes are provided as part of the charter application. Organizational chart and charter application provide detail on roles of key personnel. The leadership team will also include a principal, director of finance, and operations leader. (pp.29-30; pp 249-267)

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

<b>A. Charter School Goals</b> (up to 7 points for this element, under Part A)			
<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>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b>            Applicant provides five (5) clearly defined and measurable goals directly aligned to both the success of their high school students and the quality/performance/growth of their instructional staff. In addition to measuring student's pre-post growth on the PSAT and SAT assessments, the applicant also tracks students' Core 40 Honors diploma attainment, student retention rates, and student performance on ILEARN state assessments. Students in all grade levels to be served by the school are included within the proposed goals. Pages 32-33.</p> <p>On pages 32-34, the applicant provides 5 specific and measureable goals. The applicant does not provide data to show that the accelerated goals are achievable with the target population, starting at grade 9. All data provided shows success when students receive the curriculum model in elementary and middle grade levels. The applicant plans to serve students in grades 9-12 and prioritized college and career readiness, yet no graduation goals were provided. Goals were focused on grades 9 and 10. A specific "who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurement" is not provided.</p> <p>Applicant identifies 5 measurable goals that appear to be rigorous. One goal requires 70% of students to meet or exceed state standards based on Ilearn. Response could be improved by identifying how school will measure if 9th grade students are "on track" to complete Core 40 Honors Diploma. Further, the school may consider describing a goal connected to schools' 3-part curriculum: acceleration, autonomy, and agency. (p. 32-33)</p>			

<b>B. Communication Plan</b> (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<b>0 points</b> Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	<b>1point</b> A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	<b>2 points</b> A communication plan that has been well thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders (staff, students, families) has been articulated with specificity
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>		
<p>Multiple avenues are anticipated by the applicant for keeping stakeholders apprised on goals: Purpose Path Meetings/3-times per year; open houses/events engaging parents in the curriculum and social/emotional/cultural development of students; workshops for college and career planning; and regular academic and behavioral updates from advisors via daily/weekly/monthly communications. Each event's purpose is detailed to further demonstrate the involvement of all stakeholders. Parents will have 24 hour access to grades, attendance and behavior through a parent portal; weekly newsletters; and at least monthly updates on grades, autonomy progress and agency development. Parent satisfaction will be measured, tracked and used to inform programming. School-wide goals will also be shared with the community through quarterly newsletters. Pages 33-34.</p> <p>On page 34, the applicant provides a plan for communication with parents, students, and staff.</p> <p>Applicant describes a detailed communication plan that includes students, parents, advisors, teachers and staff. Applicant will host Purpose Path Meetings and Open houses to keep stakeholders informed. Parents and students will have access to daily, weekly, and monthly communications and 24 hour access to student grades, attendance and behavior. (pp. 33-34)</p>		

<b>4. USE of CSP FUNDING</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>(Up to 6 Points)</b></span>			
<b>A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal</b> (up to 4 points, for Part A)			
<b>0 points</b> No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.  <u>OR</u> , budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.  There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>1point</b> Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal.  Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>2-3 points</b> Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal.  Most combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>4 points</b> Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives.  The combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.  Applicant <b>MUST adhere to maximum</b> of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 4**

**Comments:**

All funding dedicated to start-up items and to support selected programming costs (page 34) during planning and initial three years of implementation (as all four grade levels will be fully built out entering Year 4). Proposal narrative details CSP funding anticipated for Planning and Implementation years, beginning on page 35 of proposal. Proposed expenditures include: PD (for leadership and for teachers); supplies; contractual (curriculum planning; marketing; IT Services/Set-Up; initial operations/finance); planning year personnel/benefits; facility lease/costs prior to first school day (although this expenditure appears in Year Implementation); washer/dryer (homeless/poverty); furniture (desks, chairs; storage cabinet); equipment (Chromebooks/carts); iPad Minis; and technology licenses. Applicant's total budget adheres to \$900K maximum (although some confusion on Budget worksheets Total Costs).

On pages 35-39 the applicant provides a detailed budget narrative with descriptors for all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narrative. The combined planning and implementation budget worksheet totals agree with the budget summary worksheet totals. The applicant requested \$300k in the planning year and a total of \$900K for the total grant.

Applicant provides a detailed summary of anticipated costs. A rational is provided for each of the costs described. School requested \$300,000 for planning year and a total grant award of \$900,000. (pp. 34-39)

**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:**

Applicant's CSP funding used to support start-up costs. Post CSP grant funding, all personnel expenses will be covered through the growth of State basic grant as enrollment increases; equipment/repair costs will also come from State basic grant funds. Supplies and other needs (e.g., PD) will be covered by State and federal (Title I) funding. The applicant provides an explanation of the use of funds for startup activities only and that the continued costs of sustaining the school will be supported through the basic tuition grant, Title dollars, and other state available funding. The applicant only provided details of money requested with CSP funding and not additional costs/revenue to sustain the items not supported by CSP and in the sustainability year.

Applicant states that state funding will be able to support enrollment as the school grows. Applicant states that all CSP funding is used solely to support start-up costs. (p.39)

**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:**

As documented within the proposal narrative and the applicant's budget worksheets, costs anticipated through CSP funding appear reasonable (in line with market prices of similar goods/services); allocable (permitted) and necessary (directly aligned to proposed school goals and initiatives).

**5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)**

**Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)**

- A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. **If the school uses an EMO/CMO**, applicant *also* must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected
- B. Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together)
- C. Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations
- D. Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective

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

E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. <b>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</b>
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>Applicant addresses all six required elements: (a) Page 39, board directors are named, described &amp; roles defined. They participate in quarterly meetings, hold officer positions and sit on committees--outlined within bylaws; (b) Page 41, Executive director reports directly to board and is responsible for all day-to-day management of the organization (oversight of principal; recruiting administrative leadership; search of qualified pool of candidates for BCC school teams/board; oversees daily operation and development of staff/student culture. Weekly leadership team meeting will be held (goals, data, progress, staff, culture, etc.); leaders will regularly collaborate with teachers (PD, meetings, planning &amp; collab time); common planning times for teacher colleagues; daily huddles; ongoing communication; (c) Page 41, Board members had multiple interviews, resume reviews, background checks and referral processes. Candidates' backgrounds/expertise considered in order to ensure a diverse board, reflective of students/community to be served. Going forward, existing Board members will be involved in new candidate selection process; (d) Page 42, Board Orientation required -- with each member assigned a mentor. Annual board retreats held (agenda items too important to be handled during regular monthly meetings; updates from key staffers; interaction with students and families). Education Board Partners facilitates board development/training; (e) Not applicable/no EMO; and (f) p 42, will designate administrator/staffer member to monitor data &amp; assessments. May initially contract with CIES for all state reporting (to learn the process and ensure all data submitted in a timely manner). Student tracking software will be used to monitor needed data (with in-house state reporting calendar that will be used/monitored by administrator--with two-month/one-month warnings noted to ensure timely delivery of data.</p> <p>The applicant describes the board and administrative relationships, selection and training for new board members, submission of data, and other required administrative and governance items on pages 39-42 of the application.</p> <p>Applicant provides adequate description of governance plan and administrative relationships. (pp.39-43)</p>

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Student recruitment plan description is partial, vague or unclear. Evidence to show compliance with IC 20-24-5 is not offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not present.	Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. A public lottery process is adequately described.	A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and there is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3**

**Comments:**

Page 42. Applicant provides poverty/demographic data of 12-year-old individuals within multiple areas (Indy Westside; Marian University or Ivy Tech's Meridian Campus) -- as the school's location is not yet established. Will use multiple methods to enroll students: work with faith based community; visit local churches/places of worship; visit neighborhood/communication center, events and camps. Meet with parents and youth groups to school info about school. Plans to partnership with elementary and middle schools in

Center Township (specifically to work with 8th graders to build awareness. Enrollment practices will comply with Indiana/federal laws, e.g., IDEA, Title VI of Civil Rights Act; Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act; Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Enrollment open to all, and not limited on the basis of intellectual ability, athletic ability, disability, race, creed, national origin, religion, ancestry, etc. Will participate in Enroll Indy's One Match lottery -- if more students apply than can be accommodated. Once opened, current students automatically enrolled in following grade level. Siblings given preference, as well as students eligible for free/reduced lunches.

On pages 42 and 43, the applicant provides an adequate description of a multi-pronged student recruitment plan including community surveys, census data, use of faith based organizations and schools serving 8th grade in the targeted area. The applicant provided a description of a public lottery process and all details were in alignment with the IC 20-24-5 guidelines.

Applicant describes a recruitment plan that uses multiple methods to enroll, such as faith based community and churches, elementary and middle schools, neighborhood/community centers, events, and camps. Applicant will participate in Enroll Indy to conduct a lottery if needed. (p.43)

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate.	Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups.	<i>All five student groups</i> are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); <u>and</u> the applicant <i>descriptions are viewed as exemplary</i> , demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5**

**Comments:**

Applicant sufficiently addressed all five student groups (pages 43+). Students with disabilities supported via special education coordinator/principal/certified special education teachers who ensure adherence to IDEA & Article 7; guarantee all move-in and annual case conference reviews conducted in timely manner; and who will develop Section 504 Plan & IEPs of newly enrolled & plan of action for Believe HS). Outside providers (speech/language therapists; OTs, psychologists, social workers, counselors) will be used to provide the full continuum of services needed. EL needs supported via anticipated partnership like LUNA Language Services. Home Language Survey upon enrollment; will use Title III funding to hire an ESL Coordinator to administer WIDA, determine English proficiency levels and ensure EL requirements are met. Translators will be provided to support families; reports in native languages. McKinney Vento federal guidelines will be followed to support homeless and N/D students. All staff will be trained on the Model School Protocol for Reporting Allegation of Child Abuse and Believe HS staff will work collaboratively with Child Services, as needed. All special populations will benefit from: Use of MTSS process/early identification to effectively address individual student needs. School day will flex based on the needs. Weekly data meetings with instructional coaches/special education coaches to inform needed supports. PD delivered to general ed teachers via SpEd/EL Coordinator/s (all teachers share common planning/collaboration time). Believe HS will employ a full-time social worker to meet the evolving social and emotional needs of students and will also provide an Advisor to advocate and provide additional "parent-like" figure for each student. Uniforms will be worn by all Grade 9/10 students to ensure no one singled out because of income; parent workshops will be geared towards literacy, financial aid seminars, and college & CTE planning. Staff will partner with local agencies to make sure students/families are connected with needed resources.

The applicant provides a detailed description of how each student group will be addressed on pg 43-46. The reviewer would have scored this section higher if more specifics about how the applicant plans to ensure students are able to overcome underachievement and achieve diploma proficiency acceleration through the supports being provided for these special populations.

Applicant provides a descriptions for all five student groups and how the school will address the need of each group. (pp. 43-46)

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear	Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained	Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3**

**Comments:**

Page 46, parents of current IPS students were consulted as part of the planning process (and Believe HS's model shifted from gifted and talented, in part, as a result of this input). Believe HS has partnered with LUNA Language Services to make sure that all marketing materials are accessible across multiple languages -- and to have translation services, as needed, for future meetings. Parents will be encouraged to attend scheduled sessions throughout the year to provide feedback and input into career and academic planning for the students. Over past 6 months, executive director has met with community members, business owners, clergy, school leaders, organization heads and more to both inform the school's design and to identify potential community partners. A position is budgeted to manage community partners to maximize those relationships, once the school is launched. (Teacher and student "stakeholders" not addressed, as the school will not open for another full year.)

The applicant provides a detailed description of how the community has already been engaged in the development of the schools as well as the plans to continue further community engagement as well as encourage parent engagement once students are enrolled (pg 46-47).

Applicant engaged current parents of the Indianapolis Public School and multiple stakeholders as part of the development of the program. Applicant considered barriers to parent and community involvement and tried to address based on feedback from parents. (pp. 46-47)

**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**

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

**Comments:**

Page 47, Board Treasurer and the Finance Committee will conduct annual review of financial policies/procedures. Major financial transactions (\$5K or greater) will require involvement of at least two individual (e.g., a signed and reviewed purchase order) and all cash disbursements of \$5K or greater will be approved by signer (CEO, Board Chair, Treasurer). Individual responsible for recording financial transactions in Quick Books will not have signatory authorization (ensuring segregation of duties); Director Operations (generate checks, enters monthly payroll) and back-office provider (enters payroll, reconciles bank statements, generates financial reports) will process transactions; CEO and Treasurer will have access to review, but not process. Long-term budgets/projections; financial planning/oversight (including contingency plans for various enrollment/staffing scenarios); monthly ad hoc financial reports for the Board and State will be supported by seasoned financial expert Bill Kiolbasa--via his firm (Joule Growth Partners).

**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).
-------------	---	--

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2**

**Comments:**

Page 48, Believe HS will manage CSP grant, with support via Bill Kiolbasa/Joule Growth Partners--a nonprofit financial services firm. Director of Operations will do input, record, and report all financial activity; handle day-to-day activities (purchasing, accounts payable, payroll prep and cash receipts). Joule Growth Partners will summarize and review check runs, process payroll transactions, reconcile cash on a monthly basis, and provide monthly financial statement/summaries to CEO and Treasurer prior to review by Board. Over time, school will successfully manage all finances in-house.

The applicant provides a detailed and appropriate process for decision-making, budget and tracking purchases relative to this grant on page 48.

Applicant provides a description of how the grant finances will be managed, however does not provide a description of the decision making process or creating of budget by the school leader. (p. 48)

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1**

**Comments:**

Page 48, applicant specifies that Believe Circle City will use State and federal funds to support effective operations and student achievement in a variety of ways. Key drivers of the budget will be overall enrollment projections, individual class size projections, overall salary structure, facility costs and long-term financial goals. Specific other State/federal funding sources are not identified.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	<i>One</i> of the three anticipated elements is provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; or (c) transportation plan	<i>Two</i> of the three anticipated elements are provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; and/or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and/or (c) transportation plan	All <i>three</i> elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; <u>and</u> (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2**

**Comments:**

Page 48, notes that Believe HS is considering two existing school facilities -- but site selection has not yet been made. Site must accommodate five classroom spaces, two offices and a large space for at least 150 in Year 1. A top priority is access to public transportation and student access to internships, jobs and

exposure activities (in alignment with program objectives). The site selected will be reviewed to ascertain safety and security to ensure the facility meets all federal and State safety requirements. Applicant is investigating public transportation, Uber, shuttle systems (in partnership with potential partner colleges and universities), car share/carpool, and bikes/scooters--as opposed to traditional transportation options. The goal is to develop a transportation plan unique to the needs/desires of each student/family. Funding will support families needing transportation assistance, e.g. Homeless/McKinney Vento.

On pages 48 and 49, the applicant provides a description of the size, location, and number of classrooms desired for the described model. The applicant has not selected a facility as of yet. The applicant did mention two facilities are currently being considered that are within the planned budget and meet the needs of the model. The applicant provided a description of the transportation plan as well as mentioned supporting it with funds from the budget. The applicant described needing five classrooms for 150 students by year 2. Earlier in the application, on page 13, the applicant showed enrollment growth up to 465 students. The model plans for students to be off-site often during the 11th and 12th grades years of school. The applicant would have scored higher in this section if more details of the facility model would have been described as it pertains to enrollment as well as contingency plans if students are unable to achieve the accelerated targets and must continue to be educated in the facility passed grade 10.

Applicant notes it is exploring two possible facilities that are within budgeted costs based on enrollment. Applicant provides a description a transportation plan that is aligned with the school program. The response could be improved by provide a description on how the facility will be safe, secure and sustainable and if the facility will meet needs, as enrollment grows.

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES				(Up to 3 Points)
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	
None of the required signatures have been obtained and submitted with the proposal	<i>One</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, or project contact person, or board president	<i>Two</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, and/or project contact person, and/or board president	<i>All</i> three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3</b>				
<b>Comments:</b>				
All three required signatures submitted.				

12. REQUIRED APPENDICES	(Up to 8 Points)
<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) <span style="color: red;">NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</span>	
D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <i>or</i> proof that application for such status has been made	
E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy	
F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <span style="color: red;">NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</span>	
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. <span style="color: red;">NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).</span>	

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 8
<p>Comments:</p> <p>All anticipated Appendices included in the applicant's proposal.</p> <p>The applicant provided the required attachments following page 50. Attachments were labeled with an attachment title on the first page of each attachment. No numbers on pages were provided or running heads to help navigate the application.</p>

**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:**

Applicant's proposal clearly presented, following prescribed format -- making the location of anticipated information and key elements readily available. Applicant did not exceed the 30-page narrative limit.

The narrative started on page 19 of the application and ended on page 49, making it 31 pages long. These pages also included the budget narrative so the applicant stayed within the 30 page limit. The narrative was well organized and was labeled in an easy-to-follow format. Links were provided for some supporting evidence, making it very easy to access. Attachments were difficult to navigate with no page numbers or running heads to help navigation.

Application is well organized and information was readily accessible.

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

<b>Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)		3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	5
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	4
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	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 Maintenance	2	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>63</b>