

**Name of Applicant: GEO Next Generation Academy**

**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 : 2**

**Comments:**

Applicant seeks Competitive Preference Priority points for Post-Secondary preparation. Proposal describes an Early College program design that will result in high numbers of students receiving Associate's Degrees and/or substantial college credits while still in high school (24). The proposal relies on the overall School Goals to support this section; of these goals, only one of the four are directly tied to the post-secondary preparation preference point category. More specific and targeted outcomes directly tied to post-secondary education are found to be lacking.

GEO Next Generation Academy did provide one area of focus, which was postsecondary. There school design is defined as an early college high school which follows the model implemented by 21st Century Charter School at Gary authorized by Ball University as stated on page 4. The school design incorporates dual credit courses, college courses completed on the college campus and a structured set of curricular pathways that lead to a value added professional or technical credential. The school has two specific measurable goals, delineated on page 18, that address the college credit/dual credit expectations and 95% of students meeting the Indiana Graduation Pathway. The school has a sophisticated set of wrap around services including a Summer Academy for entering 9th graders, campus visits, paying for tuition and textbooks, providing transportation to and from college campuses, college entry assessment prep, assistance with Federal Student Aid and counseling during the admission process, and establishing contacts post-graduation with support via the Beyond 12 app with GEO Academies staff and identifying college support systems. (page 4-5) Based on their expected staff demographics, on page 17, which indicates a 95% majority minority population and reflecting on one of its major partners, Indiana Black Expo, provides evidence that their model would offer the assistance needed to support first generation minority students success in earning college credits, at no cost, entering post-secondary education and being prepared for success.

Area of focus is clearly defined (postsecondary). The expected targets and outcomes are referenced, but the support for the targets and outcomes is not fully described with qualitative or quantitative data.

**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: 4**

**Comments:**

The vision did adequately describe the design of the school. The narrative included projected outcomes, on page 9, such as students receiving two year degrees which was not reflected in goal 3, on page 18. The disconnect was due to the fact that the goal was not rigorous and based on a small percentage of students that would have earned one college credit per academic year. The outcomes provided are all projections and there was a lack of rigor in the measurable goals compared to the stated expectations. The curricular design designated research-based options for math and English but provided no details regarding the rest of the graduation required courses, including science which is indicated in the budget but not in the narrative. The applicant stated, on page 11, that there would be no coursework for 11th and 12th graders since students would be assigned 100% on college campus for coursework. There was an inadequate set of strategies that detailed the support for students who have difficulty meeting the state standards. There were no descriptors of how the immersion experience would address the students' wraparound needs on the new campus site. The only strategy identified was that the school would consult with colleagues supported by the GEO Foundation, which is not a rigorous strategy or intervention to address student's needs, as described on page 31. The use of the Accuplacer assessment during the entry 9th grade Summer session could serve as a tool to limit access; not to expand it as described on page 13. There were no solutions offered to the issue of student inability to progress through college coursework which could be a significant barrier. There was no assurance or strategies defined to provide evidence that the college courses would meet or exceed the Indiana College and Career Ready Standards as stated on page 11. One of the strengths of the design is the comprehensive work-place study opportunities based on career credentialing as described on page 13. Since this is a replication of a current funded charter, the sustainability will be based on using grant funds only for start-up costs.

All elements are fully described, with exception of (4) Specific Strategies to Support All Students. In this element, there is no mention of data-driven instruction, personalized supports, or RtI/MTSS and the description focuses on dual credit / postsecondary success and not Indiana Academic Standards.

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

<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>          Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program</p>	<p><b>3-4 points</b>          Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program</p>	<p><b>5-6 points</b>          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.</p>
--	---	---	---

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 4**

**Comments:**

Overview of the charter school developers is presented with descriptions of the experience and expertise they bring to the school. Developers include at least five board members from the 21st Century Charter School at Gary, the school from which the early college program was developed. Developers also include Director of Community Outreach & Development for GEO Academies, Chief Academic Officer for Northwest Indiana at GEO Academies, Director of Instructional Support at GEO Academies, COO at GEO Academies, Director of Finance and Operations at GEO Academies, CEO and Founder at GEO Academies, and Director of K-12 Initiatives at Ivy Tech Northwest (36-37).

Developers appear to have the necessary qualification aligned to the proposed program based on their positions within the organization and brief biographical descriptions.

The applicant has already established an unique set of partnerships with Indiana Black Expo and the Ivy Tech College which strengthens the personnel involved in the design and operations of the Geo Next Generation Academy. The CMO staff assigned have an extensive set of credentials and expertise to address their assigned responsibilities. The expertise by the CMO included back office operations, leadership for the early college model, and provides for finance, human resource, accounting, reporting to state and authorizer, food service, transportation, school policies and safety as noted on page 17. All of these duties were detailed in Section I: Evidence of Capacity in the attachments pages 6-12.

Key personnel are identified, but descriptions of previous experience are somewhat vague and lack explicit alignment to the proposed program. The proposal could be strengthened by describing expertise and discussing previous successful experience with various elements of the proposed program related to student academic growth and achievement.

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

**A. Charter School Goals (up to 7 points for this element, under Part A)**

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

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 5**

**Comments:**

The proposal offers four distinct goals covering such metrics as attendance rate, graduation rate, college credits earned, Indiana's Graduation Pathway requirements, and passing of dual enrollment coursework.

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

The goals are all specific and highly measurable. The goals appear rigorous based on the high percentages expected and/or comparison to state averages (38).

Key proposal priority of dual enrollment college credits is reflected in Goal #3 (38). The goals do not appear to include at least one State content assessment as a metric of school success.

The applicant provided four measurable goals on page 18. None of the goals focused on a state content assessment. Three of the goals were rigorous when compared to state averages and those addressed attendance, graduation rate and completion of Graduation Pathway requirements. Unfortunately, the goal on earning college credit was not rigorous or matched the projected performance indicated in the narrative.

Four specific, measurable goals are identified along with methods for measuring success. No state content assessment is included in the goals, however, which would have strengthened the proposal to be eligible for full points.

<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 to all stakeholders is described, with progress on Goals 1 &amp; 2 being communicated through "written form, distributed annually to students and parents in the School's Handbook. These goals will be emphasized daily during instruction and through scheduled student consultation and parent/student/teacher meetings" (38).</p> <p>For Goals 3 &amp; 4, dual enrollment will be emphasized in marketing materials and featured prominently on the school's website. Progress on these goals and the importance of these goals will be displayed prominently for students to encourage academic achievement in the form of banners and daily communication (39).</p> <p>Student awareness is built within the Summer Academy, reinforced with counseling sessions, supported within the school with banners, and success stories shared on social media. The unique partnership with Indiana Black Expo also has resulted in surveys to 40,000 individuals as noted on page 33 and the recruitment of service learning and work-place career opportunities which have exposed the community and parents to the goals of the school.</p> <p>The communication plan clearly includes multiple avenues to reach students and families, but no discussion of ensuring staff are made aware of the school's goals is included.</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:**

Applicant provides a budget narrative aligned with the attached budget spreadsheet. The school seeks CSP funds during a Planning Year, Year One, and Year Two of operations. Proposal requests the maximum of \$300,000 allowed in planning year and a total of \$900,000 allowed under the terms of the subgrant.

Budget narrative describes spending in broader terms and does not fully satisfy criterion of "Detailed budget narrative descriptors...provided for nearly all line items" (40-41).

The budget areas that needed more explanation is the \$20,000 for Professional Development when in the planning year there are only 5 staff (full and part time) when in year one with full staff the amount budgeted is only \$4,000. There is a discrepancy with no explanation regarding the difference which is five times the cost for year one during the planning year and provided to only 5 staff. There was not adequate explanation of what the PD services would be and the narrative stated, on page 20, they would focus on the early college model which was vague. The travel expenses of \$12,000 was too high for five staff and did not provide any details. The budget sheets were accurate.

**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:**

A broad description of the school's sustainability after the expiration of CSP funds is offered. The applicant intends to always fund staffing and operations with "reliable revenue resources" and not the CSP funds, therefore it assumes that school operations will be well-accounted for with enrollment funds.

The sustainability narrative on page 20 does not provide justification of how costs could be maintained if there are 500 students enrolled.

**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:**

Broad categories of expenses described in narrative and Budget spreadsheets appear allowable under the

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

terms of the CSP. Budget breakdowns within the attached budget spreadsheets also appear to include only allowable expenses.

<b>5. GOVERNANCE PLAN &amp; ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)</b>
<b>Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)</b>
A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. <b>If the school uses an EMO/CMO</b> , applicant <i>also</i> 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: 5</b></p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>5a) The governance structure of the school is described with GEO Academies, Inc. operating the school under a Board of Directors consisting of 5 to 9 members. Board of Directors will have multiple standing committees with set duties and responsibilities (41). The school will be supported by Greater Educational Opportunities Foundation (GEO), a not for-profit operator of charter schools in Indiana. The role of GEO as Operator is described to include administrative and back office functions of the school. Responsibility of the Board for all fiduciary responsibility is acknowledged (42).</p> <p>5b) Organizational structure of the school is described with day-to-day academic management the responsibility of the Head of School. GEO staff will collaborate with school staff and leadership to provide support. Head of School will be responsible for fostering a productive relationship between the many institutional partners of the school.</p> <p>5c) Guiding values and principles for the selection of additional board members are provided. The Board also affirms a commitment to having its "Board represent the community within which the school operates, as well as a broad base of community affiliations and expertise, including educational policy and management, financial and legal matters, resource development, and community relations" (44). An appropriate list of skills and desired experiences of future board members is included; additional board members are to be elected with a plurality of votes at the annual meeting of directors (44).</p> <p>5d) The Board will use Board on Track resources including a dashboard to track "to assess board effectiveness, a webinar series, and a fully searchable online charter school board encyclopedia" (45). Board on Track will provide onsite board training and two books on Board Structure and Board Meetings from Board on Track will be utilized.</p> <p>5e) No employees of GEO serve on the board of GEO Academies, Inc. The applicant affirms that structural ensure that no apparent or real conflict of interest will be involved (45).</p> <p>5f) Proposal indicates the school will utilize PowerSchool to compile various student data along with internally developed spreadsheets and Individualized Service Plans to track students' progress. PowerSchool will be the primary method for submitting reports to the State of Indiana.</p> <p>The contractual agreement between the school and the Greater Educational Opportunities Foundation was in Appendix F but was not signed. Responsibilities of board members and duties of staff were well defined in narrative on pages 21-23. The CMO has hired Board on Track for governance support and training. There was no delineation of duties for fiscal reporting which is a service provided by CMO.</p> <p>The process to select board members is not clearly identified. The proposal could be strengthened by describing the actions and steps the nominating committee takes to consider candidates and determine whether or not candidates are a good fit. Diversity of candidates is also not discussed. The application narrative also fails to describe HOW the school will ensure timely and accurate reporting requirements; it simply states that the school will promptly adhere to deadlines.</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:**

A marketing plan is described in which the geographic marketing approach is supplemented with relationships with partner channels such as the Black Expo and Ivy Tech's commercial and alumni stakeholders. Phase Two of recruitment is described to include newspaper advertisements, public service radio and television, website, open-house meetings, and door-to-door canvassing. Phase Three involves coordination with the Indiana Black Expo and Ivy Tech to convene public meetings to inform the public about the course offerings and enrollment process (27-28).

Compliance with Indiana Code 20-24-5 is not specifically affirmed in this section.

The applicant affirms that a lottery process will be implemented in the event that a grade level is over-enrolled. A lottery process is described in appropriate detail in compliance with Indiana Code 20-24-5 (48-49).

The applicant and its partner organization will utilize their network partners and constituency lists for communication regarding the recruitment plan. There was a survey by Indiana Black Expo that was sent to their 40,000 members regarding the school design and purpose. There is a structured recruitment plan that used paid ads, public service announcements, website, open-house meeting, door-to-door canvassing and contact with interested employers to support the career credentialing initiative. All recruitment materials will be translated into other languages, and the marketing does focus on the fact that it is a free public school utilizing a lottery system. It did provide evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5

The student recruitment plan described appears to be compliant with IC 20-24-5 and a public lottery process is adequately described. The proposal could be strengthened through a more robust description of the recruitment plan with specific community activities tailored to the targeted community.

**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: 3**

**Comments:**

Supportive strategies for low-income students include primarily identification of students with disabilities who may have been previously unidentified due to economic status (50). Other specific interventions for this subgroup are not found to be described.

The applicant assures that compliance with relevant special education law concerning protected subgroups including students with disabilities, low-income students, ELL's, and homeless or neglected students. A broad overview of the school's IEP implementation and monitoring is described with appropriate detail, as is a description of interventions for ELL students (52).

Specific support strategies for homeless students, neglected & delinquent students, and low-income students are not found to be well-described.

The applicant used information from other network schools to discuss services for the five student groups and their plan was to replicated the network's model and depend on expertise from other school's teams to provide technical assistance. Unfortunately, there was no clear data, just anecdotal reporting of outcomes which weakens the use of these strategies. The narrative on pages 29-32 is very general based on whole group services at a tier 1 level without the identification of specific instructional and support strategies that will enhance the ability of the five student groups to be supported in this educational environment-which includes college campuses. There is only one special education teacher serving 500+ students and the details of the intervention strategies are general (i.e. use of push-in ELL model) and there are not indicators of specific intensive services that would be available as delineated by state and federal law. There was no mention of trauma informed strategies or addressing mental health issues.

The application does not appropriately address low-income students, homeless students or neglected/delinquent students.

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: 2**

**Comments:**

The applicant undertook feasibility studies with the Indiana Black Expo along with early planning of the school. The school was invited to the area by the Indiana Black Expo and Ivy Tech. Continued support, marketing, and collaboration with Indiana Black Expo and Ivy Tech as community partners is indicated (53).

Anticipated community partners "include the local Boys and Girls Club, the YMCA, the Urban League, and other local community service agencies" (53.)

Clear evidence of involvement by parents in the planning and design is not indicated. However, the applicant does intend a PTO where parents will be invited to actively participate and provide input on the operation of the school (53).

The strong use of partnerships with Ivy Tech and the Indiana Black Expo is exemplary with regard to

community involvement as reported on page 33 with the dissemination of a community survey seeking input to 40,000 families. There is a clear plan for involvement of community members in the career component of the instructional program and with families and stakeholders through the six advisory committee and PTO.

Evidence of parent and community engagement is offered, but it is unclear how the various stakeholder groups provided input into the planning and design of the school. Teachers are not mentioned in this section.

**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 system of internal financial controls in place by the existing network indicates proper oversight of accounts and expenditures. The applicant utilizes an online purchase order system requiring approval of purchases, an online vendor payment and invoicing system, accounting software that meets GAAP standards, separation of cash management from other functions, clearly established policies to prevent embezzlement and conflicts of interest, account reconciliation, and the creation and review of financial reports (54).

The EMO provides all fiscal services and there was a structured plan to assure internal controls that will be implemented by GEO's fiscal team which has expertise and experience in charter school service delivery.

A process for internal controls is clearly articulated.

**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: 1</b>		
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>Purchases made under the subgrant will follow the school's internal financial controls. CSP budgets and expenditures will be maintained separately from other school budgets &amp; expenditures to allow for greater ease of reporting and tracking of grant funds.</p> <p>While basic oversight requirements appear to be met, this section does not present a clear picture of the overall management of grant funds that would ensure the best use is being made to impact student achievement and project goals. The day-to-day implementation under the School Leader is not well understood from this section.</p> <p>The CMO provides all fiscal services but the school leaders have the role of assuring student services are met with budgetary support with access to monthly balance sheets, incomes statements and cash forecasts as stated on page 34.</p> <p>The grant management process is described, but not fully developed.</p>		
<b>C. Other State &amp; Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)</b>		
<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>		
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>Other federal grants that support the school will include "IDEA Part B (Special Education), Title II (Professional Development), and Title I (Reading and Math support)" (55).</p> <p>The school plans to operate at a deficit in years 1 and 2, financed by GEO Foundation, Inc. and reach its financial break-even in year 3 when it will become fully sustainable based on enrollment projections.</p> <p>Operational deficits will be financed by the CMO with initial startup due to lower student enrollment numbers meeting financial independence in year 3. This is a unique arrangement and is not documented with any MOUs or agreements in the appendix. There is a lack of clarity regarding the tuition expense paid to the colleges for dual enrollment or college coursework costs and how that funding will be facilitated.</p>		

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

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

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

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1**

**Comments:**

Safety, security, and sustainability of the school are not found to be well-described in this section.

Applicant affirms that reaching enrollment targets will ensure a budget that supports facilities plans (56). A statement of alternative facilities plans if enrollment is lower than projection is not offered. Transportation to the school will be the responsibility of the student/family. However, the school will provide transportation to campuses of post-secondary partners for dual enrollment coursework.

No specific facilities costs were provided and none of the CSP funding would be utilized to address this need. The plan is to share the facility owned by Indiana Black Expo and there were no details provided regarding cost, safety or sustainability of this option. There is no transportation to the school facility but the school will provide transportation to the college campus utilizing buses and vans owned by the GEO Academies as stated on page 36.

The application addresses how facilities are sustainable with enrollment, but does not discuss how the identified facility is safe or secure. Additionally, there is no discussion of a transportation plan or how the school will be accessible without transportation because of its location, etc. While transportation is not required to be provided, the application simply states that it is the responsibility of students/families to transport students to school.

**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:**

All signature requirements were met.

**12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)**

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

<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) <i>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</i>
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. <i>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</i>
G. School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)
H. School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present. <i>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).</i>
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 8</b>
<b>Comments:</b>  All required attachments are included. The submitted agreement between CMO and charter was not signed and was watermarked SAMPLE.

<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>  Narrative clearly presented and followed prescribed format. Location of information was readily available, with the exception of required signatures not being easily located. Narrative did not exceed 30-page limit.  Appendix was not numbered or appropriately organized to follow the Required Appendices page with Appendix indicators.  Application often referenced later/earlier sections and charter application pages which made required information not readily accessible or easily found within narrative.				

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>		2
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	4
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	4
3A. Charter School Goals	7	5
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &	1	1
Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary		
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	3
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record	2	2
Maintenance 9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for	2	1
Grant Management	2	1
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>53</b>