

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

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

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

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

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

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

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
0 points Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	1point A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	2 points A communication plan that has been well thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders (staff, students, families) has been articulated with specificity

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

A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal (up to 4 points, for Part A)

0 points	1point	2-3 points	4 points
<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 & 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 & 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 & 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 & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p> <p>Applicant MUST adhere to maximum of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.</p>

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

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

C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C)

0 Points	1 Point
Many costs appear either unreasonable, or unallowable, or unnecessary (as they cannot be directly tied to activities or personnel described within the applicant’s proposal narratives)	All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary

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

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

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

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

E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.

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

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

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

0 points	1-2 points	3-4 points	5-6 points
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).

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1point	2 points	3 points
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	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

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)

A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)		
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points
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
B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)		
0 Points	1 Point	2 Points
No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter	Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO	Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all

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

Application	explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).
C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)		
0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	2 Points Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement

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

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

12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)	
Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below)	
A. Charter Application to Authorizer (for new or replication proposals) <i>or</i> Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)	
B. Budget Worksheet	
C. Most recent <i>Expanded Annual Performance Report</i> (IDOE Compass) NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).	
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. NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).	
G. School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)	
H. School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present. NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).	

13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.	1point Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence. OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.	2 points Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Generally, information was easily located.	3 points 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.

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

Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements	Points Possible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points) 	
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6
3A. Charter School Goals	7
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2
10. Facilities & Transportation	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3
12. Required Appendices	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3
TOTAL POINTS	68