

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

**Name of Applicant: The Excel Center -- Bloomington**  
**Overall Ranking: 62.4 out of 71**

<b>OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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 = 2.6			
The grant application focuses on the <b>postsecondary</b> level, specifically targeting students who had previously dropped out of school. The applicant addresses all three elements; all students will take duel credit coursework or seek industry certification.			

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-5 points</b>	<b>6 points (1 point per element)</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <b>1 point per element</b>	At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <b>1 point per element</b>	<i>All six elements are fully developed and described.</i> (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.6			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>A needs analysis was completed and supported with both quantitative and qualitative data points. A communication plan outlined numerous action steps. The proposal cited evidence in support of the methodology outlined in the proposal. Instructional strategies aligned to the proposed approach used to both remediate and instruct students. Sub-groups were also addressed (special education, EL, and first time high school students). State standards and College and Career readiness standards will be used to support academic attainment as well as 21<sup>st</sup> Century skill building. The sustainability plan is not as clearly developed nor does it include funding sources such as federal and State grants, general fund, or outside fundraising.</p>			

<b>2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	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.

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>5.6</b>
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The applicant identifies key personnel with solid descriptions that show each individual’s qualifications aligned to previous Excel Center experience.</p> <p>With the intent to <b>replicate</b>, the applicant is able to clearly demonstrate strong academic growth and performance, based on annual performance from all Excel campuses.</p>

**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></p> <p>No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p><b>1-2 points</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>No less than three specific, measurable goals are clearly described. Academic outcomes of all students (all grade levels served) will be addressed. All goals appear rigorous, yet attainable. Applicant specifies who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurement. Applicant <b>MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment</b> to be scored within the 6-7 point range.</p>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>6.3</b>
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The applicant identifies three specific, measurable goals but it is unclear when goals will be met (i.e., each year or by a certain year in the life of the school). Goals do appear rigorous, yet attainable, based on data analyses provided in prior section. Applicant includes mandatory State assessments.</p>

<b>B. Communication Plan</b> (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Communication plan regarding goals not addressed</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></p> <p>A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>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</p>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>1</b>
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The applicant identifies how goals will be communicated to staff, students and the community – though the community outreach is limited to an advisory group. The proposal could be strengthened by explicitly addressing how community partners not participating in the advisory group also will be kept apprised of goals and progress. Communication with families is not explicitly addressed (this is likely because the school’s students are considered adults).</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)			
<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p><b>OR</b>, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></p> <p>Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the</p>	<p><b>2-3 points</b></p> <p>Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to</p>	<p><b>4 points</b></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>

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

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.	proposal.  Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	initiatives described within the proposal.  Most combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	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 = 3**

**Comments:**

Applicant provides a narrative for budget categories and the combined *Planning and Implementation* worksheet totals agree with the *Budget Summary* worksheet totals. Within the narrative, descriptors supporting professional development were not sufficiently outlined/connected back to the instructional model. Also, the narrative indicates that grant funds will be used to ensure support from the central office—though all expenses appear to be allocated to school personnel.

**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 = .3**

**Comments:**

The narrative provided is unclear as to how the school will develop and maintain capacity to continue the program, particularly since the majority of CSP funds will be supporting school level personnel. The narrative would be strengthened by a discussion of how the school will be able to continue to pay these personnel out of State (other) funding after the life of the grant.

**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 = .6**

**Comments:**

Costs appear reasonable and align to the instructional needs outlined throughout the application.

**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. <b>If the school uses an EMO/CMO, applicant also</b> 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
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>

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

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>
<b>Comments:</b> All areas in this section were outlined and fully supported; the applicant also cites a 10-year history of compliance as further evidence that they will continue that trend.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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.

<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</b>
<b>Comments:</b> A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is presented using various forms of communication to solicit students (including specific strategies). Admission procedures demonstrate that the IC 20-24-5 will be followed; details for an appropriate lottery also evidenced.

**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).

<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The applicant thoroughly addresses students with disabilities and English Learners but less explicitly speaks to the needs of low-income, homeless, neglected & delinquent students or strategies that support their unique characteristics.

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

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

<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The application has thoroughly outlined community partnerships as they relate to businesses located in Bloomington. Key stakeholders were noted including work force development organizations and Ivy

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

Tech (pg 38). The consideration for the lack of parental involvement was also addressed (adult students served by school).

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

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6

**Comments:**  
 The process follows the procurement required under the State Board of Accounts. Internal controls are present and run through GEI. All monetary allocations associated with the grant are subject to board approval and evaluated through the school's financials. Applicant describes a solid plan for adopting internal controls, though the narrative is unclear regarding record maintenance.

**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 Application	Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3

**Comments:**  
 Applicant describes management of the grant, including decision-making and creation of the budget, but does not address how items purchased are tracked.

**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 = 1.3

**Comments:**  
 The narrative indicates that the school will sustain solely on State funding, but does not indicate how the school will utilize federal/other funding sources beyond the grant.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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	One 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	Two 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 three elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

Comments:  
 The required elements were adequately addressed by the applicant.

**11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:  
 All three signatures are present (pages 2 and 5)

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

<b>Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below)</b>	
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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **8**

Comments:  
 All anticipated attachments were provided by the applicant.

**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 = **2.6**

Comments:  
 The grant was well organized and presented in the requested sequence.

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018**

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority	3	2.6
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5.6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5.6
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6.3
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	.3
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	.6
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	2.6
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.6
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.3
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.3
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.6
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>62.4</b>