

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

**Name of Applicant: Global Preparatory Academy**  
**Overall Ranking: 61.2 out of 71**

<b>OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<p><b>0 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)</p>	<p><b>1 point</b>            Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described</p>	<p><b>2 points</b>            Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described</p>	<p><b>3 points</b>            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>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</p>			
<p>Comments:            Global Prep’s focus is <b>Early Childhood</b>. This grant will help the school expand its current K-8 recognized model to include a dual-language <b>pre-school</b>. Clear, quantitative goals are provided and the applicant explains its expected targets and outcomes. The staff will employ a Two Way Immersion educational model for pre-school aged students (pp. 22-23). Unique populations include an anticipated student population of 50% Hispanic children. Applicant stayed within the 2-page limitation for this section of the proposal.</p>			

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<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.   <b>1 point per element</b></p>	<p><b>3-5 points</b>            At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.   <b>1 point per element</b></p>	<p><b>6 points (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 &amp; Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.5</p>			
<p>Comments:            The school’s vision is “to provide tomorrow’s leaders and global citizens with the highest quality of instruction through language immersion and experiential learning that is culturally relevant” (p. 24). A list of “I believe” statements is included. As the Hispanic population in Indianapolis continues to grow and consistently perform below their White peers, a high quality dual-language school will meet this growing need. Global Prep will be the only public dual-language school in Indianapolis. The school works with a professional marketing firm to optimize communication in addition to social media, email, yard signs and a website (p. 25).             The Curriculum Framework employs TWI as its educational model for students’ acquisition of two languages. It is based on research that language is acquired and developed by using it as a means for instruction rather than the object of instruction, like traditional language classes. Global Prep intends to implement two components of the model: language arts instruction in native and language of instruction. Curriculum will be aligned with NAEYC’s 10 program and curriculum standards (p. 26).             Global Prep will use an interdisciplinary approach based on Project GLAD which is tied to the IN State Standards. A Director of Exceptional Learners &amp; Inclusions and Dual Language Coach, along with</p>			

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

SPED teachers and a high ability teacher, will provide instruction and support (p. 27).

Global Prep will use the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Early Learning Framework and Guide as a professional development tool for teachers. As the world becomes more diverse, students who are bilingual and bi-literate will be well prepared to step into professional roles (p. 28).

A five-year business plan is based only on its future guaranteed streams of revenue to ensure sustainability. (p. 28).

**2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (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	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 = 6

Comments:  
 Key personnel are identified and their strong qualifications are clearly described – from the award winning and highly honored creator and implementer of the original school to the school leaders and board members. The Board has diverse skills and experiences and the staff has the appropriate degrees to serve in their designated areas (p. 29). As a school that intends to **expand**, evidence demonstrating significant growth since the school became a charter school is presented (p. 30).

**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>1-2 points</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 = 6.5

Comments:  
 Global prep provided both academic goals and operational goals. All are specific and measurable; rigorous and attainable. An explanation of how data will be submitted to various agencies is provided (p. 31). State content assessments do not apply, since these students are too young to take any of them. The applicant provides goals for students' entry into Kindergarten.

**B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)**

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

<b>0 points</b> Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	<b>1 point</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
---	--	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.5

**Comments:**

Global Prep uses a professional marketing form to optimize communication and will work with Bright Minds to publicize goals and expected outcomes with staff, the Board, OEI, IPS and families at monthly meetings. They also employ social media, email and a website to communicate with the larger community. Traditional flyers will be provided to families who do not attend monthly meetings.

**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)**

<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>1 point</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 = .8

**Comments:**

Global Prep’s budget narrative includes start-up costs associated with establishing a nationally recognized dual language preschool and relate to CSP goals, i.e. furniture, technology, curriculum and materials (aligned to NEYC standards). Marketing feed for recruiting new teachers and stipends for existing teachers and those stepping into leadership roles are also part of the budget (p. 32). However, no totals are provided in the applicant’s budget narrative. More importantly, the required (and detailed) Budget Worksheets were not attached to this proposal.

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

<b>0 Points</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	<b>1 Point</b> 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:**

The budget narrative includes staffing requests that will be covered with general funds and Title I funds after the grant ends. They will also have On My Way Pre-K dollars to support post grant (p. 33). Other

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

<p>identified costs for furniture, technology, curriculum and materials are mainly one-time purchases (p. 32). The Sustainability Year worksheet is noted but was not received – as it is part of the missing Budget Worksheets.</p>	
<p><b>C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary</b> (up to 1 point, for Part C)</p>	
<p><b>0 Points</b></p>	<p><b>1 Point</b></p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>.8</b></p>	
<p>Comments:            Costs are identified for staffing, teacher recruitment, and start-up costs for furniture, technology, curriculum and materials (p. 32). In the absence of the Budget Worksheet, specific line items cannot be reviewed. However, all costs identified within the narrative appear reasonable, allocable and necessary.</p>	

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

<p><b>Six Required Elements</b> (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)</p>	
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
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. <i>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</i>
F.	Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>5.5</b></p>	
<p>Comments:            A bulleted list identifies the Board’s responsibilities. It holds a 501C3 with its own corporation code in the IDOE (p. 34). The Board works collaboratively with the chartering agency and school leader. The organization chart shows a separation of academic and operational duties. The Board hires the school leader, but the school leader is the instructional leader for the school. A dual language coordinator works with students and staff and the director of operations supports the business functions of the school (p. 35). Global Prep aggressively recruits Board members with diverse perspectives, experiences and expertise and members are elected by the Board (p. 35). The Board meets monthly and all Board members participate in an annual Board retreat. They also provide Board on Track, an online webinar service for Boards (p. 35). Conflicts of interest are avoided by a thorough review of contracts (p. 35). In its 2016-2017 accountability process, Global Prep earned a ‘Meets Standard’. It has previous experience submitting reports, data, and documentation. They have a system of checks and balances to ensure accuracy and timeliness (p. 36). No EMO/CMO is working with the school (p. 20).</p>	

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

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

<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.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.5**

**Comments:**

Global Prep recruits door to door, at supermarkets, community centers, apartment complexes and public housing units. They also reach out to organizations in the community, i.e. not-for-profits, local businesses, religious organizations, health clinics and doctors' offices. Social media is also used to inform parents and the community about GPA's programming. The applicant acknowledged compliance to IC 20-24-5. For enrollment, they use Enroll Indy, per IPS's innovation agreement. A public lottery system is used if enrollment exceeds capacity (pp. 35-36).

**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 = **4.3**

**Comments:**

Daily practices comply with IDEA and provide F/R lunch to students year-round. Global Prep employs highly qualified staff to focus on the needs of students experiencing homelessness or involved in Child Protective Services. All materials are provided in both English and Spanish. An EL specialist and SPED staff support students with needs in these areas. Students are fully integrated into the general education classroom. Teachers receive training on how to identify and support at-risk students and all staff help connect families who have mental health needs to community-based resources (pp. 37-38).

**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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.5**

**Comments:**

Global Prep engages parents as partners and they, along with community members, helped with the design and development process for the school (p. 38). A series of family and community meetings were held to obtain feedback from stakeholders (p. 38). Parents are encouraged to be in the building and sign a commitment to encourage participation (p. 39). Global Prep disseminates a survey to parents, family

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

members and guardians to get ongoing feedback and input. They have also formed several community partnerships to provide resources to families (p. 39).

**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:**  
 The Board formulates financial policies and reviews financial operations and activities. Oversight of this responsibility is delegated to the Treasurer of the Board and the principal of Global Prep. The principal must prepare an annual budget presentation and manages the grant and other funding sources. The principal also selects the accountant and outside auditor/s. All grants received previously (Mind Trust, Walton Family, IDOE PCSP) have been managed well (pp. 39-40).

**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 = 2

**Comments:**  
 An office supervisor and business manager perform day-to-day accounting operations. Global Prep is audited annually by an independent public accounting firm. The Board reviews the audit. The office manager oversees payroll with the assistance of a third-party vendor. The school founder and leader will manage the grant (p. 40).

**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 = 2

**Comments:**  
 All staff positions will be sustained pre- and post-CSP-funding through Title I and ADM count dollars. On My Way Pre-K funding will also be used for staffing. CSP funds are marked for start-up activities, single purchase items, national accreditation needs, and teacher recruitment (p. 41).

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

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

<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	<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 = **2.8**

**Comments:**

Global Prep will be housed in an existing and recently-renovated IPS school building. It is compliant and accessible for a preschool, with an outdoor play area and a wing to house a dual language option. The school can add up to 40 new preschool students each year (p. 41). The school has an agreement with IPS to provide transportation for all students, whether preschool, special education, and/or 504 (p. 41).

**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:**

Page 11 and page 14 show the required signatures of the authorizer, project contact person and board president.

**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, <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. <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 = **7**

Comments: The Budget Worksheet was not attached (required element B).

**13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)**

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

<p><b>0 points</b>  Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.</p>	<p><b>1point</b>  Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence.  OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b>  Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations.  Generally, information was easily located.</p>	<p><b>3 points</b>  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.</p>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.5</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b>  The narrative was clear and followed the prescribed format. It did not exceed the 30-page limit.</p>			

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

<b>Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers</b>
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority	3	3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5.5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	6
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6.5
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.5
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	.8
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	.8
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.5
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	4.3
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.5
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	2
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.8
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	7
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>61.2</b>