

**Name of Applicant: Indiana Agriculture & Technology School**  
**Overall Ranking: 62.6 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 = <b>2.8</b>			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>This applicant has chosen two focus areas – <b>rural school</b> and <b>postsecondary</b>. The applicant describes a blended learning model situated in a rural school district. Although the curriculum is described as blended, the online component is more clearly described than the project-based method to be utilized on the 600-acre farm, with reference to the Curriculum for Agricultural Science Education. Partnerships have been developed to assist with curriculum development, and the applicant has provided a general overview of the targets and anticipated measurable outcomes of the school. Applicant also describes dual-enrollment opportunities through partnership with Ivy-Tech.</p>			

**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 = <b>5.8</b>			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a unique vision for IATS and through educational opportunities that are currently lacking in this rural community. Since its inception, there have been many opportunities for the community to hear about IATS through public forums and media attention. The applicant outlines high standards and important partnerships to enhance the curriculum and build students' 21<sup>st</sup> century skills and college or career readiness. Strategies and methods for serving <i>all</i> learners lack specificity in terms of intervention, differentiation, assessment, and supporting academic growth and mastery of Indiana's rigorous standards. The applicant discusses sustainability beyond CSP funding, for costs that are primarily related to one-time expenditures and start-up activities.</p>			

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

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

<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>          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.</p> <p>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 = **5.5**

**Comments:**

The two key personnel members that are fully discussed have high levels of expertise in their field. Specific alignment to the program is not discussed, but is inferred through their qualifications. Other key personnel are identified who will support the innovation model and create a successful academic outcome for students.

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **6**

**Comments:**

The applicant's goals strive to help students achieve a well-rounded education. CSP goals are specific to increased graduation rates, NWEA pass rates, and students' attainment of workforce objectives. The State assessment goal is aligned to participation, rather than performance. However, achievement on State assessments is included in the applicant's authorizer goals.

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

<p><b>0 points</b>          Communication plan regarding goals not addressed</p>	<p><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)</p>	<p><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</p>
--	---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

**Comments:**

The communication plan is comprehensive and includes industry and professional organization representatives; however moving forward the applicant will need to address communication of goals with students more specifically.

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

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

<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 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><b>1 point</b></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><b>2-3 points</b></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><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> <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>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b>            The applicant's budget narrative does not specifically identify items listed in the Budget Worksheet. Within the worksheets, the sustainability tab is not completed. Line items are described and align with proposal initiatives in the Budget Worksheets. Total grant funding requested does not exceed the maximum amount permitted.</p>			
<b>B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &amp; Operation</b> (up to 1 point, for Part B)			
<p><b>0 Points</b></p> <p>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</p>		<p><b>1 Point</b></p> <p>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p>	
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b>            Capacity is sufficiently described by the applicant, with CSP grant funding used primarily for infrastructure and initial start-up activities.</p>			
<b>C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary</b> (up to 1 point, for Part C)			
<p><b>0 Points</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><b>1 Point</b></p> <p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .5</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b>            Reviewers questioned the allowably of indirect costs in Years 1 and 3 and grant management fees.</p>			
<b>5. GOVERNANCE PLAN &amp; ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<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</p>			

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

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.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.3</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The applicant adequately described the required elements but lacked specificity on the process for selecting board members (5C).

<b>6. STUDENT RECRUITMENT &amp; ADMISSIONS PROCESSES (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<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 = 2.8</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> Applicant discusses multiple recruitment efforts and specifies Indiana Code requirements for student enrollment and lottery process, although details for the lottery are less fully addressed.			

<b>7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (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	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>
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> While each required group of students is mentioned within the response, the services described are general and do not show specific strategies for addressing the needs of each group, except for students with disabilities.			

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

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

<b>0 points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1 point</b> Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear	<b>2 points</b> Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained	<b>3 points</b> 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 = <b>2.8</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> There is strong evidence of the many efforts to broadly share information about the school with the community. Applicant discusses community partnerships, but lacks specific evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school.			

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

<b>A. Internal Controls over Expenditure &amp; Record Maintenance</b> (up to 2 points, for Part A)		
<b>0 Points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1 Point</b> Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear	<b>2 Points</b> A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.8**

**Comments:**  
 Applicant describes fiscal controls generally, but omits specificity regarding record maintenance and internal controls over expenditures.

<b>B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management</b> (up to 2 points, Part B)		
<b>0 Points</b> No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1 Point</b> 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)	<b>2 Points</b> 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**

**Comments:**  
 The grant management decision-making process is described. Charter school leaders are responsible for grant; however specific budgeting and tracking methods required in this section are not adequately detailed.

<b>C. Other State &amp; Federal Funds Support School Operations</b> (up to 2 points)		
<b>0 Points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1 Point</b> Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	<b>2 Points</b> Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

**Comments:**  
 Sustainability of grant expenditures is described through a variety of other funding sources.

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

<b>0 points</b> Applicant opts not	<b>1 point</b> <i>One</i> of the three	<b>2 points</b> <i>Two</i> of the three	<b>3 points</b> All <i>three</i> elements are
---------------------------------------	---	--	--

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

to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	anticipated elements is provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; or (c) transportation plan	anticipated elements are provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; and/or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and/or (c) transportation plan	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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.3</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> The 600-acre farm has been inspected for safety. Applicant identifies and recognizes all aspects of the varied needs for two types of facilities. Costs are minimalized through collaborative efforts with additional partners. Transportation will be needed and negotiated, based upon student population and needs (vaguely described in this section).			

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

<b>12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)</b>	
<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	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 8</b>	
<b>Comments:</b> All anticipated appendices items provided by the applicant.	

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

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	2.8
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5.8
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5.5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	.5
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.3
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.8
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	4
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.8
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.8
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	2
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>62.6</b>