Quality Counts Peer Reviewer Rubric

The Quality Counts grant is competitive. A team of expert peer reviewers with experience in school improvement, management and direct experiences with charter schools will review grant applications. Each application will be reviewed a minimum of two times and may include further adjustments or reductions after awards are made. The review of the applications will utilize the criteria listed within the rubric included in the request for proposals.

Proposals that receive higher scores increase their likelihood of approval and receipt of funding at the requested levels. Department staff shall conduct a final review of all applications to ensure the application was completed with fidelity and complies with all requirements. Department staff shall determine the final budget for each subgrant recipient and will determine whether proposed activities are reasonable, allocable, and necessary. If the page limit of the application is exceeded, reviewers may reduce the total score by up to 10%.

Pre-Requisites Satisfied:

1. Accountability Grade:
    a. Accountability Grade of A or B
    b. Evidence of strong academic results, including strong student academic growth and performance on ISTEP (i.e. above state average)
2. No Corrective Action in the following Categories:
    a. Student Safety
    b. School Finance
    c. Operational Management
    d. Statutory/Regulatory Compliance in Least Restrictive Environment and English Language Learner areas
3. School is not identified for Targeted Support and Improvement and meets subgroup needs through demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement, including graduation rates, for all students served by the charter school:
    a. Economically disadvantaged
    b. Major Racial and ethnic groups
    c. Students with disabilities
    d. Students with limited English proficiency

Peer Reviewer Instructions: The peer reviewer shall determine the band that best fits the holistic evaluation of each section in the grant narrative and then determine the strength within that band to arrive at a score. The peer reviewer shall provide a comment if a 0, 1, or highest score is assigned.

Indiana Agriculture and Technology School
Optional Competitive Preference Priority 1 (CPP1): Early Childhood, Postsecondary, and/or Rural Areas

0	1	2	3
Not included in the application; model will not focus upon any of the priority areas	Area of focus is indicated, but expected targets and outcomes, and specific populations are not mentioned.	Area of focus is clearly defined, expected targets and outcomes are described, specific populations are mentioned.	Area of focus is clearly defined, expected targets and outcomes are clearly described and supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and assessable goals. Unique populations are clearly defined and described quantitatively and qualitatively.
Comments: 2 – focus on agriculture, expect rural students – targets and outcomes mentioned very generally			

1. Charter School Vision and Expected Outcomes: 3

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Charter School vision included, no clear indication of community need/community communication, curriculum framework mentioned but not expanded upon, no clear description of how educational program will meet Indiana's academic standards or how students will develop 21st Century skills, nor a clearly defined sustainability plan beyond the life of the grant.	Charter school vision included, community need and communication plan outlined. Curriculum framework, key instructional practices, and curriculum development guide outlined. Methodology for the proposed program to reach all learners is explained. A plan for how students will develop 21st Century skills is present and a sustainability plan post-grant is outlined.	Charter school vision is fully developed and described, evidence to support community need for this program is clearly defined and presented, and a communication plan is clearly described. Curriculum framework, key instructional practices, and research to support the usage of these is clearly articulated. Specificity is used to demonstrate how the proposed program will support all students in meeting/exceeding Indiana's academic standards. The program's ability to help prepare students for college or develop 21st Century skills is clearly defined. A sustainable, viable plan is articulated to continue the program beyond the life of the grant.
Comments: (App. Pgs. 4-7; 9; 11-18; 23 -26;) 3 -The agriculture curriculum is very vague regarding implementation and it is the curricular element that is to most distinguish the school. Methodology for student/teacher face-to-face instruction at satellite sites is also vague.			

2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers:

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Key Personnel are identified. Data and analysis to support the program are vaguely described. No evidence that the proposed program will deliver strong growth and student achievement is presented. No analysis is presented.	Key Personnel are identified and described. Data and analysis that support the program are described. Some connections are made between the data and the program's ability to deliver academic growth and student achievement. Analysis is present but does not reference school's Annual Performance report from DOE Compass.	Key Personnel are identified and their qualifications are clearly described and relevant to the proposed program. Data and analysis that support the ability of the proposed program or replicated program are presented and demonstrate clear evidence that the proposed program will deliver strong academic growth and student achievement. Analysis references school's Annual Performance report from DOE Compass or similar report.
Comments: 4–Resumes for two and bio for one staff member are provided for this section.			

3. Charter School Goals:

0	1-3	4- 5 -6	7-9
No description provided or cited.	Description is partial, vague, or unclear. Inadequately addresses academic outcomes of students in a measurable format or include achievement data. Community communication plan is vague or not present.	Goals to address academic needs are described and connections are made to student outcomes. Methods for measuring success towards goals are mentioned but may be unclear. Student achievement data is referenced. A community communication plan is outlined to describe school goals.	Specific, measurable goals are clearly described and how academic outcomes of all students will be addressed and the measurement of progress towards goals is articulated. Student achievement data from state content assessment is included and incorporated into the explanation. A communication plan that has been well-thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders has been articulated with specificity.
Comments: (App. Pgs. 18- 20; 37 -40; 42;) 5 - Academic Goal 1 is stated twice with two different targets. It is not clear which is the correct goal; other goals are mentioned (though not state assessments) but vague; communication plan is well thought out – There are no goals that reference agricultural education. (NWEA goal has value signs for targets switched.)			

4. Use of CSP Funding:

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Budget Narrative is partial, vague, or unclear. Few costs are reasonable or necessary. Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue program after grant life is inappropriate, not measurable, or not adequate.	Budget narrative addresses most line items and shows connection between the grant goals and the proposed expenditures. Many costs are reasonable but may not be allocable or necessary to reach project goals. Explanation of the program beyond the life of the grant is present but does not make clear how it will be	Budget narrative addresses each line item and demonstrates alignment between grant goals and expenditures. Nearly all costs are reasonable, allocable, and necessary to support project goals. A plan for continuing the program at a high quality level beyond the life of the grant is clearly articulated.

	Ideas are disjointed.	maintained at a high quality level.	
Comments: 3 – Budget and narrative address most line items; planning year is set as April to June 2018 – however budget has the personnel costs for 7 months .			

5. School Governance Plan and Administrative Relationships:

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	The school governance structure description, school staff connections, and existing relationships with EMOs and CMOs explanation is partial, vague, or unclear. Information regarding school operations, charter school leader's decision making process, and staff cohesiveness is not evident, measurable, or adequate. Relationship between charter school leadership, governing board, and/or authorizer is poorly described. No plan for how timely and accurate data will be submitted. Ideas are disjointed.	The governance structure of the school is described but school staff connections and existing relationships with EMOs or CMOs are not adequately explained. A description of school operations, charter school leaders' decision making process, and staff cohesiveness is present. School board member recruitment process and board governance training are vaguely described. Relationship description between charter school leadership, governing board, and/or authorizers is described but lacks ability to demonstrate lack of conflict of interest. Data submission plan described.	The governance structure of the school is clearly described, articulating connections between school staff, any existing partnerships with EMOs or CMOs are clearly defined. School operations and charter school leaders' decision making process, as well as staff cohesiveness are explained with specificity. The school board member recruitment process is methodically described. Appropriate evidence of a governance training for board members is presented. Relationship description between charter school leadership, governing board, and/or authorizers is clearly described and demonstrates no conflict of interest. Data submission plan described and demonstrates ability to submit timely and accurate data.
Comments: (App pages, Org. chart; 45-51 – section 2; 52-54; Art. Of Inc, pg 5; Art. VIII; & p. 5) 2 - for this portion of application Org. chart and Art. Of Incorporation were not included (as indicated). Explanation lacks continuity for a firm understanding of staff cohesiveness.			

6. Student Recruitment and Admissions Process:

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	Student Recruitment plan description is partial, vague, or unclear. No evidence to show compliance with Indiana code 20-24-5 is offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not	Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with Indiana code 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. Public lottery process is described.	Student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and evidence of compliance with Indiana code 20-24-5 is presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.

	present.		
Comments: 3 – Clearly describes recruitment plan and lottery process.			

7. Meet the Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students:

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Proposal offers partial, vague, or unclear explanation of how school will complete with state and federal law to deliver services to students with disabilities, English learners, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students. Explanation does not seem appropriate, measurable, or adequate.	Proposal presents explanation that may be somewhat unclear to describe how school will comply with state and federal law to deliver appropriate services to students with disabilities, low-income students, English learners, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students. Explanation is generally, but not fully, appropriate, measurable, or adequate.	The proposal demonstrates how the school will comply with state and federal law to deliver appropriate services to students with disabilities, low-income students, English learners, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students. Specific evidence to support the above mentioned areas is present.
Comments: (App. Pgs. 12 -15; 25-36) 3 – very extensive explanation of service to students with disabilities and ELL, does not discuss homeless, low-income or neglected and delinquent students. Selected three due to extensive discussion of SPED and ELL services.			

8. Community Outreach Activities:

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	Evidence of parent, student, and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague, or unclear.	Evidence of parent, student, and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully appropriate.	Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, students, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented.
Comments: 2 – there is mention of a Parent Advisory Council for continual improvement, but other interaction with parents and community refer to providing information to them on the school or allowing/expecting their involvement with student grades, behavior, field trips, etc.			

9. Fiscal Management Plan:

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record

cited.	maintenance is partial, vague, or unclear. Explanation for charter school leadership responsibility for grant does not seem appropriate or adequate. Minimal or disjointed explanation for how state and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement is offered.	described. The grant management process is described. Charter school leaders are mentioned as responsible for the grant but explanation does not seem fully adequate. A description for how other state and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement is described but not fully adequate.	maintenance is clearly articulated. The grant management process is clearly defined. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all aspects of the grants and not the CMO/EMO. A sufficient description for how other state and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement is provided.
Comments: 1 –Internal controls and record maintenance are well defined, but application does not describe specific responsibility and management of this grant.			

10. Facilities:

0	**1**	**2**	**3**
No description provided or cited.	A vague or unclear school facility plan is presented, and does not incorporate student enrollment's impact on facility needs. Transportation plan is mentioned but does not seem appropriate or adequate.	A generally appropriate school facility plan is presented, mentioned student enrollment and an adequate explanation of how student enrollment impacts facility needs. A transportation plan is described but may or may not be appropriate for student needs.	An appropriate and thorough school facility plan is presented, including how student enrollment impacts facility needs. A transportation plan appropriate for the school's student needs is presented. If transportation is not aligned with the needs of the school, this should be explained.
Comments: 1 – does not describe how enrollment impacts needs of facility, particularly in terms of the satellite learning areas where teachers and students meet for educational purposes.			

11. Signed Charter School Assurances:

0	6
No signed assurances provided that the authorizer, charter school developer, staff, and management organizations will fully comply with the stated activities within the sub grant and employ appropriate internal controls to manage the grant.	Signed assurances are provided that the authorizer, charter school developer, staff, and management organizations will fully comply with the stated activities within the sub grant and employ appropriate internal controls to manage the grant.
Comments: 6	

Total Points (Out of 57):_____33____

Competitive Preference Points (+ Up to 3): ___2_____

Total Score (Out of 57): __35__