

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

Name of Applicant: Invent Learning Lab
Overall Ranking: 64.8 out of 71

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points	1 point	2 points	3 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)	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 = .8			
Comments: As an FYI, one of the four reviewers awarded points on the basis of the applicant’s descriptive, ongoing Pathways model strategies to support student’s post-secondary success (hence partial points awarded here). The applicant, however, will not serve high school students and technically does not qualify for post-secondary competitive preference priority points.			

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points	1-2 points	3-5 points	6 points (1 point per element)
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. 1 point per element	At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 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 21 st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 6			
Comments: The vision for the school was well defined. The applicant demonstrated community need and its input in developing the school. The charter application was developed in collaboration with the Twin Aire neighborhood, on the southeast side of Indianapolis, and aligns to the Southeast Neighborhood Quality of Life Plan. The applicant documented the lack of quality schooling options in the proposed target area. The proposed curriculum is evidence-based and aligned to Indiana standards. A design thinking block will integrate subjects with real world issues and community partnerships. Students will spend 6-8 weeks on design projects, and that are multi-aged and individualized. Students with disabilities will be supported by certified special educators, two teachers in each classroom and personalized learning plans. EL students will benefit from a dedicated EL teacher. The school has also selected social and emotional curriculum, as well as the Pathways post-secondary readiness curriculum. Formative assessments have been described, as well as plans for addressing the needs of diverse learners. Funds requested are for start-up related costs, including initial trainings, planning year staffing, supplies and equipment. Ongoing position costs will be funded through per pupil funding. Professional development will be funded by Title I, II and III funds as enrollment increases. The budget will include an annual reserve dedicated to replacement and technology costs.			

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

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (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	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 REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.5

Comments:

Proposed staff appears well-qualified and have appropriate experience and expertise to start a school, although only the CEO and Director are described in depth. The advisory committee reflects diverse backgrounds and includes neighborhood representation. Team members are diverse and represent organizations/people that are known to be impactful in an at-risk community (p.34). Several research-based practices are provided, such as an extended school day, focus on STEM, access to technology, two teachers in each classroom, personalized learning practices, high quality math and reading platforms, continuous assessments, and a focus on 21st century skills. The Mind Trust fellowship has given the school leadership an opportunity to develop start-up plans and set up operational systems.

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)

0 points	1-2 points	3-5 points	6-7 points
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 MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment to be scored within the 6-7 point range.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 6.5

Comments:

Goals are well defined, rigorous (attainable) and measurable. The five identified goals reflect academic, family engagement and college/career readiness. Goals also include the State assessment (ILEARN) and one focused on reading achievement (iReady). Pages 35-36.

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

0 points	1 point	2 points
Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	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 = 2

Comments:

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

A well-defined plan was presented to communicate goals to stakeholders through multiple communication platforms. School leadership will communicate goals to teachers and share progress updates. Parents, families and staff will receive information through email, data boards and notifications during events. Teachers will share goals with students. The board will receive a monthly update to monitor progress toward these goals. (Page 36)

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	1 point	2-3 points	4 points
<p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p>OR, 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>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3.8**

Comments:

A budget narrative describes all subject lines. Expenditures are aligned to school goals and building the capacity of teachers to meet student needs. CSP funds are designated for start-up costs. Planning year is under \$300K and the entire grant request is less than \$900K.

The CEO and Head of Curriculum positions are fully funded by the grant in the planning year. A lead teacher will be paid during the planning year to plan the school's curriculum and assist with hiring. Personnel costs in Years 1-3 are absorbed by the general operating budget.

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

0 Points	1 Point
<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>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **.8**

Comments:

The applicant will use CSP for start-up costs only and as enrollment grows these expenditures will be absorbed into the school's operating budget, and when appropriate, funded by Title I or Title II funds. Personnel costs in Years 1-3 will be absorbed by the general operating budget.

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

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

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
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>All costs appear reasonable and necessary for the start-up of a school. They are all allowable under the CSP guidelines. In the planning year, 73% of the funding goes to personnel and benefits to prepare for the school's opening through work considered essential for the school's success.</p>	

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 also 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.	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>ILH is a non-profit governed by a Board of Directors and functions within its Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and Indiana state law. Board members will recruit new members, as well as from community members serving on committees. A governance committee will review all potential board members, including reviewing skill sets and needs of the board. Current board members have been trained through Charter Board Partners. The board and school leadership will develop an onboarding process for new members. School leaders have decision-making responsibility for school operations, academic excellence and financial management. Staff will have weekly time after early release to engage in PD. Additional time is built into their day for collaboration, data analysis and lesson planning.</p> <p>The school will not use an EMO, but will contract for services to assist with State reporting. A reporting calendar has been established to ensure timely reporting. The school also anticipates using Power School to manage student data and help with reporting. (pages 42-44)</p>	

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

0 points	1 point	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.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.5			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Recruitment plans were well defined, including neighborhood partnerships, Enroll Indy and community</p>			

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

events. A marketing campaign will begin in Fall of 2018. Spanish language materials and translators will also be utilized for marketing materials and events. The school’s plan is in compliance with IC 20-24-5. The lottery process will be conducted in partnership with Enroll Indy. The school has not finalized its lottery process but indicates a desire to give priority to students living in proximity and siblings. (Pages 44-45)

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 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>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5.8**

Comments:
 The applicant detailed planned services for all five student groups identified in the CSP application. The narrative was complete and in compliance with all requirements for special populations.

 Hiring plans for special education teachers were detailed. The school will provide FRL breakfast and lunch for low-income students, and support low-income students through family engagement activities. The school is also working with a community organization to co-locate wraparound services. Home language surveys will be conducted during enrollment to determine EL services. ILPs will be developed for English Learners.

 The Compass curriculum for social and emotional learning will be utilized building-wide, but will be especially helpful to students who are homeless, neglected or delinquent. An onsite counselor also will be available to support students as needed. (pages 45-46)

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1 point	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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:
 The applicant clearly demonstrated community need and its input in developing the school. The charter application was developed in collaboration with the Twin Aire neighborhood, on the southeast side of Indianapolis, and aligns to the Southeast Neighborhood Quality of Life Plan. Examples included: quality preschool, before and after school programming, parental programming, and improving workforce skills. (Pages 46-47)

 Area managers were surveyed to determine skill deficits in the workforce. Parents were surveyed and invited to share ideas about the school’s plans. This proposal demonstrates intentional efforts and actions to involve parents, teachers, and the community the planning and design of the charter school.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.8**

Comments:
 The school will follow the guidance of the State Board of Accounts for controls and record keeping and leaders plan to contract with the Center for Innovate Education Solutions to establish business practices. Board-determined signature thresholds will be required for large purchases. At least three individuals will be involved in each transaction to ensure segregation of duties.

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 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 = **1.8**

Comments:
 The initial budget was developed by the CEO and Head of Curriculum, with input from the finance committee and finance consultant. The school leader will be responsible for managing the budget using accounting software (for tracking purchases). All purchases and reimbursement must be approved by the CEO and office manager. The Board will receive updates on the budget at regular meetings. (Page 48)

C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)

0 Points	1 Point	2 Points
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:
 A plan is in place for sustaining the grant expenses after their CSP funding expires. Costs will be absorbed by State funds, as well as other federal funding sources. Special education and Title III funds will be utilized for staffing and accommodations. Title 1 funds will be used for teacher capacity building and family engagement. SPED funding and Title I funds will expand personnel.

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)

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

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
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 = **2.5**

Comments:

A facility has yet to be identified, but the school has identified its facility needs and conducted a market search. A temporary location may be used until 2020 or 2021. They plan to start with 300 students and add a grade level each year until capacity is reached. The school has utilized the State's suggested safety plan, and will modify plans when a final facility is secured. The school plans to provide transportation to students within a 2-3 mile radius of the school, for those without reliable transportation. It is expected that most students should be within walking distance from the building.

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

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
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	All three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments: All required signatures were provided (See pages 11 and 14).

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) *or* Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)
- B. Budget Worksheet
- C. Most recent *Expanded Annual Performance Report* (IDOE Compass)
NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).
- D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, or 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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **8**

Comments: All anticipated appendices items were attached.

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>0 points Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.</p>	<p>1point Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence. OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.</p>	<p>2 points Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Generally, information was easily located.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</p>			
<p>Comments: The application was well organized, clearly written and within the page limit parameters. All attachments were provided and well-organized.</p>			

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optional Competitive Preference Priority 	3	.8 DNA
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5.5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6.5
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3.8
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	.8
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.5
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	5.8
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.8
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.8
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	2
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.5
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
TOTAL POINTS	71 Total Points Possible	64.8