

Name of Applicant: James & Rosemary Phalen Elementary School
Overall Ranking: 62.9 out of 71

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)			
0 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)	1 point Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	2 points Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	3 points 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 = 0			
Comments: Applicant did not apply for competitive preference priority.			

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2 points Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element	3-5 points At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element	6 points (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: Applicant provides school’s vision statement. Need is based on a severely underserved area on the far eastside of Indianapolis, with schools that continually score D-F in the State’s accountability system. Applicant engages extensively with the community and already has a community network of over 500 families (p. 12). Phalen intends to follow a proven PLA RESTORE model as its curricular framework. Starting with mastery of core skills, the use of formative assessment and data-driven decisions, differentiated instruction, individualized daily intervention, one-to-one, small group and personalized learning will engage students and address needs of all learners. Technology, including adaptive software, will also support student learning. Students are coached to grow critical thinking skills, responsibility and problem-solving through project-based, hands-on learning opportunities. They also work with teacher/mentors. Students will participate in college visits and connect to mentors from participating colleges (p. 17). Grant dollars will be used to embed foundational systems and processes that will require very little capital to sustain. They will also be used for one-time costs, i.e., furniture, hardware and software, and staff iPads (p. 18).			

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>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program</p>	<p>3-4 points Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program</p>	<p>5-6 points 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.</p>
--	--	---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5

Comments:

Key personnel are identified by name and position/responsibilities and display strong qualifications aligned to program needs. *Annual Performance Report* data demonstrates strong improvement (from school grades of D to A and F to B) at all schools following the PLA RESTORE framework.

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>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points 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>3-5 points 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>6-7 points 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.</p>
--	---	--	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.6

Comments:

Phalen has three academic goals that are specific and measurable. Two are focused on math and reading scores on ILEARN (pp. 21-22). Goal 1 does not establish the metric by which a year and a quarter of growth will be measured. Implementation Year 2 requests \$58,000+ for STEM implementation. However, there are no goals aligned to STEM success.

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

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

Staff is aware of goals through training, meetings, school communications, newsletters, and a data wall in the office. Students will see posters and will always know what goals they are working towards individually. Families will receive information communications from the school, shared student portfolios, family events, and weekly report cards. The community will be aware of goals through meetings, open houses, and roundtables (pp. 22-23).

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

A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal (up to 4 points, for Part A)			
<p>0 points</p> <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>1 point</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>2-3 points</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>4 points</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>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4</p> <p>Comments: An extremely detailed budget narrative supports the Budget Worksheet line items and the associated costs. The Planning Year request does not exceed \$300K and the overall budget does not exceed \$900K. Descriptors are provided for line items. Applicant may wish to review item in Year 1 Implementation; there is a request for 61 laptops, but only one security cart which holds 36 laptops (Line 4).</p>			
B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B)			
<p>0 Points</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>1 Point</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>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1</p> <p>Comments: Applicant articulates and describes how costs will be sustained after grant implementation within narrative as well as the Budget Implementation Worksheet. Careful attention has been paid to ensure the sustainability of staff after all grant funds have been allocated.</p>			
C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C)			
<p>0 Points</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>1 Point</p> <p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>	
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .5</p> <p>Comments: All costs appear reasonable and necessary. Some reviewers questioned whether or not administrative staff salaries are allowable during Implementation Years 1 and 2.</p>			
5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)			
<p>Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)</p>			

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

A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. If the school uses an EMO/CMO, 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. IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.6
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The governing board holds accountability for the performance of the school. Board responsibilities include academic performance management, budgeting, financial oversight, authorizer accountability reporting, and facility support. The school principal reports to the board and is responsible for instructional leadership, coaching and fostering a performance-based culture centered around student outcomes (p. 28).</p> <p>School leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and collaborate with school leaders from other PLA schools during weekly team calls (p. 28). The school leader meets with the school leadership team twice weekly where student-centered decision making occurs (p. 28). A Coaching Cycle system helps teachers improve so that they can meet the needs of students (p. 29).</p> <p>A Board is already in place with members who reflect the community’s diversity. New members are invited as openings occur (p. 29).</p> <p>Governance training is ongoing and includes orientation, the online e-learning platform, school visits and classroom observations, review of data and guest speakers (p. 30).</p> <p>Phalen is an autonomous entity with its own corporation number. School leaders make decisions on supplemental service providers. Board members abide by a clear conflict of interest policy (p. 30). The central office will ensure timely and accurate reporting. Functional teams for development, compliance, finance and operations use real time collaborative tools to ensure the central office has the most up to date information for reports (p. 30).</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 = 3			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Phalen utilizes personal phone calls and automated outbound calls to share information on the new school. Enrollment packages are mailed to interested families who live out of the local school area. Phalen circulates flyers and posters around the school campuses of PLA school and in highly visible</p>			

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

locations around the community. Lastly, they host community engagement events to provide an overview of the school to community members (p. 31). If enrollment exceeds capacity, a public lottery system and waitlist will be used with identified exemptions.

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 = **5.6**

Comments:
 Phalen commits to providing a FAPE for students with disabilities in their least restrictive environment. Most students with IEPs at Phalen will be included with their peers in general education classrooms. About 11% spend less than 40% of the school day with their general ed peers due to their needs. RTI is followed to identify students who need support beyond what the general education teacher can provide. They follow the prescribed format for identifying students for special education services (p. 32). Low-Income Students, which are a majority of the students served, will be supported by highly qualified staff using the prescribed instructional model designed to meet their needs. Title I funds will also be used to support interventions. Teachers will receive training on partnering with families and offer after school and summer programs to extend the school year (pp. 33-34). For EL students, teachers will receive training and use bi-lingual models to bridge gaps (p. 34). Homeless students will be supported through customized educational services. A school liaison will be actively engaged to meet educational and other needs for homeless students. PLA RESTORE has embedded supports that cater to the needs of homeless students (p. 34). Neglected and Delinquent Students will receive support through the use of Title I, Part D funds for extensive academic and social-emotional support. The funds will also ensure that teachers receive training specific to meeting the needs of this population (p. 35).

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:
 Phalen has a comprehensive community outreach plan that includes open houses, one-on-one parent meetings, dad and mom days and distribution of a FAQ document. A Community Engagement Team ensures that families are aware of upcoming changes. Several informal means are used to engage parents such as inviting parents to help students in the classroom; go on field trips; and attend events celebrating student accomplishments (pp. 36-37). Teachers are required to have 100% parent participation—a lofty goal. Specific community partnerships are not yet developed, however the applicant has included a discussion of plans for those partnerships.

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 = 1.6

Comments:
 Phalen has an existing process that is clear, consistently followed and aligned with financial reporting requirements of all State entities. They follow generally acceptable accounting principles which include: authorization and approval for expenditures, segregation of duties control for expenditures, payroll and benefits controls for expenditures, expense report controls for expenditures, general operating expenses controls for expenditures, and review and reconciliation for expenditures (pp. 37-38). The Chief Financial Officer oversees the process, but a third-party provider manages payroll and all checks are signed by the CEO. They have an established procedure for records retention, inventory, and reconciliation of financial records (p. 38).

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 = 2

Comments:
 Applicant fully describes the grant management plan, including decision-making, budgeting and tracking purchases.

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:
 Basic State funding will cover core educational costs (personnel, curriculum) once grant funds end. Indianapolis-based funding partners like Glick Foundation, The Mind Trust and the Central Indiana Community Foundation are cited to provide additional funding. The development team is always looking for additional funding opportunities (p. 38). The Budget Sustainability year worksheet details sustainability plans.

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 = 3

Comments:

Phalen will be located in the empty half of the building that currently houses the Phalen Middle School. It will be able to house 300 students in the launch year and has 10+ acres, a cafeteria, gymnasium, auditorium, front office, conference room, commercial kitchen, 40 classrooms, 34 restrooms and 8 interior courtyards. It was renovated in 2017 and is ADA compliant. The building is currently in use and has passed all safety and building code inspections. A further description of how the décor will support student learning is provided (p. 39). Phalen will contract with Miller Transportation to provide bus service to approximately 190 students. It is positioned as a neighborhood school and is a walkable distance for many students (p. 41).

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: Authorizer signature is on page 2; project contact person and board president signatures are at the end of the Assurances on page 5.

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) <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 = 8

Comments: All anticipated appendices elements are provided by the applicant.

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: This is a very organized and thorough application. It followed the prescribed format and did not exceed the 30-page limit.</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	0 Did not apply
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5
3A. Charter School Goals 3B. Goals Communication Plan	7	4.6
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	4
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	5.6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	5.6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.6
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	2
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	3
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	62.9