

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

**Name of Applicant: Level UP**  
**Overall Ranking: 23.3 out of 71**

<b>OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b> Applicant opts not to address this element, OR narrative does not focus upon any of the designated priority areas (Early Childhood, Postsecondary, or Rural)	<b>1 point</b> Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	<b>2 points</b> Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	<b>3 points</b> Area of focus is clearly defined and <i>all three</i> elements fully addressed: (1) Expected targets and outcomes are clearly described; (2) Targets/outcomes are supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and accessible goals; and (3) Unique populations are clearly defined and described
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>1</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> The area of focus ( <b>postsecondary</b> ) exceeded the 2-page limit (pages 21-24), thus excluding this section from being considered for a 3-point ranking. The application notes that the school will target students who are underserved. The narrative supporting a unique population is broad and makes general assumptions around local high school graduation data trends. While goals are stated, they appear general in nature and do not have specific measurable outcomes (pages 23-24). Quantitative and qualitative data were not found to support reasonable targets.			

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1-2 points</b> Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <i>1 point per element</i>	<b>3-5 points</b> At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <i>1 point per element</i>	<b>6 points (1 point per element)</b> <i>All six elements are fully developed and described. (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College &amp; Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</i>
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>2.5</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> The applicant fully describes its vision, but does not fully develop or describe nearly all of the remaining elements. The narrative would be strengthened by addressing the current academic achievement in Elkhart County and the academic needs of its community, identifying and discussing its curriculum framework and how it aligns to Indiana State Standards. Key terms such as blended learning, competency based learning, and college and career planning were noted as instructional models; however, explicit curriculum used to drive instruction aligned to the Indiana State Standards was not noted in the proposal (pg. 30 & 31). The narrative also fails to specifically address students with disabilities or English learners, and does not fully describe how its educational model would develop students' 21 <sup>st</sup> century skills; it is unclear how the partnership with Greencroft is integrated into the school model. The sustainability beyond CSP funding is not addressed.			
<b>2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)</b>			

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 = **1.8**

**Comments:**

The applicant identifies their founder and CEO, who bring strong qualifications and years of practice, but does not document any previous experience in founding a new school or in high school level experiences. Data supporting the school leader's track record of success was not provided. Other key personnel relative to the development of this charter school, most notably board members and their relevant expertise, have not been described in this narrative.

**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 = **2.3**

**Comments:**

Three goals were stated. Metrics were aligned to State academic requirements but were not measurable and did not offer a path for progress monitoring against the goal itself. (pg 35-40). The goals are written as "all" statements (i.e., a 100% success rate) with no specific timelines for the measurement of these data. While ideal, it is may not reflect an attainable goal.

The goal statements have partial and/or unclear information. They could be strengthened by identifying target percentages of completion of each goal and identifying the specific student population that will achieve the completion (e.g., 9<sup>th</sup> graders, graduates, 11<sup>th</sup> graders, etc.).

There is not a goal explicitly aligned to a State content assessment of their 10<sup>th</sup> grade students (only summit learning, NWEA, and AP exams). Academic outcomes of all grade levels are captured in the school wide goal of credit tracking.

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

<p><b>0 points</b>          Communication plan regarding goals not</p>	<p><b>1 point</b>          A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students</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</p>
--	--	--

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

addressed	but not to families)	articulated with specificity
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 0		
<p>Comments:          This section asks applicants to describe their communication plan for sharing school goals with various stakeholders (staff, students, families). This was not addressed by the applicant.</p>		

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

**A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal (up to 4 points, for Part A)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2-3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>
<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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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 &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>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .5

Comments:  
 The proposal provides a very underdeveloped and vague narrative of the expected budget, with no totals presented to compare to the budget worksheet. The attached budget worksheet lacks details on some line items where the IDOE anticipated more specifics. It is difficult to ascertain how much of the CSP grant will be used on what expenditures. (Applicant did not use IDOE’s budget template that requires line item descriptors.)

The CSP grant is only embedded into the Planning Year (purple tab) vs the narrative which states it will take three years for the school to be sustainable. Line 18 in the budget does not include the needed funds from the CSP grant. It does not appear that the CSP grant, plus other revenue sources, will cover debits in Year 1. The applicant notes that sustainability will occur in Year 3, if all indicators in the budget are met. However, based upon information presented, that does not appear reasonable. The Year 4 budget is based on 300 students, yet the narrative states the expected enrollment will be 225 (pg 15).

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>
<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 = 0

Comments:

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

The applicant's narrative response (focused on "Opportunity Culture") is unclear and does not adequately describe how the proposed CSP program will be sustained beyond the grant funding period.	
<b>C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary</b> (up to 1 point, for Part C)	
<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>
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 = .5	
Comments: In the absence of the required budget line-item details, reviewers cannot fully determine whether or not all costs are reasonable.	

<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)	
A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. <b>If the school uses an EMO/CMO, applicant also must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected</b>	
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 = 2.5	
Comments: Reviewers collectively viewed the applicant's responses to items D and E as satisfactory. The remaining items were not adequately addressed and, therefore, did not generate full scoring points. For example: <i>Item C:</i> the applicant provides details of two board members being identified but does not explain <i>how</i> they were identified or the <i>process</i> that will be used to identify and select additional members. <i>Item F:</i> the applicant displays State reporting timelines but provides no details as to <i>who</i> will ensure IDOE, authorizer and federal reports are prepared, <i>verified for accuracy</i> , and submitted on a <i>timely</i> basis.	

<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.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3			
Comments: The narrative includes reference to the development of a strategic enrollment plan, but no plan is explicitly described in the application (beyond the applicant's intent to work with Indianapolis charter			

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

schools and a marketing firm). Evidence is included to suggest compliance with IC 20-24-5, though there is no description of the public lottery process or its expectations.

**7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (Up to 6 Points)**

<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>          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.</p>	<p><b>3-4 points</b>          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.</p>	<p><b>5-6 points</b>  <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></p>
--	---	---	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.5**

Comments:  
 Applicant groups all students into an “at-risk” category and offers general strategies, but does not completely or sufficiently address each subgroup specified in the application and scoring rubric (e.g., homeless, N/D). Points were awarded based on the general strategies/contracted services and references to students with disabilities, EL students, and low- and high-achieving students. However, even within these identified groups details were lacking. For example: How will the needs of SpEd students be identified and IEPs monitored? Will targeted instruction be provided to EL students? Will WIDA testing be used?

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

<p><b>0 points</b>          No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p><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</p>	<p><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</p>	<p><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</p>
--	--	---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **.8**

Comments:  
 Applicant offers information on how parents will be involved once the school is open (e.g., in the development of their student’s learning plans and pathway/college decisions) but does not describe how parents or community are involved in the planning and design of the school. Teachers’ involvement in the planning/design is not described.

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

**A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for 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 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</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b>          A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated</p>
--	---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:  
 Applicant describes SBOA required standards and identifies an expectation of controls and documentation but does not clearly describe a plan or process for adhering to the standards.

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

Delegation of responsibilities was not outlined, nor did the proposal identify an entity or outside agency to ensure fidelity to SBOA policies.		
<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 = <b>.8</b>		
Comments: Explicit detail was not provided for managing this CSP grant. Expectations, roles, and responsibilities for creating the budget, overseeing and expending grant dollars were not addressed.		
<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 = <b>.5</b>		
Comments: The applicant's response does not go beyond stating that the school will become sustainable by using other funds. In the absence of the identification of such funds, the applicant has not addressed the question.		

<b>10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION</b> (Up to 3 Points)			
<b>0 points</b> Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	<b>1 point</b> <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	<b>2 points</b> <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	<b>3 points</b> 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 = <b>.5</b>			
Comments: Narrative was incomplete and did not address the three elements required for this particular portion of the grant. Applicant is still developing its facility and transportation plan and does not address how enrollment will impact facility needs. Preparation for school safety was noted (involving stakeholders and training) to ensure student safety.			

<b>11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES</b> (Up to 3 Points)			
<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
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>0</b>			

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

Comments:  
 Required signatures were not provided.

<b>12. REQUIRED APPENDICES</b>		<b>(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) <small>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</small>	
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. <small>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</small>	
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 = <b>3.5</b>		
Comments: Reviewers collectively awarded points for Items C, F and H (not yet required for new school).		

<b>13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL</b>				<b>(Up to 3 Points)</b>
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	
Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.	Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence. OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.	Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Generally, information was easily located.	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.	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>2.3</b>				
Comments: Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations.				

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
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority	3	1
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	2.5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	1.8
3A. Charter School Goals	7	2.3
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	0
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	.5
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	0
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	.5
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	2.5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	1.3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	1.5
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	.8
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	.8
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	.5
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	.5
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	0
12. Required Appendices	8	3.5
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.3
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>23.3</b>