

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

**Name of Applicant: Mays Community Academy**  
**Overall Ranking: 55.3 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>2.3</b>			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The competitive preference priority areas are both <b>rural</b> and <b>early childhood</b> (pg. 17 &amp; 21). Using a slow growth model, the applicant will expand its existing PK-6 model into a PK-8 by adding middle school grade levels (Grade 7 in fall 2019; and Grade 8 in 2020). The unique population of Mays Academy and Rush County was captured using demographic data. With the exception of ISTEP (ILEARN) targets, a clear plan for measuring target outcomes, using qualitative and or quantitative data, was not fully developed.</p>			

**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.  <b>1 point per element</b>	<b>3-5 points</b> At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <b>1 point per element</b>	<b>6 points (1 point per element)</b> <i>All six elements are fully developed and described.</i> (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>4.5</b>			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a clear vision for the school, centering on a rural-focused place-based approach that develops strong character through community based initiatives (pg. 24). The communication plan includes a variety of approaches, but does not describe frequency or a formalized plan for on-going and specific communication with all stakeholders (pg. 24 &amp; 25). The curriculum framework cites and outlines the rural-focused place-based pedagogy method, but does not expand on curriculum development or formative assessments used to drive instruction. Specific strategies, aligned to Indiana academic standards, for increasing the learning of all students (including students with disabilities and English learners) and to improve 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning occur as MCA students become stewards of their environments to make their rural community a better place. Purchases through the CPS grant will be used for startup and one time purchases only.</p>			
<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 = **4.8**

**Comments:**

The board has a varied background encompassing community, business, and school leadership. The leadership team has strong foundations in early childhood, however, bios and resumes reflected in the application and narrative did not have supporting evidence related to expertise in middle school studies—the area for expansion. (Extensive bios are present in the school's charter application, beginning on pg. 72.) While the school has only been under the State's accountability system for one year, the school has earned a rating of a B, although proficiency rates on assessments are not yet strong.

**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 = **5.3**

**Comments:**

The application includes four goals, with one aligned to increased achievement on Statewide testing (ISTEP/ILEARN). The applicant's goal for statewide testing does not include all eligible grade levels served under the grant's perimeters (only includes 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade during the third year of the CPS grant). With other goals, the measurement method is unclear as to how the goal will be reached (e.g., How will "highly qualified" be determined?).

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

<p><b>0 points</b>          Communication plan regarding goals not addressed</p>	<p><b>1 point</b>          A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)</p>	<p><b>2 points</b>          A communication plan that has been well thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders (staff, students, families) has been articulated with specificity</p>
--	---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.3**

**Comments:**

The application provides a limited communication plan regarding the school's goals. Specifics such as frequency of communication, person responsible for communication, specific stakeholders (staff, students, families) to be addressed, and dates around corresponding communication were not

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

adequately explained.

**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><b>OR</b>, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>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 = 3**

**Comments:**  
 The budget narrative includes descriptors of items for purchase. Some items (while identified by the applicant as supporting their goals) have not been addressed within the proposal itself (e.g., the small bus described on pg. 31). The budget narrative does not address Year 3, which in the budget template allocates \$300,000 for the “set-up” of 8<sup>th</sup> grade (which expanded in Year 2 and is addressed within the narrative, pg. 31), additional infrastructure supports for the building, and additional technology. The sustainability tab is not completed.

**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 = .5**

**Comments:**  
 The explanation of how the school will develop and maintain the program after the grant concludes is not fully described. A majority of the school’s CPS proposed budget consists of items that will depreciate or require maintenance both during and after the term of the grant (technology, bus, textbooks, etc.). The school narrative does not provide a monetary projection for maintenance and replacement. The school’s plan for continuation of the CPS proposal is based solely on general fund dollars; supporting grants such as Title II, TAG, and Title III were also not considered as part of the sustainability plan for Goal #2- Highly Qualified Staff.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>
<p>Many costs appear either unreasonable, or unallowable, or unnecessary (as they cannot be directly tied to activities or personnel described within the</p>	<p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>

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

applicant's proposal narratives)	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1</b>	
Comments: Costs appear reasonable, allocable and necessary.	

**5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)**

<b>Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)</b>	
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.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.3</b>	
Comments: All required elements are adequately described, with the exception of Item C where greater detail was needed regarding the applicant's process to select board members.	

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Student recruitment plan description is partial, vague or unclear. Evidence to show compliance with IC 20-24-5 is not offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not present.	Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. A public lottery process is adequately described.	A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and there is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.8</b>			
Comments: The narrative in this proposal is vague. Although referenced in the school's charter application, the applicant's recruitment plan is not adequately conveyed. There is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented and an appropriate public lottery process is described.			

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate.	Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups.	<i>All five student groups are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); <u>and</u> the applicant descriptions are viewed as exemplary, demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).</i>
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.3</b>			

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

**Comments:**  
 The narrative minimally addresses the subgroups noted (required) in this section—and references the charter application as the source for greater detail. Applicant identifies applicable laws and resources available but does not adequately or clearly describe the services available to support subgroups, most notably EL, homeless, or N/D students.

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

<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	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 = 2.5**

**Comments:**  
 The charter was developed and organized by community members, but limited evidence was provided about the involvement of parents, teachers and the community in the planning and design of the expansion into the middle school grade levels.

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

**A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)**

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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:**  
 Building-level financial responsibilities were listed in the application. Internal controls to ensure ethical practices and spending were not noted. Internal Controls and processes are adequately described, although internal controls to ensure ethical practices were not described.

**B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)**

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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 = 1.3**

**Comments:**  
 Personnel responsible for grant implementation are listed (most notably the school’s director). Processes are not fully developed for tracking expenditures.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter	Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student	Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement

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

Application	achievement
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>1.8</b>	
<b>Comments:</b> The applicant identifies ADM state funding and federal Title I monies as the resources that will support sustainability beyond grant funding. Other funding resources, directly related to anticipated CSP-funded initiatives (e.g., highly effective teachers) are not specified, such as: Title II, Title III, Title IV, and Special Education Part B 611 and 619.	

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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 = **2.3**

**Comments:**  
 Transportation is offered through the local school corporation and CSP funding will provide a 10-passenger bus for use by afterschool clubs, athletics, and homeless student transportation. School safety provisions are in place. How enrollment impacts facility needs is not fully articulated.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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 by the applicant.

**12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)**

<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 = **7**

**Comments:**  
 Reviewers did not find evidence that the applicant's Safety Plan was submitted to the SBE (Item H).

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

<b>13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (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>2.5</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> Information followed the requested sequence and stayed within the required page limitations.			

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

<b>Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers</b>
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority	3	2.3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	4.5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	4.8
3A. Charter School Goals	7	5.3
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.3
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	.5
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.3
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	1.8
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	3.3
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.5
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.8
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.3
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.8
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	7
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>55.3</b>