

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

Name of Applicant: Otwell Miller Academy
Overall Ranking: 41.6 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 = 1.3			
Comments: Applicant provided an overview of the rural setting (unique population), but did not establish expected targets/outcomes supported by qualitative or quantitative data/specific measurable and accessible goals. Its focus area is to better develop 21 st century skills and to prepare students to be college and career ready, as broadly-described within the narrative.			

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 = 4			
Comments: Applicant did not fully address Items 1b (Need/Communication Plan), 1c (Curriculum Framework/Evidence), 1d (Strategies to Support All Learners), and 1e (21 st Century Skills/CCR), but other elements were more fully described. For example: Item 1d provides a general focus on students meeting State standards but is missing specifics as to how they will help all students reach those standards, most notably students with disabilities or English learners.			

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2 points Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	3-4 points Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	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.

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.3
Comments: Key personnel are identified and the group has a strong education background. There does not seem to be anyone listed with Federal grant background, Special Education or ELL background, or background in opening a new school.

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 No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	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.)	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.	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.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5

Comments:
Applicant set three measurable goals, including a goal aligned to State assessments: 80% will pass State content assessments by Year 3; Discipline referral will decrease by 10% each year; and applicant will demonstrate a 90% student retention rate by Year 3 (supported by several action steps). Goal for applicant's competitive preference priority is not described.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1

Comments:
Applicant clearly outlined a plan for gathering feedback and collecting data, but its goals communication plan was not fully addressed (to ensure staff, students, and families are aware of CSP goals).

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 No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal. OR, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.	1 point Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal. Several discrepancies exist	2-3 points Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal.	4 points Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives. The combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget</i>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	Most combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<i>Summary</i> worksheet totals. 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.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3

Comments:

Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague, or unclear. More detail is needed in the narrative to discern within reason what is in the budget worksheet. Identical costs for iPads, new curricular materials and playground equipment is budgeted for both CSP program years.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 0

Comments:

Evidence of a plan for sustainability beyond grant years was not demonstrated. How will costs covered by CPS grant funds be sustained when grant funding ends?

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

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

Comments:

Nearly all costs appear reasonable. Line items in "Other" category could use clarity or separation into smaller, more distinct line items within the "Other" category.

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.
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 = 5.3

Comments:

Areas where reviewers felt more detail was needed to earn full points were in Items A, C and F.

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

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 = **2.3**

Comments:

Recruitment plan is effectively described (e.g., radio, TV, newspaper, businesses, town hall, social media). Lottery process needs more elaboration in narrative section. A reference to “prioritize diversity” raised concerns, as public charter schools are not permitted to discriminate on the basis of race, gender, etc.).

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 = **1**

Comments:

Students with disabilities were addressed and EL students mentioned; however the applicant did not directly address the remaining, required student subgroups, i.e., low-income, homeless, neglected & delinquent students.

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:

Clear involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented. Examples include: continued, open communication between the school, parents and community; weekly parent information meetings at various community locations; summer family-staff events; community involvement in planning curriculum and field activities; and parent/community volunteer opportunities). It is evident that community involvement is viewed as an essential piece of this school’s instructional efforts.

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:
 A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures (with board approval) and record maintenance is articulated.

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 = **1.3**

Comments:
 Multi-tiered approval process described. Decision-making process was not fully developed. It was noted that the administrative assistant will track all purchases. Since this individual also serves as the board treasurer, this may pose a potential conflict of interest (segregation of duties)

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 = **.6**

Comments:
 Minimal description stating federal and State grants will provide coverage; lacking specifics/examples.

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)

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	One 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	Two 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 three 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 = **1.3**

Comments:
 The applicant's transportation plan was clearly provided (20 mile radius and two buses). Safety and security of facility was not addressed; how enrollment impacts facility needs was minimally articulated.

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

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	<i>All</i> three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 0			
Comments: Required signatures not provided (although assurances were attached)			

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 = 6	
Comments: No points were awarded for Items A and H (not provided by applicant)	

13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1point	2 points	3 points
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 = 2.3			
Comments: Applicant's proposal narrative presented in requested sequence, following prescribed format, and met page limitation requirements.			

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	1.3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	4
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	3.3
3A. Charter School Goals	7	5
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	1.3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	0
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.3
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	1
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	1.3
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	.6
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	1.3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	0
12. Required Appendices	8	6
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.3
TOTAL POINTS	71 Total Points Possible	41.6