

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

**Name of Applicant: Paramount School of Excellence III (PS3)**  
**Overall Ranking: 59.4 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 = 0			
Comments: Applicant did not apply for competitive preference priority points.			

**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.</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 = 5.8			
Comments: All six elements are fully developed within narratives presented on pages 13-21. Practices proven highly effective within the Paramount model (with A ratings over the past 4 years) will be <b>replicated</b> , and a highly-engaging curriculum with a focus on college & career readiness will support <i>all</i> students' achievement (e.g., STEM, PBL, Math Congress, authentic assessments, community team to support families, Eco Center/Urban Farm, MTSS, Character Ed, mastery of 2 <sup>nd</sup> language → high quality foreign language instruction in a STEM format).			

<b>2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (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> Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	<b>3-4 points</b> Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	<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.  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.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.8			
Comments: Tommy Reddick, Executive Director, oversees the development of PS3 (Paramount III) and has played a role in four different successful charter school startups. Darius Sawyer, a Teach for America alum, Mind Trust Innovation Fellow, MS teacher lead at Phalen Leadership Academy, & former AP for Paramount Brookside (A-rated) is well-prepared to lead PS3 as principal. All key			

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

leadership personnel are described (including board members), detailing their expertise and previous successful experience.

PS3 is a **replication site** of Paramount Brookside (“A” rated since 2013 and recently named a Four-Star School by IDOE). Pass rates far exceed State averages. The applicant’s attached *Annual Performance Report* demonstrates poverty rate of 87.4%, very low expulsion rates, increased enrollments (where minority students are the majority), serving grades K-8. Since the proposed school will serve **grades 5-8**, reviewers also examined APR pass rates (ISTEP) for *middle school-aged students* (2016-17). Grade 7 ELA 85% pass rate (State Average 68%); Gr. 8 ELA 84% pass (State 62%); Gr. 7 Math 77% pass rate (State 52%); and Gr. 8 Math 97% pass (State 53%).

**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)

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-5 points</b>	<b>6-7 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Goal descriptions are partial, vague or unclear; <u>or</u> applicant has only identified one or two goals; <u>and/or</u> goals are not aligned to proposal priorities (e.g., STEM, Early Childhood, etc.)	No less than three specific, measurable goals are identified. Some goals may not appear rigorous. Methods for measuring success toward goals described but may be somewhat unclear. Some key proposal priorities (e.g., STEM) do not have aligned goals.	No less than three specific, measurable goals are clearly described. Academic outcomes of all students (all grade levels served) will be addressed. All goals appear rigorous, yet attainable. Applicant specifies who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurement. Applicant <b>MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment</b> to be scored within the 6-7 point range.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.8**

Comments: Applicant has already set four very high goals within its charter agreement:

- 80% ELA & Math pass rate for EL students on ILEARN
- 70% ELA & Math pass rate for SpEd students on ILEARN
- 90% or higher staff retention rate/excluding extended core teachers
- 100% staff attend at least 3 community functions

Three *additional* goals set specifically for CSP, aligned to grant funding priorities:

- (1) fully staffed with highly qualified 5-8 teachers by Year 2 of CSP funding;
- (2) external evaluation report to IDOE will demonstrate replication of model fidelity; and
- (3) Paramount III school will surpass State averages on ILEARN by the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of replication.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.8**

Comments: Upon notification of CSP grant award, leadership will share goals/expected outcomes with PS3 staff, board members, OEI, community partners, and families via monthly meetings and the school’s website. Multiple, traditional avenues will be used to reach all stakeholders, as well as the use of Matchbook Creative (a marketing firm in Indy) to maximize communications—such as social media outlets, email blasts and yard signs to communicate with the larger community.

**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><b>0 points</b></p> <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><b>1 point</b></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><b>2-3 points</b></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><b>4 points</b></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>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.8</b></p> <p>Comments: Proposal pages 24-25 and applicant's attached <i>Budget Worksheets</i></p> <p>Budget narratives are provided within the proposal and all anticipated budget worksheets (error-free) are attached. <i>Implementation Budget</i> totals agree with <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals. Within its proposed planning budget and implementation budgets for Years 1-2, the applicant adheres to the maximum \$900K total budget.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of funding is dedicated to the <b>recruitment</b> of highly effective staff, i.e., <i>Travel</i> to recruit at job fairs, <i>Contractual</i> (marketing) and <i>Other</i> (signing bonuses &amp; minimal moving cost allowances); <b>salaries/fringe of start-up staff</b> (one-year only for each new hire); and a <b>Year 2 external evaluation</b> (<i>Contractual</i>) to assess the new school's fidelity to the Paramount model. Note that within the <u>Planning Budget</u>, three essential staff members will be hired for ½ year (beginning January 2019) to prepare for 2019-20 opening (registrar, family coordinator, and assistant principal).</p> <p>Notation: The Year 2 budget also includes a <b>\$17K equipment</b> line item. The applicant's budget worksheet rationale indicates the cost is for <i>instructional technologies</i>. The narrative on page 25, however, shows the money will be used to purchase <b>classroom chairs</b> for the new classroom teachers. (This is further substantiated within the budget, as the Vendor identified is <i>Business Furniture</i>.)</p>			
B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B)			
<p><b>0 Points</b></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><b>1 Point</b></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><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1</b></p> <p>Comments: CSP monies carry the brunt of replication start-up costs/costs for new teacher recruitment, hiring start-up staff, one-time furniture costs, and implementing the Paramount model with fidelity. All funded-activities easily maintained via solidly-enrolled grades and, thereby, generated State/general funds by Year 3. (p. 25)</p>			

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

<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 = 1	
Comments: All costs appear reasonable, allocable and necessary—and they all are directly-aligned to CSP proposal activities and goals.	

<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</b> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected	
B. Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together)	
C. Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations	
D. Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective	
E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. <i>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</i>	
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.5	
Comments: All anticipated elements are adequately addressed by the applicant.	

<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 = 3			
Comments: Applicant demonstrates a clearly-articulated, multi-pronged student recruitment plan, providing solid evidence of compliance with Indiana Code expectations (including those applicable for students with disabilities). Paramount is part of Enroll Indy (OneMatch unified enrollment system) and its appropriate public lottery process is fully described. Current students and their siblings have enrollment priority (in compliance with Charter School law in Indiana). A Director of Advancement will market the school to all area students and families and Paramount’s marketing firm (Matchbook Creative) will provide additional marketing and information to perspective parents of students of PS3. Traditional media, school website, community functions (Brookside Bash, TURN Festival, online publications, & social media) will augment recruitment efforts.			

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

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>          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 = 3.3**

**Comments:** Paramount Brookside (the replicated school) has a proven ability to recruit & develop highly qualified staff members fully focused on supporting students with IEPs, medical conditions, and homelessness. Strong relationships with CPS ensure comprehensive communication and support for students/families receiving services via CPS. Title I and a high quality MTSS system of tiered interventions further support individual student needs. PSOE fully implements Indiana's Article 7, McKinney-Vento Act (counselor supports displaced or homeless students), Title I Part C (Migrant) and Title III (EL students given WIDA to identify additional service needs). A social worker provides services to students with disabilities or those navigating poverty. Afterschool care offered on a sliding scale for families navigating poverty/work schedules. It is anticipated that all of these Paramount elements will be replicated at PS3. Though captured via the aforementioned schoolwide initiatives, N/D students are not explicitly addressed by applicant. (Proposal pages 31-32)

**FYI:** Brookside was identified by National Center of Special Education in Charter Schools as one of their "Centers of Excellence" for serving students with exceptionalities in 2016; in 2017, Paramount worked with a consultant to create a comprehensive policy & procedure manual relevant to special education. Replicating Brookside's special education processes & procedures viewed as a critical cornerstone to the new Paramount III middle school.

**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 = 2.8**

**Comments:** Clear evidence of citywide partnerships (Community Health, Fairbanks, Lilly Foundation, Rooney Foundation, Teach Plus, Mind Trust) and Near Eastside of Indianapolis partnerships (neighborhood association which plans & organizes monthly community functions). Paramount has implemented Academic Parent Teacher Teams since 2012 –which brings parents to the school to work as a team to improve academic performance (based on an Arizona model). Anchored in the Paramount system and renamed Families Allies Community Team (FACT), it's comprised of three staff solely focused on working with families (home visits, enhancing school-home communications) and supported through a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant. The replication process for Paramount III began via engagement with numerous community partners & surveys of existing families to fully understand community needs. Its proposed Director of Family Engagement (CSP Planning Year funding) will work with families as PS3 prepares to open Fall 2019 to ensure family voices are heard and that the family perspective is included in the new school's development.

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)**

<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 = **1.5**

Comments: The PSOE Board has general oversight of the fiscal management, basic education and policy development of the school (sound fiscal management, approval of yearly budget, monthly review of budget, and selection of and approval of external auditor). PSOE uses 3<sup>rd</sup> party, Bookkeeping Plus, Inc. (BPI) for validation of all financial processes. PSOE uses recognized and approved accounting protocols, as well as financial software/BPI/Board to maintain accurate projections, practices and documentation of finances.

**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 = **1.5**

Comments: All CSP funds/decisions are supervised by the executive and school leader (executive director created the budget). In collaboration with bookkeeper, they oversee expenditures relevant to CSP-funded materials and submission of receipts and reimbursement activities with IDOE. School leader responsible for all hiring of staff, recruitment, and purchases. Evaluation efforts led by executive director.

**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 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 = **1.5**

Comments: Basic State funding (ADM) covers core educational costs, including staff salaries beyond initial startup costs supported by the CSP grant. Applicant references federal Title I resources on page 34 and on page 33 also describes numerous external grants previously awarded PSOE that support school operations and achievement, e.g., Mind Trust, Walton Family Foundation, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC, Community Health.

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

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

<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: (page 34)

PS3 will open in the former PR Mallory building as a Gr 5-8 slow-growth model alongside Purdue Polytechnic High School (new construction in the Englewood neighborhood). Paramount/Purdue are working with Schmidt Architecture to design a space to meet the needs of both schools (PS3 will have four sections of each grade level served, space for SpEd, Recovery, STEM, music, PE, world language, art & cafeteria → plus greenspace for Eco Center/Urban Garden).

Fob readers will be used to secure access into building and front office will provide monitored entrance. Paramount does not offer transportation (except in cases of homelessness/IEPs, as required by law). A driveline for drop-off/pick up will connect parents/teachers on a daily basis. Paramount's *School Safety Plan* is provided in *Attachment F* (pages 87+).

**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: Signature of authorizer (Mayor's Office) on page 2; project contact person on page 4; and board president 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) *or* Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)
- B. Budget Worksheet
- C. Most recent *Expanded Annual Performance Report* (IDOE Compass)  
NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).
- D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, or proof that application for such status has been made
- E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy
- F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization.  
NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).
- G. School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)
- H. School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **8**

Comments: All required appendices items attached.

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

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

<p><b>0 points</b>  Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.</p>	<p><b>1point</b>  Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence.  OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b>  Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations.  Generally, information was easily located.</p>	<p><b>3 points</b>  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><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b>  Narrative clearly presented and applicant followed prescribed format within the 30-page limitation.</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"> <li>Optional Competitive Preference Priority</li> </ul>	3	0 Did not apply
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5.8
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5.8
3A. Charter School Goals	7	4.8
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.8
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3.8
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.5
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	3.3
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.8
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.5
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.5
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.5
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>59.4</b>