

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

Name of Applicant: PilotED
Overall Ranking: 57.6 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 = 0			
Comments: Applicant selected Early Childhood but does not meet eligibility requirement (PTQ 3 or 4).			

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 = 5			
Comments: On page 16, the applicant provides a vision statement with description and purpose followed by statements of need, such as high drop-out rates, but actual data to support these statements are not included. The applicant has held “over 65 community meetings, town halls, outreach events and open houses” (page 17) and describes a fully developed curriculum model including several rigorous evidence-based tools aligned both to Indiana Standards, blended learning strategies and plans for appropriate differentiation (pages 17-24). Programs to offer students the ability to experience various career paths are described (page 26). The applicant adequately describes how the budget will be sustained once CSP funds are no longer available.			

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.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5			

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

Comments:
 The applicant includes the CEO, principal and board members on pages 28 and 29. Their education and current job titles are included, as well as prior roles for the two school leaders. The applicant includes a list of strengths related to the mission of the school as well.

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	1-2 points	3-5 points	6-7 points
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 MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment to be scored within the 6-7 point range.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 6

Comments:
 The applicant includes more than three measurable goals, with two that are specific to the ILEARN/ISTEP exams (page 31). The applicant explains three of the 11 goals listed in greater detail, including staff assignments as related to the goals, timelines, rubrics for measuring success, etc. (pages 32-36).

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

0 points	1 point	2 points
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 = 1.5

Comments:
 The applicant includes a communication plan on page 36 that describes when the growth data will be collected (with the majority of data being populated each spring) and how the growth targets will be set for these assessments. The communication plan includes how teachers will be trained and evaluated but does not outline in detail how growth data will be made available to them. The applicant describes communication with the families occurring quarterly via in-school family days (page 36). Goal communication directly with students was not fully-developed.

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	1 point	2-3 points	4 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	Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal.	Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within	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 &</i>

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

<p>detail to justify proposed expenditures.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>the proposal.</p> <p>Most combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p><i>Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p> <p>Applicant MUST adhere to maximum of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.</p>
---	--	---	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.5

Comments:

The applicant provides a detailed narrative of each budget line-item and how the planned expenses align to the outcome goals, as well as how the initiatives will be sustained beyond the life of the grant (pages 37-41). The budget narrative and Budget Worksheets do not fully align.

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

0 Points	1 Point
<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 = .8

Comments:

The applicant shows how it will develop the required capacity to continue implementation and operation in a high-quality manner after the grant expires by using general funds and philanthropic dollars to fund items that extend beyond the life of the grant (budget worksheet and budget narrative pages 37-41). Within the sustainability budget, costs incurred by CSP must be allocated to another funding stream and several items listed as zero may not realistically be no-cost items, post grant funding.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1

Comments:

Costs appear reasonable, allocable and necessary to obtain the intended goals of the CSP grant and the mission of the school.

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 <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected
B.	Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together)
C.	Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations
D.	Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective
E.	Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. <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.

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.3

Comments:
 On pages 42-44, the applicant addresses part 5A with details about board membership, open door policies, participation, etc. The applicant does not adequately describe the duties for which the board is responsible. 5B is addressed on page 45 with an organizational structure and narrative of responsibilities as well as reporting mechanisms. 5C (pages 45 and 46) the applicant describes a desire to grow the Board in both number and in specific experiences. The applicant identifies the need for board diversity in relation to professional and demographic perspectives. The process used to select board members is not fully described. The applicant describes the process for governance training for board members, current and prospective, on page 46 to demonstrate 5D. An EMO/CMO is not used, other than a special education service provider in Years 1-3. No conflict of interest is identified with this service provider. On pages 47 and 48, the applicant describes its plan to ensure timely and accurate data is submitted.

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 = 2.8

Comments:
 A description of the recruitment plan is provided, targeting three partners and three identified approaches to strengthen relationships in the community (pages 48-49). The applicant states on page 49 that enrollment is open to all children in compliance with IC 20-24-5 through its participation in Enroll Indy, including an appropriate public lottery (page 49).

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); and the applicant descriptions are viewed as exemplary, demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).</i>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.3

Comments:
 The applicant addresses the needs of students with disabilities (pages 52-55) in accordance with legal requirements, as well as identified methods of identification, accommodations and progress monitoring (a very clear RTI process). An appropriate plan is identified to address the needs of English Learners on page 56. The applicant does not fully identify supportive strategies planned for low-income students, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students.

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

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

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
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			
Comments: On page 57, the applicant describes several ways in which the school will be of service to parents and the community at large. The applicant, however, did not fully show how the parents, teachers and community will be included in the planning and design of this charter school.			

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 = 2

Comments:
 On pages 57 and 58 the applicant clearly articulates a plan for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance.

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

0 Points	1 Point	2 Points
No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2

Comments:
 The applicant fully articulates the grant management process that will be used to manage the CSP funds if received (page 58).

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 = 1.8

Comments:
 The applicant describes how multiple funding sources including Title I, Title II, IDEA, Basic State Grant, Federal Lunch Program funds, Student State Grants, and Full Day Kindergarten Grants will be used to fully fund the budget after initial startup is supported by the CSP grant (page 58).

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)

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

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	<i>One</i> of the three anticipated elements is provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; or (c) transportation plan	<i>Two</i> of the three anticipated elements are provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; and/or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and/or (c) transportation plan	All <i>three</i> elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; <u>and</u> (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.3			
Comments: The applicant describes the financial stability of the school's facility plan on page 59, but does not fully describe how this facility has adequate space for enrollment projections and how it will be secured and maintained as a safe school. A transportation plan, with established satellite bus stop locations, will be provided for students.			

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
None of the required signatures have been obtained and submitted with the proposal	<i>One</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, or project contact person, or board president	<i>Two</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, and/or project contact person, and/or board president	All three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3			
Comments: The applicant has included all required signatures.			

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, <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. <i>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</i>
G.	School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)
H.	School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 8	
Comments: All anticipated appendices elements have been provided by the 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.

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.3

Comments:

The 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	0
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.5
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3.5
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	.8
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.3
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.8
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	3.3
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	2
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	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.3
TOTAL POINTS	71 Total Points Possible	57.6