

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

Name of Applicant: Purdue Polytechnic HS North
Overall Ranking: 63.4 out of 71

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)			
<p>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)</p>	<p>1 point Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described</p>	<p>2 points Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6</p>			
<p>Comments: A complete overview of the postsecondary programming is provided. Programming is focused on identifying career pathways by sophomore year, work-based learning opportunities including mentorships with area businesses, and college and career counseling. One target outcome is clearly defined: 75% of students passing ISTEP (ILEARN) ELA and math. Other outcomes are generally stated but not defined by measurable goals. For example, the school wants students to earn dual-credit or industry certifications, but no specific target is identified. The applicant identifies IPS area students and minority populations as beneficiaries of the school's programming and partnership with Purdue University.</p>			

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)			
<p>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element</p>	<p>3-5 points At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element</p>	<p>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 21st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.6</p>			
<p>Comments: The applicant thoroughly described the need for the school in its targeted area, including the lack of college readiness among students and the limited number of high school options on the north side of Indianapolis. The organizer has engaged business, government and community partners in the planning of the school and in ongoing outreach. Enrollment, survey data and postsecondary data are provided to illustrate the need for the school. The curriculum described is individualized, dynamic and linked to real-world work. Flexible scheduling facilitates differentiated instruction based on a student's needs and progress. The proposed use of CSP funds is dedicated to one-time expenses for equipment to facilitate the curriculum. The school has allocated funds in its annual budget for replacement and maintenance costs related to this equipment.</p>			

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)

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

<p>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program</p>	<p>3-4 points Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Applicants that intend to REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.</p>
--	--	---	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5.6**

Comments:

Individuals identified as developing the school have extensive experience with school start-up as well as government and non-profit management. Additionally, there is a direct connection to the Purdue Polytechnic Institute (PPI) to facilitate the alignment of the charter school's programming with the academic demands of the university and PPI. Additional staff members have been identified that align to school's curricular programming and management of the school's operations.

Replication: Comparative data from the flagship school show student growth in all three areas on NWEA assessments (p. 22).

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **6.3**

Comments:

More than three specific, measurable goals are clearly described by the applicant. Goals appear rigorous, yet attainable; State assessment measures are included. Occasionally, a goal requires clarification. For example, Goal #4 projects a 25% increase in student growth on the project cycle rubric score. No detail is provided about the metric or how growth is measured.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

The applicant provided detail about the types of data available to progress monitor students. However, it

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

was not explained how the school would communicate this data with individual students, or how teachers would collaborate in the use of this data. Plans were provided for communicating the general school goals and progress to parents and community members in public forums.

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
<p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p>OR, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & 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 & 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 & 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 & 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 = **3.6**

Comments:
 Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives.

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 = **1**

Comments:
 The expenditures budgeted in this application are strictly one-time expenditures for equipment, technology, services and technical assistance related to the start-up of the school. Reserves will be set aside in each year's budget to ensure that equipment can be maintained and replaced, as needed.

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 and are directly-tied to activities described within the proposal.

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

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.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.6	
Comments: The board's structure, duties, member recruitment plan and governance training are well-defined. The relationship between the board and the head of school is clearly delineated. The school has experienced staff in place to ensure accurate and timely reporting for state and federal requirements.	

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 = 3			
Comments: The proposal is in full compliance with IC 20-24-5 for open enrollment. A comprehensive plan is in place to recruit students through community outreach, IPS middle schools, school tours and shadow days, and participation in Enroll Indy. Lottery preference is given to students from the IPS district and siblings of current PPHS students.			

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</i> 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).
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4			
Comments: A Student Services Director will oversee support to all identified disadvantaged student groups. All groups are addressed with either exemplary (SPED) or sufficient (EL, low-income, homeless, N/D) descriptions of how needs will be met. A student services team will meet regularly to review student			

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

data, progress and goals. Professional development will be targeted to areas in need of improvement. All students would have access to technology and the academic resources needed to succeed.

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 = **2.6**

Comments:

The founding team for the school includes a staff person dedicated to community outreach and building partnerships. Partnerships with businesses and community organizations are the core of the school's curriculum, providing opportunities for real-world applications. Initial planning included community input. PPHS plans to solicit feedback from all community stakeholders on school impact and progress. Students will be engaged with community partners in internships, projects and mentorships. Many industry partners provided letters of support in the attachments.

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 = **1.3**

Comments:

The applicant has detailed an internal controls plan that segregates duties. Outside vendors will be contracted to review accounting practices, and provide accounting services. The Business Manager and Controller have procedures and oversight for expenditures, with a final overview by the Chief of Staff. The Head of School signs all checks. Documents are scanned and stored electronically and shared as appropriate (pp. 34-36).

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:

Fund and grant codes will be used to track grant-related expenditures and reimbursements by grant year. The controller will meet with school leadership periodically to provide updates on the grant funds.

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

0 Points	1 Point	2 Points
-----------------	----------------	-----------------

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

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 = 1.6		
Comments: The CSP application is focused on one-time costs associated with the curriculum and technology needs of setting up the labs needed to facilitate the school design. Additional state and federal funds will support the ongoing staffing, curricular and facility needs of the school. Reserves will be budgeted annually for replacement costs associated with the equipment that would be funded by this grant.		

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	<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 = 2.6

Comments:
 The school is currently searching for a facility and has identified search criteria to ensure the space is large enough to accommodate enrollment of 600, and the space is conducive to curricular needs (e.g. labs, maker spaces). No detail is provided to demonstrate how the school will ensure the facility chosen is safe and secure. The applicant will provide IndyGo bus passes to students to ensure transportation is not a barrier for enrollment. The unlimited pass will enable students to use public transportation for school, work, internships, and school activities.

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:
 All required signatures were submitted by the applicant.

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

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

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 items were submitted by applicant. Note that the safety plan will be revised when a location is finalized.

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 = 3			
Comments: The grant proposal was clearly presented, following the format and questions required in the application, and within prescribed 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	2.6
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	5.6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5.6
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6.3
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3.6
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	5.6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	4
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.6
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.3
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.6
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.6
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
TOTAL POINTS	71 Total Points Possible	63.4