

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

Name of Applicant: Seven Oaks Classical School
Overall Ranking: 56.2 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 = 1.5 | | | |
| Comments: Applicant specifies a postsecondary focus with programming that includes AP courses, a Capstone thesis, a composition workshop, and classical curriculum. Expected targets and outcomes are centered on college acceptance and college placement rates (e.g., a college acceptance goal is identified, with a target of 90% by 2022 and 100% by 2024). The applicant identified its unique populations as low-performing students, special education students, and gifted and talented students; it is not clearly articulated how the academic model or postsecondary focus impact these unique populations. | | | |

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: Seven Oaks Classical School proposes to expand grade levels served to include high school students. The applicant states that the school was formed because no other public or private classical, liberal arts education was being provided in the community, particularly at the high school level. However, the applicant does not indicate what academic needs the model addresses. For example, was there a low rate of college admission among area students? and if so, how would the school address this need? Survey interest and enrollment data are provided as evidence of need, but not data specific to the students' educational needs. The curriculum and strategies to support all students are well defined (1c and 1d). The school's focus on developing 21 st century learning skills is more generally defined. Students take at least four AP courses, complete a thesis, and engage in Socratic discussions engaging all students and developing critical thinking and communication skills. | | | |
| 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 = **5.5**

Comments:

The school leader has extensive and relevant experience related to the school's model. The board and school leadership also contract for support from the Barney Charter School Initiative, a program specifically designed to facilitate the founding of classical model charter schools. The board reflects a diverse set of skills necessary for starting a new school. The school is in its third year of operation and reports that APR data is not yet available. Performance data is provided from other state reports that indicate the school received an A in 2016-17 and the school reports increased proficiency on IREAD3.

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 = **4.8**

Comments:

The applicant offers five specific, measurable goals and includes goals related to state standardized assessments, with three goals explicitly targeted to the proposed expanded high school grade levels. The goal related to students' rate of post-secondary acceptance, does not specify how this will be measured (e.g. surveys, higher education commission data, or national clearinghouse). Although AP completion is an important component of the school's programming, and is stated as such within this CSP proposal, there are no goals related to AP scores, or other indicators of postsecondary readiness.

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 = **1.8**

Comments:

Applicant adequately addresses all required elements through multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders.

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

| 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) | | | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">0 points</p> <p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p><u>OR</u>, 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 style="text-align: center;">1 point</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 style="text-align: center;">2-3 points</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 style="text-align: center;">4 points</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 = 2.8 | | | | |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>A detailed budget narrative is provided for most line items, though some costs do not seem aligned to narrative initiatives (e.g., piano tuning). The narrative does not provide a yearly summary of expenditures; instead it is organized by category. There is no representation of how the budget supports the grant goals, or the postsecondary priority.</p> | | | | |
| B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B) | | | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">0 Points</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 style="text-align: center;">1 Point</p> <p>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p> | | |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .5 | | | | |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates that modest enrollment growth will help sustain any ongoing costs identified in the grant. A contractual relationship with Indiana Charters LLC is projected to phase out as the school develops internal capacity for administrative functions (e.g. reporting and accounting). No other funding sources are identified as a vehicle for sustainability of grant-funded initiatives.</p> | | | | |
| C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C) | | | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">0 Points</p> <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 style="text-align: center;">1 Point</p> <p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p> | |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .5 | | | | |
| <p>Comments:</p> <p>All or most expenses appear reasonable and allowable under the terms of the CSP grant. However, because the budget narrative is not tied to overarching goals, the determination of "necessity" of proposed expenditures is less clear.</p> | | | | |

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. 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: The decision-making process for formally selecting board members is outlined in the school's bylaws, but the applicant does not address the how members are recruited or the expectations of board members (Item 5C). | | | |

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 = 1.3 | | | |
| Comments: The applicant provided the school's admission and lottery process and is in full compliance with IC 20-24-5. The grant narrative did not include information on the school's recruitment plan. | | | |

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 <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 = 4.5 | | | |
| Comments: Plans to address the needs of students with disabilities and EL students were robust and detailed. The applicant indicates that the school has implemented the revised McKinney-Vento act requirements. However, it does not detail services to homeless students beyond access to health and hygiene resources. There is no mention of social services. Similarly, for neglected/delinquent students, the school does not identify services to meet their unique needs. | | | |

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

It is noteworthy that the applicant is seeking CSP funding for a “Community Engagement Officer” to establish and maintain an aggressive grant-writing and community outreach program in order to form partnerships and secure funding to support at-risk students (and families).

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 = **2.5**

Comments:

School was developed in partnership with community members and continues to have significant community involvement. Although the applicant described outreach efforts to parents and community members, how they were involved in the planning of the school (as required under this section of the proposal) is not specified. The applicant notes that a needs assessment was conducted last year; findings from that assessment are not presented.

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 = **1.8**

Comments:

A general description of internal controls was provided in the narrative, with a reference to an attached “Accounting Procedures Manual.” A plan for maintaining records was summarized within the narrative.

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 = **1.8**

Comments:

The headmaster will manage the CSP grant in accordance with board policies. A committee led by the financial office and board president created the budget. No external partners are involved in the decision-making process for the grant.

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

| 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| No description provided or cited | Minimal/disjointed explanation for | Solid descriptions for how other State |

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

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application | how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement | and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement |
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3 | | |
| <p>Comments: Minimal explanations are provided regarding how other State and federal funds will support the effective operation of grant-funded elements when CSP funding expires.</p> | | |

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 = 2.5

Comments:
 Environmental inspections have been conducted and security measures (at entry points) are in place to ensure the building is physically and environmentally safe for students. The school does not provide daily bus transportation, but instead coordinates with parents to assist with carpooling. Transportation is provided for students with special needs. The Boys and Girls Club picks up students each day for afterschool programs; the school has an extended-care program for parents to drop off or pick up based on their work schedules. How enrollment impacts facility needs was not addressed within this section.

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 three required signatures are provided 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) <small>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</small> |
| D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <i>or</i> proof that application for such status has been made |
| E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy |
| F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <small>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</small> |
| G. School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom) |
| H. School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present |

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

| |
|--|
| Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 7 |
| Comments: An Annual Performance Report is not attached. |

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 = 2.8 |
| 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 | 1.5 |
| 1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes | 6 | 5 |
| 2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers | 6 | 5.5 |
| 3A. Charter School Goals | 7 | 4.8 |
| 3B. Goals Communication Plan | 2 | 1.8 |
| 4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets | 4 | 2.8 |
| 4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation | 1 | .5 |
| 4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary | 1 | .5 |
| 5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships | 6 | 5.3 |
| 6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes | 3 | 1.3 |
| 7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students | 6 | 4.5 |
| 8. Community Outreach Activities | 3 | 2.5 |
| 9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance | 2 | 1.8 |
| 9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management | 2 | 1.8 |
| 9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations | 2 | 1.3 |
| 10. Facilities & Transportation | 3 | 2.5 |
| 11. Signed Charter School Assurances | 3 | 3 |
| 12. Required Appendices | 8 | 7 |
| 13. Overall Organization of Proposal | 3 | 2.8 |
| TOTAL POINTS | 71 Total Points Possible | 56.2 |