

**Name of Applicant: Excel Center Clarksville**

**OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 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)	Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	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 : 2**

**Comments:**  
 The applicants focus area was Postsecondary which is clearly defined. Research was put into the expected targets and outcomes. The Excel Center - Clarksville has a very specific focus on students who have not succeeded in high school and wish to obtain a high school diploma. The outcomes that are detailed in the application include the expectation of early college credit and/or career certification, confidence and ability to succeed in post-secondary settings, and greater opportunity for successful completion by offering flexibility in career choice and goals. Applicant states coursework is aligned to Indiana College and Career Readiness Standards and students have the opportunity to earn dual credit or an industry certification. Response provides some justification for identified outcomes. Response could be strengthened by providing more specific, targeted outcomes.

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

**1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-5 points</b>	<b>6 points (1 point per element)</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <i>1 point per element</i>	At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <i>1 point per element</i>	<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: 4**

**Comments:**  
 Applicant provides a clearly defined mission and vision for the school. (Although "GEI" is referenced repeatedly with no definition of the acronym. "GEI" may be synonymous with GCSI, which is referenced as Goodwill of Central and Southern Indiana.) 1b-The outreach plan consists of several impactful elements, however, there are no specific references to outreach to non-English speakers. 1c- Key evidence-based instructional practices are integral to adult learners and are demonstrated through a blended model combining block schedules, online instruction, individualized coaching, and student self-direction with ongoing support and flexible scheduling, all of which lead to the success of Excel students. Although the goals of a high school diploma and possible career certifications are outlined, there is no specific references to Indiana Academic Standards or types of assessments to be utilized. (pgs. 16-18) 1d -Each student at The Excel Center creates an individualized education plan which considers all of the specific learning and environmental needs of the student. 1e- The mission of the school and the partnerships with Ivy Tech and workplace environments, projects and certifications are well aligned with 21st Century College and Career

Readiness. Specific examples of business partnerships would be useful information. 1f - Sustainability is delineated in the application through enrollment, network support and costs that are one-time expenditures.

The Excel School serves an adult population to give them an opportunity to earn a high school diploma and begin post-secondary education and develop a career path (p.14). The vision of the school is to provide hope and opportunity through education. Before opening, Goodwill enterprises determines if there is a disproportionate share of high school drop outs in an area to determine need (p.14 but no specific data was provided). Community outreach includes partnering with local organizations, news and media releases, meetings and social media (p.15). The curriculum (p.15) section was high level and it was hard to grasp what curriculum was being used. It appeared to be competency and standards based yet it was not entirely clear what is being taught. They are clear that they use evidence based practices and meet students where they are (individualized learning)(p.16). Strategies used include classes offered morning, noon, and night as well as online classes p.17. Specific strategies to ensure meeting Indiana's academic standards was not addressed. The school uses 21st Century Skills as a framework for its program (p20) The school can sustain its program after CSP funds as it is proposing to use the funds for upfront technology purchases and furniture.

Applicant fully described four of the six elements. Description of curriculum and sustainability were lacking detail. Applicant describes the vision of the charter school (to change lives every day by empowering people to increase their independence and reach their potential through education, health and employment.). The school seeks to serve students who have dropped out of high school and support them in earning a high school diploma with dual credits or a industry certificate. The applicant describes the typical analysis of the community need and communication plan used by Goodwill Educational Initiative (GEI), however the description lacks a description of why this specific community needs The Excel Center. Applicants provides a description of research based instructional strategies and best practices in working with adult learners, however the narrative does not address the curriculum to be used or how it is aligned to Indiana state standards. Applicant provides a description of how the flexible coursework and structure will meet the needs of special populations. Teachers will plan for differentiation and meet students where they are. Narrative identified four general categories of critical competences for 21st century skills. Applicants states that the school model is self-sustaining, however does not provide any description of sources of funding once CSP funds are expended. (pp. 14-21)

<b>2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS</b>				<b>(Up to 6 Points)</b>
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>	
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	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**

**Comments:**

2a - The Excel Center team for school development and expansion demonstrate strong backgrounds and expertise aligned to the program and expansion of the school. 2b- Applicant provides strong data analysis showing growth on several data points including school grades, evidence of students meeting the goals for college and career readiness, and graduation rates. Although Core 40 Diplomas are discussed as a goal, data on this point is not provided; page 29 (2b) and page 20 (1d). Applicant also demonstrates an awareness and responsiveness to community needs.

The network has grown rapidly since its inception in 2010 (300 students to 4200 and 20 employees to 262 (p.21) though this is not always a positive. Having said this, there are bios included of 11 key employees that have extensive educational knowledge and background much of it specific to the overage, disconnected population that they serve. They provided the Annual Report data on the network showing school grades of As and Bs including an A for Excel Clarksville (p.25). The school states that there have not been any terminated contracts within their network but did voluntarily close a school in FY16.

Applicant provides a detailed description of key leaders within the GEI organization and describes growth of Excel Centers since 2010. The titles and qualification of each individual was provided. Applicant provided academic data, a grade of A or B for other campuses operated by GEI, and increase in graduates throughout the system over the past 9 years. Applicant did note one of the schools closed in 2015-16 due to enrollment but was reopened in 18-19 through a partnership with another campus. Response could have been strengthened by providing more information about the site leadership team for this Excel Center (pp. 21 - 28).

**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>1-2points</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**

**Comments:**

Three goals are provided and based upon the mission and model of the school. However, the applicant does not qualify who and when these goals will be measured. Applicant provides connection between school expansion and use of CSP funds, as well as indirectly linking goals, all of which are rigorous and pertain to graduation (school's model and mission), with enhanced technology. Part A on pp.29 lists 3 specific, very rigorous, and measurable goals relating to graduation but not related to state content assessment. They appear to be attainable as other schools in their networks have achieved them.

<b>B. Communication Plan</b> (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<b>0 points</b> Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	<b>1point</b> A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	<b>2 points</b> 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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>		
<b>Comments:</b> The communication plan for advancing goals to stakeholders, particularly staff and students, is adequate. However, the explanation of the Advisory Groups is vague and does speak to how school goals are communicated to the community. This seems of particular importance since the school is serving adults in the community. On page 29 the applicant describes a clear process to ensure students and staff are aware of the goals and the progress meeting these goals. There is a Community Advisory Team (CAT) at each school but it is unclear how they message these goals to the outside community.		

**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)

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2-3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>
<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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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 &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>

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 2**

**Comments:**  
 Budget Narrative describes line items that are aligned to anticipated costs. Planning and implementation worksheet numbers agree. The school is using the CSP funds to purchase technology and furniture that is much needed to run their program and achieve their goals (p.30). Though this explanation does not specifically address a direct relationship, there is alignment in that they need to be a sufficiently outfitted school to achieve their goals. Narrative provides a broad overview of what will be purchased, but does not provide detail on line items and costs noted in the budget worksheet. (p. 30)

<b>B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &amp; Operation</b> (up to 1 point, for Part B)	
<b>0 Points</b> 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	<b>1 Point</b> Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>  Applicant states school is already open and has established most of school operations. The school receives support from the central office which provide administrative services. (p. 31) Sustainability plan does not specifically speak to the items budgeted in the worksheet. However, these items are one-time expenses that should not need replacement or maintenance (not associated with cost) in following years. As stated previously, the funds will be used for technology and furniture that will not need to be purchased again for years. They have a strong centralized network that operate under economies of scale and the CSP funds have not and will not be needed for sustainability. The school opened and has been up and running without CSP funds thus far.	
<b>C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary</b> (up to 1 point, for Part C)	
<b>0 Points</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)	<b>1 Point</b> All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>	
<b>Comments:</b> Costs of equipment appear reasonable, allocable and necessary.	

<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</b> , 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. <b>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</b>
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 6</b>
<b>Comments:</b> <p>A clear and appropriate list of the scope of the Board was included on p.31. Assurances of the school leaders autonomy, a reasonable board selection process and a strong board orientation process was outlined on p.32. The process for ensuring state and federal compliance was outlined on p.33 with the statement that the school has more than 15 years' experience providing timely and accurate submissions. Applicant states it does not work with an Education Service Provider. School is part of the Excel Center Network, the largest charter school network in Indiana. Applicant describes leadership team and specific responsibilities of the Board. School Directors have high autonomy over the day to day operations while receiving support from the Excel Center network. Board members are vetted for experience in finance, education, law, business and community ties. Current board has extensive experience and CEO and Vice President provide governance training. Board chair leads an annual retreat. School states does not work with a EMO/CMO. Applicant has over 15 years of experience complying with state and federal reporting. Dedicated staff will use student information system to provide reports to IDOE when due. (p. 31-33)</p>

**6. STUDENT RECRUITMENT & ADMISSIONS PROCESSES (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</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:**  
The recruitment plan does not reflect a no-cost tuition for the school, but describes the school as a public charter school that is "open to all students" (pg. 33). Student recruitment is multi-pronged including social media and open-houses. The applicant describes a random lottery process for over-enrollment. The school provides a seat to all students who have completed the application process. They recruit students by forming strong ties with the community and social media. Emails and their website. They also state that word of mouth is a big recruiting tool-while this may be true stronger activities should still be employed. The lottery process is clear and within the law.

Applicant states the school will comply with Indiana Code 20-24-5 and accept every Indiana resident that attends. A public lottery will be help if more student apply who can be admitted. however because of the nature of the program the school does have "minimal requirements" for admission (pp.. 33) specifically, 18 or older, dropped out of school or significantly behind, a resident of Indiana, not already have a high school diploma and not listed on state or federal sexual offender registry.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1-2 points</b>	<b>3-4 points</b>	<b>5-6 points</b>
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: 6**

**Comments:**

A continuum of services is provided for students with special education needs. Identification of adult students with special needs depends to some extent upon self-reporting or teacher/student concerns. TORs will maintain IEPs and 504 plans as reported by students or identified through the provision of educational services and students will receive extensive individualized instruction in the least restrictive environment (with embedded flexibility and individualized instruction/curriculum). Transition plans will be maintained and include transition assessments and Vocational Rehabilitation services, if needed. Applicant includes plans for service to EL students and meeting the needs of low-income, homeless, neglected and delinquent students through individualized coaching and local partnerships for student services.

The school gave a detailed and comprehensive plan for addressing all 5 of these populations as many are the exact population they seek and specialize in. The applicant also stated many times that it always serves these students under the appropriate state and federal guidelines. The school's overarching philosophy is to serve all students where they are at and individualized education plans for all including all of these special populations.

Applicant provides detailed description of plan to meet needs of students with disabilities including compliance with FAPE, child find, and IEP meetings as well as how design of general program has built in supports to help meet needs of all learners. Applicant provides a plan for identifying, assessing and monitoring ELL student progress as well as identifies specific instructional strategies and supports for the learning of English. Applicant's coaching model provides wrap-around support for students with non-academic challenges such as low income or lack of stable housing. RTI will be used to provide differentiated intervention to students requiring additional academic support. (pp. 34-41)

**8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)**

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear	Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained	Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3**

**Comments:**

As a charter school serving adult students, the Excel Center is not highly involved with parents, however, if a student is under 18, the staff and coaches will communicate directly with parents and provide opportunities for parental involvement. The GCSI organization is equipped to assist families with issues that impede student success, including childcare. Outreach to community is multi-pronged and includes

coordination of social service organizations with families in need. School has an active Community Advisory Team. Teachers/staff have input in school activities and design.

The applicant reiterated many of the community outreach activities outlined throughout this application on p.41 such as the CAT (see communication and recruitment plans). They also acknowledged that since their population is primarily adults and many of their students no longer live with parents or guardians. For students who are under 18, coaches make every effort to engage the parents and are the primary liaison between the school and family. There is a large and comprehensive list of the school's community outreach activities on p.42 such as block parties, relationships with social service agencies, and partnerships with the Rotary Club and Chamber of Commerce.

Applicant states that school design has been shaped over the past 10 years by teaching and staff of school with feedback to improve the model over the years. Applicant does not anticipate much parent involvement because it is an adult high school and most students live on their own. Coaches meet regularly with students and families to support learning. Applicant appears to have a strong ties in the communities they serve and has identified a Community Advisory Team to continue to engage community. More detail on how community and families were involved in the design and planning of the charter would have strengthened this response. A detailed list of community outreach activities were provided. (p. 41-43)

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN <span style="float: right;">(Up to 6 Points)</span>		
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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</b>		
<p><b>Comments:</b>            Plan for maintaining internal controls and record maintenance is broadly described, but vague or partial in areas such as record maintenance and specific controls. Applicant refers to "established policies and procedures", but does not reference specific appendices that provide details. (p. 43)            The applicant described a clear and appropriate fiscal management plan on p.43 including annual audits, segregation of duties and clear processes and procedures. Applicant provides a partial response. Applicants provided bulleted list of two internal fiscal controls to be implemented. Although response references that the board approves the budget, it does not state or identify the expenditures that require board approval. Response does not describe how checks or payments are issued or record retention procedures.</p>		
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	Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO	Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019**

Application	explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).
-------------	---	--

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1**

**Comments:**  
 Grant expenditures are approved by school leader and requests flow through GEI's accounting department.  
 Goodwill Enterprises will handle the grant purchases (not the school leader) as it is clearly specific purchases to outfit the school. Proper purchasing procedures will always be used. Due to the nature of the budget, it seems appropriate that the central office will handle the purchases for the school.  
 Applicant states that finance and management teams will support grant and all expenditures will go through appropriate approval process. Response lacks detail on the decision making process and tracking process. (pp. 43-44)

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

<b>0 Points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1 Point</b> Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	<b>2 Points</b> Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement
---	---	--

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1**

**Comments:**  
 The applicant states that it can sustain on state funding but does not elaborate on what it is used for or what federal grants it will seek and use.

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

<b>0 points</b> Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	<b>1point</b> <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	<b>2 points</b> <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	<b>3 points</b> 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**

**Comments:**  
 The school safety plan is general, but covers several aspects of school safety (does not reference school safety plan in appendices). Enrollment is discussed, particularly as it applies to facility location and transportation plan. Transportation plan involves assisting students with access to public transportation and fuel for those with vehicles.

The network have vast experience locating appropriate facilities for their high schools in areas that have a high population of high school dropouts. They ensure that facilities are up to all codes and compliance regarding health and safety. The transpiration plan is somewhat weak in that if students do not have the funds for public transportation or gas, it will provided but no fair and equitable process was described.

Applicant adequately describes a transportation plan to consider student population and location when determining the location of the facility. Response states it will be able to identify a facility that is "appropriate" but lacks additional detail on how the facility will be safe, secure and sustainable. Applicant does not mention how enrollment will impact the facility needs. (pp. 44-45)

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES				(Up to 3 Points)
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</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	<i>All</i> three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3</b>				
<b>Comments:</b> Required signatures are included in application.				

12. REQUIRED APPENDICES	(Up to 8 Points)
<b>Eight Required Appendix Elements</b> (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) <b>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</b>	
D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <u>or</u> proof that application for such status has been made	
E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy	
F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <b>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</b>	
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. <b>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).</b>	
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 7</b>	
<b>Comments:</b> Applicant provided all required documents for this section.	

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

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019**

<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>   The applicant primarily followed the directions and sequence and did not appear to go over 30 page limit (p.14-44) but there different page numbering throughout. Proposal narrative was clear and well organized.</p>			

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)  
**SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 3, Revised May 2019**

<b>Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)		2
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	4
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	4
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	2
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	6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	7
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
		56
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>68</b>