

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

Name of Applicant: Dynamic Minds Academy

Overall Ranking:

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points	1point	2 points	3 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)	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 = 0			

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points	1-2 points	3-5 points	6 points (1 point per element)
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 st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4

Comments:
 The applicant provides a solid and strong overview of the project. The applicant has fully outlined each of the six elements. DMA provides cited research-based evidence in 1b, 1c, 1d and 1e. They have shown the curriculum framework (STEAM, Exact Path) and the will use the Universal Design of Learning (UDL) guidelines to develop and incorporate the Indiana Academic Standards. In addition, DMA outlines specific strategies, specifically therapeutic, that will be necessary for their student population to achieve successful academic growth based on individual student needs. In addition, DMA provides research for how their model will provide educational and therapeutic interventions and accommodations to effectively meet 21st Century requirements. They clearly outline how CSP will be used for one-time purchases and provide specific ways for non-CSP funding beyond the grant life.

The vision is developed, but application would be strengthened by more discussion of the pillars of the program. Communication plan is limited only to those parents who have already engaged but no plans for reaching out to community or other parents are discussed. Curriculum is discussed as being developed, but no evidence-based instructional practices are described.. Specific strategies are discussed related to ASD student’s therapy, but not in related in meeting/exceeds IAS. Additionally, no discussion of English Learners is included. 21st century skills are adequately addressed. Sustainability appears to rely on philanthropy.

The vision of the school is unique and provides a detailed description of purpose using data to support an overarching need. While STEAM was identified as a research based practice, the narrative needs to be strengthened. Online learning components were noted and identified by grade levels. Additionally, adaptive diagnostic growth assessments were aligned to the online learning platforms. Various pathways to address the needs of the students were addressed in the grant application.

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

0 points	1-2points	3-4 points	5-6 points
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 REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4

Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of important qualifications that will support academic growth and student achievement. DMA's staff and consultants hold strong qualifications and experience in Special Education, ABA and Therapy Services to properly meet the needs of their student population. In addition, the Board of Directors have strong business and financial experience. Many have direct experience and therefore personally identify with the student population to be served. Recommend including number of years served in Special Education for each staff member to strengthen argument.

Key personnel are identified, and descriptions of prior experiences are included, but qualifications could be strengthened through prior rigorous instructional or principal/school leader experience.

Qualifications focus primarily on serving those students with Autism. Argument would be strengthened in describing leadership in capacities necessary to open and run a startup. Those qualifications would consist of strong leadership with history in school operations and leadership, school leadership and board members diverse in school finance (SBOA), school operations, and marketing.

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	1-2points	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: 4

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

Comments:

The applicant provides 4 Charter School Goals however, only Goal #4 provides a measurable goal of "by when" each goal will be accomplished. Goals 1, 2 and 3 state a measurable percentage of the student population to meet the desired goal set, but do not outline when the goal will take place by. However, Goal 2 is directly aligned with individualized IEP Plans, therefore this goal may be necessary according to state requirements. If so, the applicant should have clearly outlined this was the reason for setting a 100% rate for student IEP goals. All goals should have had a measurable date of when they expect to successfully achieve them in order for the goals to be fully measurable. In addition, DMA did not incorporate how the curriculum framework (STEAM Exact Path), including assessments, progress monitoring, etc., would be used to achieve specific goals. Applicant could have incorporated measurable goals based on the curriculum framework to be used with student population. In addition, DMA did not directly incorporate measurable or relevant therapeutic goals. The school's model is unique and therapy plays a very important role in student achievement and success. Including goals around this portion of their model would have strengthened the argument.

Goals are worded as Smart Goals and provide measurable goals. Two of the four goals align to state content assessments. The other two goals align specifically to individual learning plans (IEPS). All four goals were long term goals. While the grant exceeded the three specific measurable goals required for this section of the application, key priorities noted in the curriculum section of the grant were not addressed. This would include the use of growth data from online platforms, the integration of NWEA, and programmatic data around foundational curriculum components (STEAM, online learning platforms, and therapeutic services).

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
<p>0 points Communication plan regarding goals not addressed</p>	<p>1point 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>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1</p>		
<p>Comments: Communication plan is very broad. Applicant outlines avenues for communication (weekly staff meetings, IEP reviews, student handbook, newsletters and social media), however, DMA did not assign a numeric value for occurrences, nor did they outline how academic assessment data would be communicated or reviewed with staff and/ or families. Explicit dates, events, times and locations should be noted. Additionally, the communication plan has a single lens (families) and does not include all stakeholders and community partners.</p>		

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>0 points 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>1point 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>2-3 points 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>4 points 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>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</p>			
<p>Comments : Applicant provides a budget narrative within the submitted CSP Application. Applicant breaks down the use of CSP Funds by category, however, applicant does not provide specific dollar amounts within the budget narrative of the application itself. Applicant provides a narrative by category, but does not show a breakdown of the use of CSP Funds of dollar amounts by year with a breakdown of specific categories within that year. Applicant does not adequately break down the costs in the narrative to match the CSP Budget provided. Budget worksheet totals are not able to be compared to the budget narrative.</p>			
B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B)			

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

0 Points	1 Point
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	Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1	
Comments: Applicant provides outline and specific plan for school's sustainability after the grant expires. DMA states they will maintain to continue the capacity of the program through Special Education Funding and Indiana MAC reimbursements. Narrative does not address how the activities in the grant, such as training for new staff members, will be addressed during future growth or sustained when future training is needed.	
C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C)	
0 Points	1 Point
Many costs appear either unreasonable, or unallowable, or unnecessary (as they cannot be directly tied to activities or personnel described within the applicant's proposal narratives)	All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary
Average Peer Reviewer Score = 1	
Comments: All costs are reasonable, allocable and necessary that are outlined in the provided CSP Budget for Years 1-3. However, there is a significant acquisition of property is questionable in terms of allowability. Cost align to the narrative and align to the grant guidelines.	

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)
F. 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

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

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 = 4
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Narrative does not detail what the governing board is accountable for, and does not delineate between governance and management responsibilities. The narrative also does not provide a description how board members are selected, only how the board may elect new directors. No discussion of desired qualities or qualifications of board members is included. No training for prospective board members is included in the narrative, nor is training considered to be ongoing. The narrative also does not describe HOW the school will ensure timely and accurate submission; it simply specifies that staff has knowledge of the requirements. 5a) Applicant provides a summary and a table that states that all decision-making will be contained within the school level and that the Board of Directors will only provide support and consultation. Applicant does not meet the requirement that the Board of Directors (governing board) is accountable for school performance, budgeting and financial oversight, reporting, etc. 5b) Education Director is given the authority to make day to day decisions and states that the Board will hold that position accountable5c). DMA clearly outlines how a Board member is selected and the specific process followed. In addition, DMA provides necessary requirements that must be met . 5d). Applicant states that initial training took place in May 2019 and that will occur quarterly over the first year, however, DMA did not state specific details as to what the training will cover and what the board will be trained on. More information needed on the Trainers. 5e) Applicant should have listed "N/A" on this section. 5f) Applicant states that school leadership will handle and meet all reporting requirements.</p>

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

0 points	1point	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

Comments:
 Applicant describes Student Recruitment plan as "an extremely organic approach" and describes methods for recruitment such as word of mouth and working with various community organizations. DMA offers specific evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 by stating all students who enroll will be offered equal access to admission. Applicant provides a clear and adequate lottery process. No evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered, outside of allowing students who attended during the prior school year to enroll in subsequent years. While both elements were present, the recruitment plan could have been strengthened.

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

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

<p>0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p>1-2 points One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate.</p>	<p>3-4 points Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups.</p>	<p>5-6 points <i>All five student groups are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); <u>and</u> the applicant <i>descriptions are viewed as exemplary</i>, demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).</i></p>
--	---	---	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3

Comments:
 Applicant sufficiently addressed all five student groups and provided descriptions that demonstrate the school's commitment to ensuring all five student groups' needs are properly met. Homeless student section needed more in-depth answer to show how specific examples on how staff would be trained and specific resources the school would provide to support this student group. All student groups are addressed, but solely from a compliance standpoint with no discussion of how services or educational model will be tailored to support these students' specific needs. There is no evidence of teacher involvement in the planning and design of the school offered. Additionally, it is unclear how parents gave feedback and guidance in the creation; it is only stated that they were able to give such input.

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 1

Comments:
 Applicant provides examples of past and present parent and community involvement. Applicant states that DMA will host a fundraiser, but there is not specific evidence of how teachers will be or have been involved. The applicant provides specific examples of how parents can be involved (PTO, weekly coffee meeting and fundraiser events). Applicant states specific examples of programs they will engage in within the community (Best Buddies Program), but does not do a thorough job of explaining what this program is or how it ties into their vision and model. The school has limited connections to the community in which it will reside. The school appears to have strong alliances with the ASD community, however, building those relationships with all stakeholders will be key specifically for a new start-up school. Strategies to engage stakeholders are not explicitly defined and are dependent on past relationships of service providers isolated to the ASD community. There may be families and community members not yet familiar with those services the school is branching out from, thus, more outreach to ensure that all subgroups, families, and stakeholders can be reached must be fostered.

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			
Comments: Applicant's process for sound fiscal management and internal controls is not strong. Applicant states that the Education Director is allowed to make purchases without board approval up to \$50,000. Applicant does not show or state a process for internal controls (two signatures) on any and all purchases, regardless of the limit set, which does not meet the internal controls standard. Applicant does not demonstrate a well-thought out response of how records will be maintained and does not show knowledge of SBOA Compliance standards. The plan for maintaining internal controls over expenditures is clearly articulated, but the narrative includes no discussion of record maintenance, separation of responsibilities, finance procedures, and/or record keeping practices.			
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: 2

Comments:
 Applicant provides a process and demonstrates a well-thought out process for tracking grant expenditures via the selected accounting system. Applicant states that Charter School leaders will ultimately be responsible for Grant Management and Compliance. Applicant clearly states that the Education Director will be responsible for the grant budget and coding items in the accounting system.

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

Comments:
 Applicant provides examples of the types of State and Federal Funds will support school operations and student achievement. Applicant does not provide a breakdown in the Narrative or Budget worksheet provided for how those specific grants/ funds will cover Salaries and support the school model past the CSP Grant life. A breakdown and specific descriptions in the narrative and budget does not occur. More solid descriptions would have provided a higher score.

While the narrative indicates the use of other state and federal funds to support the school, the narrative indicates that philanthropy is necessary to sustain the school.

The grant appears to be relying on general fund for many of the sustainability efforts along with Medicaid services. While it is noted that DMA intends to peruse other grants and philanthropic funding, it is not clear how the ADM numbers (of only 150-250) along with state and federal funding will allow for sustainability

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1point	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

Comments:
 Applicant addresses all three of the elements required for part 10 of the application. Applicant addresses facilities with specific needs for their student population while speaking to how secure premises is important. Applicant understands the importance of enrollment and how it affects potential facility expansion. Applicant understands the unique dynamics of transportation for their student population and addresses how their well-thought out transportation plan will ensure success for all students. Answer would be strengthened by discussing how the facility is sustainable, and offering some transportation plan that does not limit access to students whose parents cannot pick up / drop off. Safe and secure faciilites that are

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

aligned to ADA compliance and the State of Indiana safety code for schools. Policies and procedures around safety including drills were not included.

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	1point	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	<i>All</i> three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 3

Comments:

All signatures are submitted.

12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)

Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below)

A. Charter Application to Authorizer (for new or replication proposals) *or* Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)

B. Budget Worksheet

C. Most recent *Expanded Annual Performance Report* (IDOE Compass)
NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).

D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, *or* proof that application for such status has been made

E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy

F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization.
NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).

G. School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)

H. School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present. *NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2020 – 2021 school year (scored as an automatic point).*

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score: 8

Comments:

Applicant has provided all required elements.

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 Scores: 3

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

Comments:

Applicant's proposal narrative was clear, well formatted and all elements were easy to access. Applicant did not exceed the 30 page narrative limit and was at 27 pages. Narrative is clearly labeled, follows the prescribed format and does not exceed the page limit. Some details noted in the charter application could have been used to provide a more detailed narrative in some sections.

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

Summary of All Scored Quality Counts Proposal Elements	Points Received	Points Possible
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Up to 3 points)	0	0-3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	4	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	4	6
3A. Charter School Goals	4	7
3B. Goals Communication Plan	1	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	3	4
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &	1	1
Operation 4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	4	6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	2	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	3	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	1	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record	1	2
Maintenance 9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for	2	2
Grant Management	1	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations		
10. Facilities & Transportation	2	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
TOTAL POINTS	48	68