

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

**Name of Applicant: The Excel Center –Muncie (Goodwill Education Initiatives, Inc.)**  
**Overall Ranking: 64.6 out of 71**

<b>OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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 = 3			
Comments: Serving adults (ages 18 and over) who do not have a HS diploma, this program prepares students for <b>post-secondary</b> education. Excel Center graduation requirements include participation in at least one dual credit or industry certification course (primarily provided in cooperation with Ivy Tech). Electives & certifications to be offered are based on the vision of the Muncie-Delaware County, Indiana Economic Development Alliance and include: Certified Nursing Assistant; Child Development Associate; and Hire Tech (in partnership with Conexus, to learn the skills needed to work for area manufacturing companies, e.g., Progress Rail or Magna Powertrain). All three required elements of this section fully addressed. (Proposal pages 9-10)			

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<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.  <b>1 point per element</b>	At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  <b>1 point per element</b>	<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 = 6			
Comments: All six elements fully developed and described. Services directly aligned to area employment needs and curriculum framework design is based on solid, evidence-based practices for adult learners (balancing education with life challenges)—coupled with students benefitting from supportive relationships with Center peers and staff. This innovative model provides wraparound services that allow students to overcome both academic and non-academic barriers to their educational success and future educational & career attainment – including differentiated strategies for students with IEPs and EL and gifted students. (Proposal pages 11-18)			

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5.3**

Comments: Key GEI organization leadership roles identified and supported by strong qualifications (in roles that support all Excel Center sites). Brandon Marks will serve as School Director of The Excel Center Muncie, following six years with GEI (teacher; college & career coach) and work at Indian Creek HS and Greenwood HS. Marks is currently pursuing his Masters degree. Other Muncie site personnel/roles (for proposed new program) do not appear to be identified here. (See proposal pages 18-21)

Proposed program replicates The Excel Center operating in other communities. While *Annual Performance Reports* are attached (proposal page 400+), the narrative (beginning on page 22) provides compelling evidence of success for the overwhelming majority of those Excel program sites.

**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><b>0 points</b>          No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p><b>1-2 points</b>          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><b>3-5 points</b>          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><b>6-7 points</b>          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.</p>
--	---	--	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **6**

Comments:

Due to uniqueness of The Excel Center model, serving adults without diplomas, the SBOE has approved alternative accountability metrics (see proposal p 25). Three rigorous goals established: (1) At least 70% grad rate, as measured by SBOE's approved modified, non-cohort-based grad rate; (2) At least 90% of all grads will have passed all mandatory State assessments, without a waiver; and (3) At least 80% of grads will earn either a college credit or industrial certification.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.3**

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

Comments: Communication of goals occurs through PD and regular staff meetings; progress routinely reviewed & discussed in classrooms and at the individual level by students' life coaches. Program goals shared with community through advisory groups –which includes representatives of postsecondary institutions, community groups, government/business, teachers and students. (Proposal p. 26). The applicant does not reference communication with families.

**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>1 point</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 = **3.3**

Comments:

Budget includes *Planning “Year”* prior to opening; Year 1 = 2018-19; Year 2 = 2019-20. Total costs at **\$835,328.72** (less than \$900K).

**Planning Year** (*prior to start* of 2018-19 program year):

- Hire key staff prior to school opening and ensure they are well prepared to serve students (Director, Office Manager, Lead Teacher, SpEd Instructor, CCR instructor, and 4 coaches);
- Purchase property/equipment to ensure facility has the technology infrastructure, proper equipment & furniture needed to successfully implement model (AV systems, teacher work table, desk phones, 76 classroom Acer Computers, 30 classroom Acer Chromebooks).

**Year 1 Implementation—2018-19:**

- *All CSP funds devoted to personnel/fringe:* Same 9 staff funded during Planning period, plus 5 additional instructors (math, humanities, & science) and 3 “YLCC” drop-in center staffers.

**Year 2 Implementation—2019-20:**

- *All CSP funds devoted to personnel/fringe:* Same 9 staff funded during Planning and Year 1 Implementation and same 8 staff funded during Year 1 Implementation, plus 1 more humanities instructor, 2 paraprofessionals, 1 more SpEd instructor, 1 more lead coach, and 1 more YLCC part-time attendant.
- Only one **budgeting error** identified in Planning Year: Property & Equipment. Per *Budget*

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

<p><i>Summary, costs should total \$103,367.44 (Planning Year Property/Equipment budget costs total = \$103,657.44 (a difference of \$290)</i></p>	
<p><b>B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation &amp; Operation</b> (up to 1 point, for Part B)</p>	
<p><b>0 Points</b></p>	<p><b>1 Point</b></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>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1</b></p>	
<p><i>Comments: CSP funding will be used entirely for staffing at Muncie Excel Center and the purchase of technologies/equipment to facilitate teaching and student learning. Capacity of staff will be developed and maintained after CSP grant expires. No explanation provided for sustaining personnel/equipment costs beyond grant funding (on p 27 of proposal – or in the Budget Sustainability Year worksheet, <u>not</u> completed by applicant).</i></p>	
<p><b>C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary</b> (up to 1 point, for Part C)</p>	
<p><b>0 Points</b></p>	<p><b>1 Point</b></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>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1</b></p>	
<p><i>Comments: All costs are viewed as <i>reasonable and necessary</i>.</i></p> <p><i>Applicant states (p 27 of proposal) that its school enrollment stabilizes in Year 3 of implementation. In order to fully staff and achieve model outcomes, CSP funds are crucial to allowing Excel Center to hire staff in early years.</i></p>	

<p><b>5. GOVERNANCE PLAN &amp; ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)</b></p>	
<p><b>Six Required Elements</b> (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)</p>	
<p>A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. <b>If the school uses an EMO/CMO, applicant <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected</b></p>	
<p>B. Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together)</p>	
<p>C. Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations</p>	
<p>D. Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective</p>	
<p>E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved.  <i>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</i></p>	
<p>F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.</p>	
<p><b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.6</b></p>	
<p><i>Comments: All anticipated elements are adequately addressed by the applicant. While board governance is described for 5A (beginning on page 27), there is no reference to the principal's or other administrators' duties.</i></p>	

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

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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 = <b>2.6</b>			
Comments: Proposal pages 29-30 appropriately describe student recruitment plan, assure compliance with IC 20-24-5, and describe The Excel Center's public lottery process.			

<b>7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<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 = <b>6</b>			
Comments: Proposal pages 30-37 address all five student groups anticipated within this grant proposal. Comprehensive details provided for students with IEPs and EL learners. The Excel Center-Muncie anticipates that the majority of its students will have non-academic challenges (e.g., low-income, lack of stable housing, N/D history) and is connecting with local resources to further support student needs (Muncie Housing Authority, Open Door for mental health care, Muncie Transit Authority to provide free transportation). Using the RTI approach to services/intervention offers all students targeted support at increasing levels of intensity, based on degree of need/s. Academic success is also augmented through highly-qualified staff and The Excel Center's use of Life Coaches to help students manage their learning, address barriers that interfere with learning, and continuously monitor progress.			

<b>8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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 = <b>2.6</b>			
Comments: Existing strong connections to Muncie community (Goodwill Store and Nurse-Family Partnership program serving 1 <sup>st</sup> -time mothers) provided foundation to reach other education & workforce development organizations. Hired all local employees to work in the Center, further enhancing community engagement. Invaluable community input provided informed decisions about certification & skill needs for the local economy – and informational meetings held with more than 85 Muncie organizations, e.g., police, NAACP, Veteran Administration, probation offices, faith and services organizations. (Proposal page 37-38)			

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

The design of Excel Center programming has been influenced & shaped by teachers and staff over the past eight years. As an Adult HS, parental involvement is unlikely, since most students live on their own and are more likely to be responsible for their own lives (and often, their own families). Life Coaches communicate school expectations and work with families to address challenges or barriers, e.g., including providing care for young children of students.

**9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)**

**A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)**

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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 = **1.6**

Comments: Proposal pages 38-40 state that GEI follows SAAP & SBA requirements in all accounting practices for its schools. Organization has a Director of Financial Operations (also serves as the assistant treasurer for GEI’s Board of Directors) assisted by the Chief Financial Officer (also the Board treasurer). Audited on an annual basis and applicant contracts with Greenwalt CPAs as its independent auditor. Prepares annual budget (adopted by Board), manages payroll and employs proper segregation of duties, disbursements authorized & processed in accordance with established policies & procedures, and bank accounts held in federally insured, non- speculative, commercial bank/credit union accounts.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments: GEI manages the CSP grant, with Board responsible for all aspects. Appropriate bidding and shopping to enable grant (property/equipment) purchases. Every CSP purchase must have approval from the School Director.

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

<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>
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 = **1.3**

Comments: The Excel Center is designed to be sustainable solely on State funding following the expiration of the grant period (Adult Learner funding and “other state and federal grants for which they are eligible” to pay staff, offer PD, purchase equipment, etc. (example/s of “other” funding not provided).

CSP grant proposed funding for personnel, facilities and travel decrease substantially in Year 2 to prepare for transition into self-sufficiency.

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

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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 = 3

Comments: Participate in mandatory fire, tornado & lockdown drills. Full-time security officer monitors entrance and scans active security camera feeds located throughout the school. Proposal page 40 discusses appropriate use of internet/electronic resources. Safety, Loss Prevention & Security Department manages security & safety in facilities (regularly conducts compliance audits). Full enrollment is anticipated at 300 students, and space is available to support all students and staff.

Muncie location is ADA compliant and also complies with local health & safety expectations, State Fire Marshall and local agency requirements. It is located on a Muncie Indiana Transit System line to help ensure students with limited resources are able to regularly attend school. If travel creates a financial burden to those driving to school, students will be provided gas cards. Carpooling, walking or biking are also travel options to school site, located in area with significant need. (Proposal pages 40-41) *Comprehensive School Safety Plan* (Muncie Emergency Response Procedure Booklet) in appendices.

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

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3

Comments: Authorizer signature on p. 2 and project contact and board president signatures on p 5.

**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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 8

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

Comments: School Safety Plan authored & reviewed by Brandon Marks, June 2018. No evidence of submission to SBE. Note, however, that Excel Center is for non-HS-grad adult students (ages 18 and over).

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>
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

Comments: Proposal narrative followed prescribed format and was clearly presented.

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

<b>Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers</b>
• Optional Competitive Preference Priority	3	3
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5.3
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.3
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3.3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.6
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.6
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.6
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	2
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.3
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>64.6</b>