

**Name of Applicant: Ignite Achievement Academy (Indianapolis)**  
**Overall Ranking: 51.3 out of 71**

<b>OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<b>0 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)	<b>1 point</b> Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	<b>2 points</b> Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	<b>3 points</b> 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			
Comments: Applicant did not apply for competitive preference priority.			

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b> No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	<b>1-2 points</b> Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  1 point per element	<b>3-5 points</b> At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.  1 point per element	<b>6 points (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 = 4.6			
Comments: Although 10 pages are devoted to this section (pages 21-31), several elements were not specifically or effectively addressed. <i>Examples:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Curriculum Framework (starting on proposal p. 23) focused almost exclusively on the research base, but lacked specificity as to how it would translate into instructional strategies/practices within the school’s classrooms.</li> <li>• Page 25+ (Strategies to Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding IAS) noted that a detailed Scope &amp; Sequence <i>will be developed</i> (aligned to IAS and Common Core Standards) and then showed Exit Standards for Grade 6 --where Number Sense &amp; Computation standards did not make any sense. Although Math &amp; Literacy Labs, after-school tutoring and Saturday school were referenced by the applicant, none of these strategies were adequately explained.</li> <li>• Page 30 (21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills) noted applicant’s strong focus on rigorous college/career prep expectations, scaffolds and resources ... rituals, practices, routines and supplemental programs,” but did not specify how 21<sup>st</sup> century skills are actually promoted. They also referenced the “7 Mindsets of Success,” but did not explain its relevance in meeting 21<sup>st</sup> century skills.</li> </ul> Item f (Sustainability on page 30) was one of the stronger elements.			

**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>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4</p>			
<p>Comments: Pages 31-33 identify previous, aligned experiences of head of school and board members with generally solid descriptions.</p>			

**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 = 4.6

Comments: Page 33+ in proposal

Authorizer-approved goals

- 80% of students will be able to “mediate” in grade-level determined time increments by end of school year...demonstrating increased ability to concentrate & focus, self-control and patience;
- students will participate in 4 scaffolded standards-based projects across school year; and
- 50% will exceed NWEA spring growth projection in Reading.

*In addition* to authorizer goals, additional “CSP goals” have been set by the applicant:

- IAA will be fully staffed with highly-qualified teachers for all grades by 2019 and will retain 90% of staff through 2022. Applicant specifies how goals will be measured (page 34), i.e., based on resumes/signed contracts by highly qualified *teachers hired with CSP funding* in Years 1 & 2. None of CSP funding is used to hire teachers. Highly-qualified is not defined.
- IAA will ensure that building is up to code with all State/federal regulations (ADA, OSHA). Is this the \$300K budgeted in Years 1 & 2 for the Brain Lab (reviewer thought this was for technologies)? Kitchen renovations at \$70K in Year 3? How will this be measured?
- Students will achieve at/above State averages on ILEARN by 2022 (raise scores 5 points per year).

The overwhelming majority of CSP funding is proposed for PD, renovation and technology upgrades. Aside from the ILEARN goal, the established “CSP goals” do not appear aligned to the CSP

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

proposal/funded elements.		
<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>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)	<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
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3		
Comments: Page 34 states that applicant will notify stakeholders via scheduled meetings and website, and vaguely mentions marketing consultant and social media consultant (to be funded via CSP).		

**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> No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.  <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.  There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>1 point</b> Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal.  Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>2-3 points</b> Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal.  Most combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	<b>4 points</b> Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives.  The combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.  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.
---	---	--	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3

Comments: Page 17 (funding dates are incorrect). Year 1 implementation should be September 1, 2018 to July 31, 2019, etc. Applicant has applied for \$300K, per year, for a total budget of \$900K. *Summary Budget* totals agree with expenditures anticipated in *Implementation Years 1-3* worksheets.

Detailed budget descriptors are NOT provided for nearly all line items to more fully explain proposed expenditures within the attached Budget worksheet. Further, the descriptions provided within the proposal narrative, page 35, are fully inadequate to explain significant anticipated costs. Examples:

- Funding for “renovating” an existing space into a fully-functional brain lab (with a total of \$300K proposed Contractual expenditures in Years 1 & 2) are not explained (i.e., for Furniture? Technology? Wiring? Remodeling?)
- Year 2 expenditures for a sensory garden (\$60K), recording studio (\$30K) and renovation for self-contained special education classrooms to be compliant with ADA are not explained.
- Year 3 classroom Calming Corners, \$20K staff bull pen renovations not detailed (nor addressed within narrative). The kitchen renovation “Supplies” of \$70K has a rationale that mentions OSHA compliance, but does not further explain. Applicant also budgets \$120K for 800 Chromebooks (a technology update for 550 students). Certainly an allowable cost, but, again, not referenced within the proposal narratives.
- Across all three years, PD costs via Travel (ASCD Conference in Chicago, Buck Institute for PBL World 2020, and Ron Clark Academy) total \$66K for 5-8 staff per event. Breakdown of costs not explained. Contracted PD (onsite) includes Child Trauma Academy/certification, Trauma & Neuro-science PD, Roses in

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

<p>Concrete Teacher PD, RAD Teaching, and Culturally Responsive PD –all with <b>vague rationales</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although an allowable expense, costs for <i>teacher recruitment efforts</i> are not explained in the budget -- nor within the proposal narratives.</li> </ul>	
<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>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>1</b></p>	
<p>Comments: CSP funding covers PD, technology and renovations (one-time costs) applicant can sustain beyond the grant.</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>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>.6</b></p>	
<p>Comments: Many costs cannot be directly tied to activities described within the proposal narratives. The <i>reasonableness</i> of costs was often difficult to ascertain (due to lack of budget detail/rationales).</p> <p>Although, on page 36, the applicant references the lack of maintenance &amp; upkeep to the existing school site (formerly Digg Elementary/IPS), and the need for “necessary maintenance, repair, or upkeep of buildings/equipment,” <i>none of the renovation costs are explained within the proposal (or budget detail).</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</b>, applicant <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected</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>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>4.6</b></p>	
<p>Comments: Most of the six elements are demonstrated, but some lack specifics. For examples, while the applicant identified desired board member traits (Item 5-C) it did not adequately explain the board member <i>selection process</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**

<p><b>0 points</b>          No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p><b>1 point</b>          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.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b>          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.</p>	<p><b>3 points</b>          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.</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>2.3</b></p>			
<p>Comments: Member of Enroll Indy (unified enrollment plan). Multi-pronged recruitment plan clearly articulated. Lottery system presented, as well as evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5. Will enrollment consideration be given to students living outside the traditional geographic boundaries of the former public school?</p>			

<b>7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (Up to 6 Points)</b>			
<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>          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><b>3-4 points</b>          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><b>5-6 points</b>  <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>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>4.6</b></p>			
<p>Comments: Applicant's use of 10 point font and 1.15 line spacing made for tedious reading.</p> <p><b>MTSS process</b> supports academic and behavioral needs of <i>all</i> students through interventions based on level of need. Those struggling in ELA or Math provided targeted instruction during elective time in the Math and Literacy labs. Bi-weekly progress monitoring of research-based interventions will occur among grade level teams (with leadership, discipline dean, instructional coach, social worker/counselor, SpEd and ESL teacher (if applicable). Title I support also provided.</p> <p>Expectations and support for students with disabilities and EL students are directly and more completely addressed. On page 41, applicant "pledges to report ("<i>support</i>") neglected, delinquent, low-income and homeless children annually and to consult in a timely fashion to determine the needs to develop and execute effective programming and supports." McKinney Vento Community Liaison in place (p 41). More specific strategies needed here to generate full points.</p>			

<b>8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<p><b>0 points</b>          No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application</p>	<p><b>1 point</b>          Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear</p>	<p><b>2 points</b>          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><b>3 points</b>          Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = <b>1.3</b></p>			
<p>Comments: Page 43+ identifies engagement partnerships, i.e., those providing services to the school or community. Applicant goes on to show opportunities for stakeholders to voice</p>			

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

concerns/questions/appreciation at quarterly Parent Universities, as well as PTO events and anonymous surveys. Prospective parents and community leaders were surveyed to assess the level of demand for the academy.

Good information was provided about what will take place to promote/support family and student involvement, but applicant did not address the question posed in 8b, i.e., no evidence provided of parent, teacher & community involvement in the *planning & design* of the school.

**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 = 2

Comments: Ignite expects to hire a Business Manger to work onsite to handle day-to-day financial activities. For now, contracting with Donovan & Somerset to provide financial oversight, payroll/accounting and State reporting. Processes clearly articulated. Security of School Documents (record maintenance) oversight by Board of Directors or Finance Committee. (Proposal p. 45+)

**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 = 1.6

Comments: Applicant demonstrates that charter school leaders would be responsible for all aspects of the grant. An EMO is not used by Ignite Achievement Academy.

**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: Page 48+ provides describes how other State and federal funds will support school operations and achievement beyond grant funding.

**10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (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>
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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3</b>			
Comments: Proposal page 49 addresses this section.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant did not describe how the facility is safe/secure and sustainable (10a).</li> <li>Per an agreement with IPS, students who attend Ignite are provided full transportation services from IPS.</li> </ul>			

<b>11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</b>			
Comments: Authorizer signature (Mayor's Office) on p.11; project contact person and board president signatures on page 14.			

<b>12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)</b>	
<b>Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below)</b>	
A.	Charter Application to Authorizer (for new or replication proposals) <i>or</i> Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)
B.	Budget Worksheet
C.	Most recent <i>Expanded Annual Performance Report</i> (IDOE Compass) <i>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</i>
D.	Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <i>or</i> proof that application for such status has been made
E.	Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy
F.	Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <i>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</i>
G.	School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from 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>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 7.6</b>	
Comments: All anticipated appendices elements provided by applicant.	

<b>13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)</b>			
<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</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.

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

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.6**

Comments: Various font sizes (often Calibri 10 or 11) used throughout the doc ...and intermixed font sizes were employed within single sections of the proposal (likely due to cut/paste). Frequent use of 10-point font often made for a tedious read. For an *example*, see p.23 of proposal.

Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations.

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

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optional Competitive Preference Priority</li> </ul>	3	0 Did not apply
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	4.6
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	4
3A. Charter School Goals	7	4.6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.3
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	.6
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	4.6
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2.3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	4.6
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	1.3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	2
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.6
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.3
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	1.3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	7.6
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2.6
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>51.3</b>