

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

**Name of Applicant: Paramount School of Excellence II (Paramount Community Heights)**  
**Overall Ranking: 61.4 out of 71**

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

**REQUIRED ELEMENTS**

<b>1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (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>  Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.   1 point per element</p>	<p><b>3-5 points</b>  At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described.   1 point per element</p>	<p><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 &amp; Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</p>
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.5			
Comments: Replicates Paramount Brookside, an A-rated school demonstrating strong growth, an 84% student retention rate and an annual, high-demand waiting list of 300-500 students. <i>All six</i> required elements are developed & described by the applicant, demonstrating the replication of proven practices at the exiting, and highly successful, Paramount Brookside school. A more comprehensive discussion of the identification of special needs, design, monitoring, and implementation of IEP/504 plans would have generated full points for this section. (See proposal pages 13-21)			

<b>2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (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>  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			
Comments: All key personnel described, detailing their exceptional expertise and previous successful experience (Proposal pages 21-22). The proposed Paramount Community Heights school replicates the highly-successful Paramount Brookside charter school. On proposal page 22, applicant provides evidence of Brookside's effectiveness, i.e., exceptional ISTEP and IREAD longitudinal results,			

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

augmented by more comprehensive evidence in Appendix C's *Expanded Annual Performance Report* on pages 108-127. This IDOE report demonstrates increased enrollment (528 in 2013-14 to 719 in 2016-17), where minority students are the majority, serving grades K-8. Poverty rate of 87.4% and 18.5% students with disabilities in 2016-17. School rated by IDOE as an "A" for four consecutive years. Very low expulsion rate (median of one student per year, for Grades 1-6).

**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>1-2 points</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 = **6**

Comments: Applicant has already set four very high goals within its charter agreement (80% ELA & Math pass rate for Hispanic students and 70% for SpEd on ISTEP+/ILEARN; 90% or higher staff retention rate/excluding extended core teachers; and 100% staff attend at least 3 community functions).

Three *additional* goals set specific for CSP, aligned to grant funding priorities:

- (1) Fully staffed with highly qualified K-5 teachers by Year 3 (how will this be measured?);
- (2) External evaluation report to IDOE will demonstrate replication of model fidelity; and
- (3) Paramount Community Heights school will surpass State averages on IREAD and ISTEP+ (ILEARN) by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year of CSP funding.

See proposal pages 23-24.

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

<b>0 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>
Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	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 = **1.8**

Comments: Multiple, traditional avenues will be used to reach all stakeholders, including the use of Matchbook Creative (a marketing firm in Indy) to maximize communications—including social media outlets, email blasts and yard signs to communicate with the larger community. Regular communication to students, regarding progress towards goals, is less clear. (See proposal page 24)

**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)

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

<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p><u>OR</u>, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning &amp; Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></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><b>2-3 points</b></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><b>4 points</b></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 = 3.5**

**Comments:** Budget narratives provided on pages 25-26 of proposal. All anticipated budget worksheets provided, error-free. The lack of clarity and minimal explanation as to the significant levels of funding directed toward ongoing salaried positions may be viewed as an area of concern. However, all costs are directly-aligned to proposal activities and goals.

*Implementation Budget* totals agree with *Budget Summary* worksheet totals. Within its proposed implementation budget for Years 1-3, applicant adheres to maximum \$900K total budget.

Note: The Year 2 budget includes costs for “Furniture & Technology,” although it appears to be for 50 units (computers/tablets) at \$360 each – for a total cost of \$18K. The budget rationale here is somewhat vague – and also includes a reference to “computer installation costs” of \$44K → NOT included within the CSP proposed budget.

**B. School’s Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation** (up to 1 point, for Part B)

<p><b>0 Points</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><b>1 Point</b></p> <p>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p>
---	---

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .8**

**Comments:** Once funded activities are established (recruitment, hiring start-up staff, one-time technology fees, etc.), costs are easily maintained via State and general funds beyond Year 3. (Page 26 proposal)

**C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary** (up to 1 point, for Part C)

<p><b>0 Points</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><b>1 Point</b></p> <p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>
---	---

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .8**

**Comments:** All costs appear reasonable and necessary, if ongoing salary costs are approved by IDOE (i.e., IDOE guidance for start-up of staff for “one school year only,” and not ongoing operations that can be met with State or local funds).

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

- This new school (replicated program) opens fall 2018. Allocable costs are budgeted for teacher recruitment, signing bonuses and minimal moving costs for recruited teachers.
  - Costs for Director of Academics, Director of Student Supports (Positive Behaviors) and external evaluation also appear reasonable and allocable.
  - Proposed start-up costs for lead classroom teachers are based on a slow-growth model whereby:
    - Year 1 funds five lead teachers (Grades K-4);
    - Year 2 funds two (Grade 5) and two (Grade K) teachers; and
    - Year 3 funds two (Grade 1) and two (Grade 2) teachers.
- Through this model, Paramount will be able to sustain itself with State and general funds beyond Year 3. On proposal page 26, Item 4c, the applicant states: “Per IDOE guidance, salaries for start-up of staff for each additional grade level have been included for one school year only.”

**5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)**

<b>Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)</b>	
A.	All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. <b>If the school uses an EMO/CMO, applicant also must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected</b>
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. <i>IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point</i>
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 = 5.8</b>	
<b>Comments:</b> All anticipated elements are adequately addressed by the applicant, although the process for board member selection could have been stronger to generate a full point.	

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

<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.
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</b>			
<b>Comments:</b> Pages 29-31 of the proposal demonstrate a clearly-articulated, multi-pronged student recruitment plan, providing solid evidence of compliance with Indiana Code expectations. Paramount is part of Enroll Indy (unified enrollment system) and its appropriate public lottery process is fully described.			

**7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (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>          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>
--	---	---	--

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.8**

Comments: Paramount Brookside (the replicated school) clearly focuses on underserved students, i.e., nearly 81% poverty, 47% Black, 16% Latino, 27% European, 11% Multiracial – with 18% students with IEP and 15% EL. Paramount recruits & develops highly qualified staff. They provide Title I services to at-risk; N/D and homeless students also supported by McKinney-Vento (social worker onsite). Title I Part C and Title III (employ best practices for language learners and use of WIDA). School implements high-quality MTSS. Brookside identified by National Center of Special Education in Charter Schools as one of their “Centers of Excellence” for serving students with exceptionalities in 2016; in 2017, Paramount worked with consultant to create comprehensive policy & procedure manual relevant to special education. Replicating Brookside’s special education processes & procedures viewed as a critical cornerstone to the new Paramount Community Heights school (Proposal pages 31-32). More clearly articulated policies and procedures for identifying, designing, implementing, and monitoring students with exceptional education need would have strengthened this section of the proposal.

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

<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>
--	--	---	---

**Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.8**

Comments: Clear evidence of citywide partnerships (Community Health, Fairbanks, Lilly Foundation, Rooney Foundation, Teach Plus, Mind Trust) and Near Eastside of Indianapolis partnerships (neighborhood association which plans & organizes monthly community functions). Paramount has implemented Academic Parent Teacher Teams since 2012 –which brings parents to the school to work as a team to improve academic performance (based on an Arizona model). Anchored in the Paramount system and renamed Families Allies Community Team (FACT), it’s comprised of three staff solely focused on working with families (home visits, enhancing school-home communications) and supported through a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant. The replication process for Paramount Community Heights began via engagement with numerous community partners & surveys of existing families to fully understand community needs. (Proposal pages 32-33)

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

<b>A. Internal Controls over Expenditure &amp; Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)</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>          Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear</p>	<p><b>2 Points</b>          A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated</p>

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

<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3</b>		
<p>Comments: Statement of Board responsibility for fiscal management is included. Bookkeeping is handled in-house and then validated through BPI software system. Proposal claims the use of recognized and approved accounting protocols. Budgets and monthly financial statements are reviewed by PSOE leadership. An independent financial consultant conducts external audits and oversight.</p> <p>General statement of accountability and broad overview of procedures are appropriate; however, specific internal controls regarding purchase orders, record keeping, dual signature requirement, or other GAAP are not offered to provide greater reassurance as to internal financial controls.</p>		
<b>B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)</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).
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3</b>		
<p>Comments: Decision-making process and creation of budget described, but not fully developed, e.g., how are purchased items tracked? (Proposal page 34)</p>		
<b>C. Other State &amp; Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)</b>		
<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
<b>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2</b>		
<p>Comments: In addition to State and general funds, pages 34-35 show numerous external grants (e.g., Mind Trust, Walton Foundation, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC, and Community Health) in addition to Titles I, II, III and ADM that will support ongoing costs. The <i>Budget Sustainability Year</i> worksheet also describes how costs associated with grant will be sustained.</p>		

<b>10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (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 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 = 3</b>			
<p>Comments: Updated facility site, previously used by IPS (classrooms, bathrooms, administrative space, recess space &amp; cafeteria space already in place). Passed health code and city inspections. Currently, six developed classrooms, with room for expansion as school grows (Year 1 anticipate 120 K-4 students, expanding to 160 K-5 students by Year 3, with target of 300 students by Year 4). Fob readers (secure access in/out of building), monitored entrance, parking lot security, greenspace for environmental programming and readily-available behavioral health services via Lutherwood and Community Health</p>			

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

Networks. Comprehensive *Safety Plan attached.*

Transportation not provided by Paramount (except in cases of homelessness or IEPs). Driveline is setup as family drop off in the morning and an in-class pickup in the afternoon, promoting procedures that connect parents & teachers on a routine basis.

**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	<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 three required signatures submitted on pages 2, 4 and 5.			

**12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)**

<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) <small>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</small>
D.	Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <i>or</i> proof that application for such status has been made
E.	Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy
F.	Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <small>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</small>
G.	School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)
H.	School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 8	
Comments: All anticipated appendices included.	

**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 = 3			
Comments: Narrative clearly presented with applicant following prescribed format within the 30-page limitation.			

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	5.5
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	5
3A. Charter School Goals	7	6
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	1.8
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	3.5
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	.8
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	.8
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.8
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	4.8
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2.8
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.3
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.3
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	2
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	3
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	8
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>71</b> Total Points Possible	<b>61.4</b>