REVIEW SUMMARY

Reviewer Name:	Applicant Name: Mississippi Global Academy		
Dates of Review: 9/04/2024	Total Score: 100		

Please make sure you have signed the review at the end of the document.

Section I. Rubric for a Non-CMO Applicant with an ESP

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	<mark>2</mark>	1	0	
A. CMOs; ESPs ESP requirements (1)(A)		 Copy of the contract, including name and contact information for the ESP, provided. Cost of the contract, including the amount of CSP funds proposed to be used toward such cost, and the percentage such cost represents of the school's overall funding is provided AND cost is 	□Steps for one of the following steps are likely to be ineffective: that school pays fair market value, that school makes all programmatic decisions, that school maintains control over CSP, that school directly administers or supervises CSP.	□ A copy of the ESP contract is missing. □ Contract does not specify one or more of the following: name and contact information of the ESP, cost (including the amount of CSP funds proposed to be used and the percentage such cost represents of the school's overall funding), or duration. □ Proposed costs	The proposal makes it clear that the applicant will be working with an external organization as a service provider (p. 596- 598). This arrangement is spelled out with respect to the kinds of services

version 12	14.22
● Duration of the contract is □ Roles and responsibilities proverse	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		□Steps the applicant will take to ensure that it pays fair market value for any services or other items purchased or leased from the ESP are clear and effective. □Steps the applicant will take to ensure it makes all programmatic decisions are clear and effective. □Steps to maintain control over all CSP funds are clear and effective. □Steps to ensure the applicant directly		□ Roles and responsibilities of the ESP are unclear. □ Applicant takes no steps to ensure one or more of the following: that school pays fair market value, that school makes all programmatic decisions, that school maintains control over CSP, that school directly administers or supervises CSP. □ Steps for more than one of the following are ineffective: that school pays fair market value, that	

ac	<mark>dministers or</mark>	school makes all	
<mark>SU</mark>	<mark>upervises the</mark>	programmatic	
ac	dministration of the	decisions, that school	
g <mark>gr</mark>	rant in accordance	maintains control	
		over	
wi	rith 34 CFR 75.701	CSP, that school	
a <mark>ar</mark>	<mark>re clear and</mark>	directly administers	
		or	
e <mark>f</mark>	<mark>ffective.</mark>	supervises CSP.	
er	rrective.	supervises CSP.	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	<mark>2</mark>	1	0	
				□ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	

requiremen ts (1)(B) & (1)(C)	□ No actual or perceived conflicts of interest, including financial interests.	□Description of any business or financial relationship between the charter school developer and the ESP, including payments, contract terms, and property owned, operated, or controlled by the ESP or related individuals or entities that will be used by the charter school is clear. □Name and contact information provided for each member of the governing board of the charter school and a list of ESP officers, chief administrator, or other administrators, and any staff involved in approving or	□Clear description of how any actual or perceived conflicts of interest will be resolved in compliance with 2 CFR 200.318(c) but process will not comply with state ethics requirements.	□No description of business/financial relationship between school and ESP or description is unclear. □Name and contact information for board/staff/ESP individuals not provided. □No description of how conflicts of interest will be resolved. □Resolution procedures are inadequate and/or do not comply with 2 CFR 200.318(c). □Substantial conflicts of interest exist that cannot be resolved in	The proposal spells out the service agreement between the applicant and the ESP (p. 569-597). In particular, this relationship does not provide a supervisory role for the ESP and clarifies the specific roles and responsibilities that exist between the ESP and the applicant.
-------------------------------------	--	---	--	---	--

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	<mark>2</mark>	1	0	
		executing the ESP contract. Clear description of how any actual or perceived conflicts of interest will be resolved in compliance with 2 CFR 200.318(c) and with state ethics requirements.		compliance with state or federal rules.	

ESP requiremen ts (1)(D)	Not applicable	□Applicant plan to ensure that members of the governing board of the school are not selected, removed, controlled, or employed by the ESP is clear and effective. □Applicant plan to procure legal, accounting, and auditing services independently from the ESP is clear and effective.	Not applicable	□Applicant plan to ensure that members of the governing board of the school are not selected, removed, controlled, or employed by the ESP is unclear or ineffective. □Applicant plan to procure legal, accounting, and auditing services independently from the ESP is unclear or ineffective.	The proposal specifically shows how the governing board and the ESP are separate (p. 572). Moreover, the proposal clarifies the plan for procuring legal, accounting and auditing services that are distinct from the ESP's services (p. 573).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
ESP requiremen ts (1)(E)	Not applicable	□ Applicant plan to ensure that ESP contract is severable is effective. □ Severing the ESP contract will not cause the school to close. □ The duration of the ESP contract will not extend beyond the charter's expiration. □ Renewal of the ESP contract must receive approval and affirmative action by the governing board.	Not applicable	□Applicant has no plan to ensure that ESP contract is severable, or plan is ineffective. □Severing the ESP contract is likely to cause the school to close or it is not clear whether school can remain open without ESP. □The duration of the ESP contract extends beyond the charter's expiration. □Renewal of the ESP contract does not require approval and/or affirmative action by the governing board or it is unclear.	The proposal spells out the details of the relationship between the applicant and the ESP, including the duration of the relationship (p. 577)) and the severability of the contract (p.

					VEISIUIT 12.14.22
					593).
ESP requiremen ts (1)(F)	Not applicable	□Applicant steps to maintain control over student records are clear and effective.	Not applicable	□Applicant steps to maintain control over student records are	The proposal states that the applicant will maintains
					oversight of the school and management of the student data (p. 69).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		□Process to provide records to another public school/district in a timely manner upon transfer of a student, including due to closure of the school, in accordance with 4308 of the ESEA is clear and effective.		records to another public school/district in a timely manner upon transfer of a	The proposal states how the applicant will work with other educational entities, as necessary, to ensure that students are afforded a smooth transfer (p. 322).
Subtotal	The applicant scored "2	" for all of these criteria			10

Eligibility

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
-------------	--------	---

Did the applicant score any "does not meet" for any question?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.
---	------------------------	-----------------

If yes, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Question Points Available	Exceeds Standard Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets Standard Meets all of the following:	Partially Meets Standard Meets any of the following:	Does Not Meet Standard Meets any of the following:	Score
B. Parent, family, and community engagement, part 1	□Applicant reserves a seat on its governing board specifically for a current parent.	□Applicant has a parent and/or community advisory body or council that reports to the governing board. OR Applicant has another robust method of soliciting and considering input from parents and community members on the implementation and operation of the school. □Applicant has a clear process for accepting parent or student objections to governing board policies and decisions, administrative procedures, and school practices.	□Applicant does not have a parent and/or community advisory body or council that reports to the governing board. AND Applicant's other methods of soliciting and considering input from parents and community members on the implementation and operation of the school are weak. □Applicant's process for accepting parent or student objections is not likely to be effective OR is not applicable to all of the following: policy/decisions,	□ Applicant has no method of soliciting and considering input from parents and community members on the implementation and operation of the school. □ Applicant has no process for accepting parent or student objections to any policy/ decision, procedure, or practice. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal states that the school will have a academic advisory committee that will guide the school's programma tic growth and ensure

		procedure, and	that the
		practice.	
		practice.	academic
			programs
			are
			addressing
			community
			community
			needs (p.
			50).
			50).
L	I		

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	<mark>2</mark>	1	0	
C. Parent, family, and community engagement, part 2	□Plan to engage parents is exceptional, with multiple, meaningful and effective opportunities for ongoing parent, student, and community involvement.	□Plan to engage parents is robust, with meaningful and effective opportunities for ongoing parent, student, and community involvement. □No parent or student expectations are likely to prevent interested families from being able to attend the school. OR Parent volunteer requirements include a waiver to consider individual circumstances.	□Opportunities for engagement may be effective, but they are not meaningful. □Opportunities for engagement omit any of the following: parents, students, or community members.	□ Engagement plan presents few or no opportunities for ongoing engagement. □ Engagement plan presents no effective strategies. □ Parent or student expectations are likely to prevent interested families from being able to attend the school. □ Parent volunteer requirements do not include a waiver. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal provides a specific parent engagement plan that will offer volunteer opportunities, events and communicatio n strategies (p. 46).
Subtotal					4

Eligibility

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

If yes, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	21	<mark>18</mark>	9	0	

		1		1	
D. Planned activities, expenditures, and sustainability	□ Budget narrative is exceptionally detailed.	□Completed CSP subgrant budget form is attached. □Proposed subgrant does not exceed \$300,000 per year for 5 years. □The budget narrative is aligned to the budget form and clearly describes all planned activities, expenditures, and cost assumptions. □Planning versus implementation funds are clearly delineated in the budget and budget narrative.	□ Expenses are allowable but misallocated to either planning or implementation. □ Budget is miscalculated .	□No CSP budget form. □No CSP budget narrative. □Subgrant exceeds \$300,000 per year or maximum number of years. □Budget form and narrative are not aligned. □Planning or implementation funds are not clearly delineated. □Some planning expenses appear to exceed the 18- month maximum.	The proposal communica tes the budget clearly (p. 557-570). These expenses delineate planning and implementa tion. Moreover, the expenses are clear, reasonable and commensur ate with the intended impact of the school.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	21	18	9	0	
		□ Expenses proposed are reasonable, allowable, and allocable. □ Clear goals for the CSP subgrant align with the purposes of CSP. □ Clear description of all major planned activities/ expenses to be supported with CSP subgrant funds. □ Applicant justifies all activities as necessary to carry out the CSP subgrant program and purposes. □ Applicant has a clear, effective sustainability plan, including how revenue will be		□Some expenses proposed are not reasonable. □Some expenses proposed are not allowable. □Some expenses proposed are not allocable. □Applicant's goals are not clear and/or do not align with the purposes of CSP. □Activities/expense s are not justified or necessary. □Sustainability plan is unclear or likely to be ineffective. □Answer to any item is too vague or	

	replaced if need be.	confusing to evaluate.	
		ovaluato	
		evaluate.	

Eligibility

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

If yes, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	

E. Needs Analysis (1) Community support Support Community support E. Needs Analysis (1) Community support Support Community support Communit	demand for school either in Attachment 6 or supplemental materials, but whether charter school will achieve and maintain enrollment projections is not clear. demand for school either in Attachment school presented. Description of local community support and benefits indicates school would be actively harmful to community. Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate. The proposal notes a partnership with a local organizatio in to ascertain
--	---

		the school.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		instructional approaches). □Clear description of local community support and benefits to the community. □All evidence indicates strong likelihood the charter school will achieve and maintain its enrollment projections.			

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	

(3) Student demograp hi cs

□ Plans to establish and maintain a racially and socioeconomically diverse student body, including proposed strategies (that are consistent with applicable legal requirements) to recruit, admit, enroll, and retain a diverse student body are strongly likely to succeed based on evidence presented.

□Clear analysis of the school's projected student demographics (including race and socio-economic status) and a description of the demographics of students attending public schools in the local community in which the charter school would be located and the school districts from which the students are, or would be, drawn. □ Clear description of plans to establish and maintain a racially and socioeconomically diverse student body, including proposed

strategies (that are

consistent with

applicable legal

requirements) to

□ Description of why establishing a diverse student body is unlikely is missing one of the following: why it is unlikely that the school will be able to establish and maintain a racially and socio-economic diverse student body, how the anticipated racial and socio- economic makeup of the student body will promote the purposes of CSP, and the anticipated impact of the proposed school on the racial and socio-economic diversity of the public schools and school districts from which students would be drawn.

□School's projected demographics are not clear or missing for race or socioeconomic status. □ Description of the demographics of relevant public schools from which students are, or would be drawn, is not clear or missing for race or socioeconomic status. ☐ Plans to establish and maintain a racially and socioeconomically diverse student body, including proposed strategies (that are consistent with applicable legal requirements) to recruit, admit, enroll, and retain a diverse student body are not

The proposal lists the anticipated demographi c information of the students. (p. 34-36). These data are taken from the local school district.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		recruit, admit, enroll, and retain a diverse student body OR clear and compelling description of ALL of the following: why it is unlikely that the school will be able to establish and maintain a racially and socio-economic diverse student body, how the anticipated racial and socio- economic makeup of the student body will promote the purposes of CSP, and the anticipated impact of the proposed school on the racial and socio-economic diversity of the public schools and school districts from which		clear or are clearly not legal. Description of why it is unlikely school will establish a diverse student body is missing two or more of the following: why it is unlikely that the school will be able to establish and maintain a racially and socio-economic diverse student body, how the anticipated racial and socio- economic makeup of the student body will promote the purposes of CSP, and the anticipated impact of the proposed school on the racial and socio-economic	

	students would be drawn.	diversity of the public schools and school districts from which	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
				students would be drawn. Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	

	1	I	I	1	
(4) Robust family and community engagement plan	□School design was family and community led through a stakeholder visioning process.	□Clear description of how families and the community were, are, or will be engaged in the vision and design of the school, including specific examples of input incorporated into the vision and design. □Clear plan to meaningfully engage with families and the community to create strong and ongoing partnerships. □Clear and effective plan to foster a collaborative culture involving the families of all students, including underserved	□Description of how families and the community were, are, or will be engaged in the vision and design of the school, but no specific examples of input incorporated into the vision and design provided. □Plan to engage with families is clear, but it is unclear if it will lead to strong and ongoing partnerships. □Plans omit one of the following: student recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and retention. □Plans for student	□ Description of engagement in the vision and design of the school is unclear. Plan to engage families is unclear or families will clearly not be engaged. Plans omit more than one of the following: student recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and retention. □ Plans for student recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and retention do not include more than one of the following: English learners,	The proposal describes how the school hopes to foster a collaborative culture within the school through policies and curriculum (p. 28). Also, the governing board has specific strategies to foster family and community engagemen t. (p. 49).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	

_				. 5.5.5
	students, in ensinput in decision making. Clear and effective plan for student recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and retention that wengage and accommodate families from various backgrounds, including Englistlearners, studen with disabilities and students of color, including providing enrollment and recruitment information in widely accessib formats (e.g., hacopy and online multiple langua as appropriate, large print or	admissions, enrollment, and retention do not include one of the following: English learners, students with disabilities, or students of color. will the nts f by le ard e in ages;	students with disabilities, or students of color. No description of how the applicant has engaged or will engage families and the community to develop an instructional model to serve the targeted student population and their families, including students with disabilities and English learners.	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		available and transparent means (e.g., online and at community locations). Clear description of how the applicant has engaged or will engage families and the community to develop an instructional model to serve the targeted student population and their families, including students with disabilities and English learners.			

operations provide of how feedby direct incorp	scription des examples w community back was tly porated into perations plan. Clear des of how the applicant's school ope reflect the students ar families in community including considerati district or community and how th	considers community assets but does not discuss how the school's location will facilitate access for the targeted student population.	□ Description of responsive operations plan vague or confusing. □ How operations plan reflects the needs of students and families is not clear. □ Description does not consider either	The proposal notes that the applicant is committed to being responsive to the community's needs (p. 48). This is evident through their partnership s in the community.
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		school's location, or anticipated location if a facility has not been secured, will facilitate access for the targeted student population.		community assets or how the school's location will facilitate access for the targeted student population.	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		which the school is, or would be, located and the districts from which students are, or would be, drawn, including efforts to comply with a court order, statutory obligation, or voluntary efforts to create and maintain desegregated public schools. □ Effective steps taken to ensure that the proposed charter school would not otherwise increase racial or socio- economic segregation or isolation in the schools from which the students are, or would be, drawn.	unclear utility.	delaying, or negatively affecting desegregation efforts or by otherwise increasing racial or socio-economic isolation. School is in a district with an ongoing voluntary or court order, as confirmed by Mississippi First, and did not respond to questions as required.	

Subtotal	12

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□YES □ <mark>NO</mark>	Choose an item.

If yes, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	6	4	2	0	
F. Transportation	□Transportation plan includes not only daily transportation but also transportation for field trips and extracurriculars. □Transportation plan extends beyond the charter school's geographic school district attendance zone.	Clear description of an effective transportation plan to provide reliable and safe daily transportation for all students within the charter school's geographic school district attendance zone to prevent transportation becoming a barrier to charter school access.	□Clear description of an effective transportation plan to provide reliable and safe daily transportation for some students within the charter school's geographic school district attendance zone.	☐ Transportation plan is vague or missing. ☐ Transportation plan will not ensure reliable and safe daily transportation for any students. ☐ Plan will not ensure transportation is not an access barrier for students.	The proposal provides a general transportati on plan. However, the

<u>Eligibility</u>			
			proposal does not make some details clear, such as who the transportati on vendor will be.

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.	
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.	

If yes, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	

G. Enrollment disclosures to families	□Applicant has no policies and requirements, nor any services that are or are not provided, that could impact a family's ability to enroll or remain enrolled OR has a process to waive such policies and requirements or provide accommodations to families needing services that could impact a family's	□ Applicant fully and clearly explains plans to disclose, as part of the enrollment process, any policies and requirements (e.g., purchasing and wearing specific uniforms and other fees, or requirements for family participation), and any services that are or are not provided, that could impact a family's ability to enroll or remain enrolled in the school	□ Applicant explains disclosure plans clearly but these plans omit either policies and requirements or services. □ Applicant explains disclosure plans but these happen postenrollment.	□ Applicant's response is vague or confusing. □ Applicant's plans to disclose policies, requirements, or services are not clear or are inadequate. □ Applicant's plans will actively mislead families.	The proposal provides an enrollment policy for the school. These details make clear how families will apply, be admitted and enroll (p. 319-322).
---------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
	ability to enroll and remain enrolled.	(e.g., transportation services or participation in the National School Lunch Program).			

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS
A	10 (of 11)
В	2 (of 3)

If yes, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS
С	2 (of 3)
D	18 (of 21)
E	12 (of 18)
F	4 (of 6)
G	2 (of 3)
Points Earned	50
Possible Points	65
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	77
Percentage Points Earned X 50%	38

Reviewer Name:

Date: 9/4/2024 Reviewer Signature:



Section II. Assessment of Risk

A. ESP or Virtual School

Model	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as meeting Risk Category 1.
ESP	□ <mark>YES</mark> □ NO	Yes
Virtual School	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

B. Financial History and Practices and Findings and Questioned Costs

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
	audit, timely reporting and drawdowns, etc.	within budget, clean audit, timely reporting and drawdowns, etc.			
Question 4	□Applicant has at least one financial staff person or contractor with a CPA. □Applicant's financial staff or contractors have compelling experience.	□ Applicant has at least one financial staff person or contractor with a four- year degree in accounting. □ Applicant's financial staff or contractors have some experience.	□Applicant has at least one financial staff person or contractor with a two- year degree or certificate in bookkeeping.	□ Applicant does not have qualified financial staff or contractors. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal shows that the applicant has the capacity to monitor the finances as well as conduct an external audit (p. 74).

Question 5	Not applicable	□Applicant has never been suspended or debarred.	□Applicant has been suspended or debarred in the past but has been removed from the list of excluded parties.	□Applicant is currently suspended or debarred, or it is not clear whether the applicant is, or has been, suspended or debarred.	The proposal provides no evidence that the applicant has ever been suspended or
Question 6	□Applicant has never been designated a highrisk grantee by any grantor.	□Applicant is not designated a highrisk grantee by any current grantor.	□Applicant was previously considered a highrisk grantee but is not longer.	□Applicant is currently considered a high-risk grantee.	debarred. The proposal provides no evidence that the applicant has ever been designated a high-risk grantee.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
Question 7	□Fully developed financial policies, procedures, and practices that have been fully implemented.	□ Fully developed financial policies, procedures, and practices that have not been fully implemented BUT clear and effective timeline and plan for full implementation.	□Partially developed financial policies, procedures, and practices that have only been partially implemented or not yet implemented BUT clear and effective timeline and plan for full development and implementation. □No financial policies, procedures, or practices BUT very strong timeline and plan for full development and implementation.	□ Partially developed financial policies, procedures, and practices AND no clear or effective timeline and plan for full development and implementation. □ No financial policies, procedures, or practices AND weak or no clear timeline and plan for full development and implementation.	The proposal provides fully developed financial policies and procedures to guide the running of the school (p. 73-75). It appears that hese policies and procedures will be

					implemente d when the school project is carried out.
Question 8	□Applicant currently has very strong insurance coverage.	□Applicant has adequate insurance coverage to protect organization in the event of misallocation of funds. OR Applicant has clear plan to purchase adequate coverage before	□Some insurance coverage to protect organization in the event of misallocation of funds but coverage is not complete/adequate and applicant has no plan to purchase	□No insurance coverage. □Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal shows that the applicant is committed to securing comprehen sive insurance coverage to protect the school, its staff,studen ts, and stakeholder

		s. This insurance will be obtained in July 2025 (p. 71).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		receiving CSP or within 30 days of receiving CSP.	remaining needed coverage.		
Subtotal					13

Eligibility & Risk Assessment 2a

Eligibility or Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being either ineligible or meeting Risk Category 2.
Is applicant currently debarred or is it unclear if the applicant is currently debarred?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.
Had applicant even been debarred?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for question 3, 4, 6, 7, and/or 8?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

If applicant is currently debarred, stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
Question 9			*informational only*	•	
Question 10	Not applicable	□Applicant uses professional accounting software appropriate for a school to record accounting transactions. OR Applicant intends to purchase such software, or hire a contractor with such software, within 30 days of receiving CSP.	Not applicable	□Applicant does not use professional accounting software appropriate for a school (e.g., uses Microsoft Excel, a paper ledger, or a check register) and will not purchase professional software or hire a contractor with such software. □Accounting software used is not named.	The proposal states that the applicant will contract with a financial service provider for support and audit services (p. 74). This includes contracting for an accounting

					software system (p. 632). The proposal also states that the applicant uses Quickbooks (p. 64).
Question 11	□Applicant separately tracks grant funds as a routine practice by coding expenditures by grant source, type of expense, and related program when the expense is approved.	□Applicant separately tracks (or will track) grant funds as a routine practice by coding expenditures by grant source and type of expense when the expense is approved.	□Applicant has the capability to track funds separately by source but does not do so routinely. □Applicant must undertake a special review of expenditures after the expense has been paid to	□ Applicant cannot separately track grant funds. □ Applicant is unsure if they can separately track funds. □ Applicant's ability to produce detailed, accurate reports at any time in unclear.	The proposal communica tes that the applicant will implement a policy for managing CSP expenditure s. This policy will be enacted once the funds are received (p. 73).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		□Applicant can (or will be able to) produce detailed, accurate reports quickly (automated or fewer than 24 hours).	determine whether it is attributable to a grant. Applicant requires more than 24 hours to produce detailed, accurate reports of grant expenditures.		
Question 12	□Applicant's system is very efficient and effective.	□ Applicant has a clear, effective system for checking grant reports.	□Applicant has a system for checking grant reports but it may be ineffective.	□ Applicant has no system to check grant reports. □ Applicant's system is ineffective. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal notes that the accounting software system will be used to manage funds. The financial policies and procedures in the

	1	1	I	1	
					proposal describe the roles and responsibili ties for managing the project's expenditure s. (p. 73).
Question 13	□ Financial statements are (or will be) reviewed and approved by the head of the entity or unit at least monthly and reviewed and approved more frequently than	□Financial statements are (or will be) reviewed and approved by the head of the entity or unit at least monthly and reviewed and approved at least quarterly by board or board committee.	□ Financial statements are (or will be) reviewed and approved by the head of the entity or office at least monthly but not reviewed and approved by board or board committee,	□ Financial statements are (or will be) reviewed and approved less frequently than monthly by the head of the entity or unit. □ Financial statements are not routinely reviewed or	The proposal states that the Board Treasurer will meet monthly with the financial services provider to review the school's financial status prior to each Board meeting (p. 73).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
	<i>quarterly</i> by board or board committee.	□ Review process is adequate to identify and quickly correct inaccuracies or fraud.	either <u>at least</u> <u>quarterly or</u> <u>otherwise</u> .	are only reviewed for accuracy through audits. ☐ Review process is not likely to identify and quickly correct inaccuracies or fraud. ☐ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	
Question 14-21 (to be evaluated holistically)	□ Applicant has strong financial procedures and controls.	□Applicant has adequate financial procedures and controls to ensure good fiscal stewardship and prevent fraud.	□Some procedures and controls are adequate but some must be further developed.	□ Applicant does not have adequate financial procedures or controls, or financial procedures or controls are unclear. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal states that the applicant has financial policies and procedures to ensure good

Questions 22-23		*informational only*	stewardship of funds (p. 73). These procedures include a financial services provider, the school leadership and the governing board.
Subtotal			11

Risk Assessment 2b

Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as meeting Risk Category 2.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

For applicants responding to Findings and Questioned Costs questions ONLY

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	

Audit findings □ School audit (and ESP audit, applicable) not an unqualified unmodified opinion. If applicable, □ESP appears good financial health.	□School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) identified deficiencies, but these were not significant. □School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) expresses a qualified, modified, adverse, or disclaimed opinion. (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) identified non-material weaknesses. If applicable, □ESP financial health presents some concerns. □School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted significant deficiencies. □School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted material weaknesses. □School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted material weaknesses. □School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted material weaknesses. □School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted material weaknesses.
---	--

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
				applicable) identified non- compliance material to the financial statements of federal or state awards. School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted findings and questioned costs. School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) noted prior-year findings which have not been corrected. If applicable, ESP financial health is weak and presents concerns that ESP will not continue to be a going concern.	

Subtotal	N/A

Risk Assessment 2c

Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as meeting Risk Category 2.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

C. Delayed Openings or Failure to Launch (as applicable)

If the applicant marked "not applicable," skip this section and continue to D.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	6	3	1	0	
Question 24	□Applicant has never had a delayed school.	□All delayed schools have since been opened. OR Applicant has no more than one currently delayed school, the explanation for the delay is reasonable, AND there is a clear timeline for launch.	□ Applicant has two or more delayed schools, BUT the explanation for the delay is reasonable, AND there is a clear timeline for launch.	□ Applicant provides no rationale or no clear timeline for launching one or more currently delayed schools. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	The proposal provides no evidence that the applicant has ever had a delayed

					school.
Question 25	Not applicable	□All of applicant's schools have opened or are scheduled to open.	□Applicant has no more than one never- opened school, BUT the explanation for the failed launch is	□Applicant spent CSP funds on one or more never-opened charters.	N/A

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	6	3	1	0	
			reasonable, AND the applicant did not use CSP funds on the school.	☐One or more charters expired or were relinquished by applicant due to delays or any other reason and no reasonable explanation is provided.	
Subtotal					12

Risk Assessment 3

Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as meeting Risk Category 3.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

D. Past Performance (as applicable)

If the applicant is a new operator with no operating schools, skip this section and continue to scoring.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	12	9	6	0	
For new school applicants ONLY:	□Applicant's schools have exceptional performance academically, operationally.	□Applicant's schools, as a whole, have strong performance without any notable academic, financial, or operational issues.	□Some applicant schools have strong or exceptional academic performance, but some schools have low academic performance. □Applicant schools, as a whole, have strong or exceptional performance in at least two areas (academic, operational, or financial) but low performance in one area.	□ Applicant's other schools have low performance in two or more areas (academic, operational, or financial). □ Applicant has had a school closed for academic, financial, or operational reasons. □ Applicant has had serious contract violations leading to authorizer intervention in the last three years.	N/A

For replication and expansion applicants ONLY:	□Applicant significantly exceeds the definition of a "high-quality charter school."	Applicant meets the definition of a "high- quality charter school" as follows: Shows evidence of strong academic results, which may include strong student academic growth, on state or nationally	Not applicable	□Applicant does not meet the definition of a "high-quality charter school." □ If applying for an expansion grant, applicant did not have strong academic results or increasing student achievement	N/A
--	---	---	----------------	--	-----

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	12	9	6	0	N/A

		7131011 12.14.22
recognized assessments;	for subgroups for at least three	
□ has no significant	years.	
issues in the areas	☐ Answer is too	
of student safety,	vague or confusing	
financial and	to evaluate.	
operational	to evaluate.	
management, or		
statutory or		
regulatory		
compliance;		
□has demonstrated		
success in		
significantly		
increasing student		
academic		
achievement,		
including graduation		
rates where		
applicable, for all		
students served by		
the charter school;		
and		
□has demonstrated		
success in		
increasing student		
academic		
achievement,		
including graduation		
rates where		
applicable, for each		
of		

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	12	9	6	0	N/A

·	<u></u>	
	the subgroups of	
	students, as defined	
	in section 1111(c)(2),	
	except that such	
	demonstration is not	
	required in a case in	
	which the number of	
	students in a group is	
	insufficient to yield	
	statistically reliable	
	information or the	
	results would reveal	
	personally	
	identifiable	
	information about an	
	individual student.	
	☐ If applying for an	
	expansion grant,	
	applicant showed	
	evidence of strong	
	academic results	
	for at least three	
	years.	
	☐ If applying for an	
	expansion grant,	
	applicant showed	
	success in	
	increasing student	
	achievement,	
	including	
	graduation rates,	
	for subgroups	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	12	9	6	0	
		for at least three years.			
Subtotal					N/A

Eligibility & Risk Assessment 4

Eligibility or Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being either ineligible or meeting Risk Category 4.
If the applicant is applying for a new school grant, did the applicant score "does not meet"? [LEAVE BLANK IF NOT APPLICABLE]	□YES □ NO	Choose an item.
If the applicant is applying for a replication or expansion grant, does the applicant school/ school model meet the definition of a "high- quality charter school"? [LEAVE BLANK IF NOT APPLICABLE]	□YES □ NO	Choose an item.
If the applicant is applying for an expansion grant, did the applicant show three years of strong academic results and increasing	□YES □ NO	Choose an item.

١.	,		4	_		\sim
W	'ers	ınn	-1	') '	14	ンソ

	student

Eligibility or Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being either ineligible or meeting Risk Category 4.
achievement? [LEAVE BLANK IF NOT APPLICABLE]		

If replication or expansion school/model is not "high quality," stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a

CSP subgrant.

If expansion school did not show strong academic results and increasing student achievement for at least three years,

stop scoring. Applicant is not eligible to receive a CSP subgrant.

Overall Risk Assessment Categories 1-4

Risk Category	Meets?
Category 1	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>
Category 2	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>
Category 3	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>
Category 4	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>
Number of Categories Met 2-4	0
TOTAL NUMBER OF CATEGORIES MET	0

If applicant meets two of three of Categories 2-4, stop scoring as applicant is too risky. Applicant is not eligible

to receive a CSP subgrant.

SECTION II SUMMARY SCORE

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS		
	Questions 1-8	Questions 9-23	Findings and Questioned Costs
В	13	11	0
	(of 17 points)	(of 14 points)	(of 2 points)
C*	12. (of 6 points)		
D*	0. (of 12 points)		
Points Earned	36		
Possible Points	51		
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	71		
Percentage Points Earned X 20%	14		

^{*}as applicable

Reviewer Name:

Date: 9/4/2024 Reviewer Signature:



Section III. Overall School Plan Quality

A. Coherence and Detail

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
Vision, mission, and educational model	□School model's connection to targeted student population's needs is particularly strong.	□School has a clear vision and mission. □School has a clearly articulated educational model. □Vision and mission align to school model. □Logical connection between school model targeted	□Connection between school model and targeted population shows some weaknesses.	□School's vision and/or mission is unclear. □School's educational model is unclear. □No clear connection between vision and mission and school model.	The proposal provides a clear mission and vision that guides the school. This vision has a logical connection with the intended student population. (p.

		student population's needs.		□No clear connection between school model and targeted	5).
				student population. □Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	
Curricular plan	□School names specific high-quality curriculum for core subjects.	□School has a clear, well-considered plan for curriculum. □School explains how curriculum is high	□School has a clear plan for some aspects of the curriculum but no or weak plan for	□School has no specific plan for curriculum or plan is confusing or vague.	The proposal describes a high quality curriculum. (p. 7-21). This curriculum specifically names, for example, IXL as part of the mathematic s curriculum and Expeditiona ry Learning for English Language Arts. (p. 7-21). These curricular

		resources are research- based, which further suggest that
		suggest that they are high quality.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		quality, rigorous, and culturally relevant. Curriculum choices align with proposed school model.	other parts of the curriculum.	□School does not explain how curriculum is high quality, rigorous, and/or culturally relevant. □ Curriculum choices do not align with proposed school model. □Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	
Educator development and culture	☐School describes educator input in design of coaching and/or professional	□School has a clear, effective plan for coaching and developing	☐School's plan aims to foster a positive and professional culture among and between	□School has no or vague plan for coaching and developing	
	development plan or design of evaluation.	personnel. School has a clear, thoughtful plan for evaluation that ties to	school leadership and staff but does not	personnel. School has no or vague evaluation plan.	The proposal states that teachers will

			V 0101011 12.1 11.22
			receive training
			connected with the
			curricular resources.
			For example,
			teachers will
			participate in
			training connected
			with the
			Expeditionary
			Learning curriculum.
			(p. 41). Moreover,
			the professional
			development plan
			for educators is
			articulated related
			to the content or
			capacity to be
			developed as well as
			who will facilitate
			that capacity
			building (p. 62-64).
	<mark>professional</mark>	tie to professional	
	development and	development or	
	personnel decisions.	personnel decisions.	
	☐ School describes how it will foster a		
	positive and		
	professional school		
	professional school		

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		culture among and between leadership team and staff.			
Human resources	□School presents fully developed, high quality human resources manual.	□School has a clear and feasible plan for recruiting, hiring, and compensating qualified personnel.	□Some parts of a personnel plan—recruitment, hiring, or compensation—are clear but not all three.	□School has no or vague plan for recruitment, hiring, and compensation. □ Compensation plan is not feasible or unlikely to attract qualified staff.	The proposal provides a clear plan, including a timeline, for hiring highly-qualified educators (p. 58). A staffing plan in the proposal shows how various roles will be compensat ed (p. 57).

Coherence and overall quality	□School plan is extremely high quality.	□The school plan is internally coherent. □School plan aligns to school budget and budget narrative. □All portions of the school plan are clear and rational. □School plan is feasible. □School is quality and likely to be approved or has already been approved.	□School plan shows promise but has some areas of weakness. □School might not be approved.	□School plan is internally contradictory. □School plan is missing significant elements and/or significant elements are too vague or confusing to evaluate. □ Elements of school plan raise serious questions about feasibility or legality. □School plan does not align with	The proposal includes a feasible and reasonable plan that is aligned with the budget narrative. The research-based curriculum and the strategy for recruiting and supporting high quality teachers suggests that the school can effectively support student achievemen t.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
				proposed budget and budget narrative. □School is unlikely to be approved.	
Subtotal					9

B. Likelihood of Proposed Leadership Team's Success

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	6	5	2	0	

school leader signif and leadership expent team opera	hool leader has ificant erience in rating eptional charter bols. School leader has strong experience in leading highperforming schools OR school leader has completed a state or nationally recognized charter school	□School leader has some experience leading schools, but the quality of those schools is mixed or ambiguous. □School leader is strong but other	□School leader no experience leading schools AND has not completed a state or nationally recognized charter school leadership program.	The school's leadership team has extensive experience and education. As evidenced by their CVs in the proposal, they have the capacity to carry out the plan as intended and support high student achievemen t.
---	--	--	--	---

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	6	5	2	0	
		leadership development program. □ Other identified staff have strong experience supporting high- performing schools. □ Board members have strong skills and experience.	identified staff or board members do not bring strong experience or skills. ☐ School leader has some experience leading a high-performing school, but the experience was less than 2 year or was not in a top role.	□School leader only has experience leading poor- performing schools. □School leader or other members of the leadership team seem anti-charter or confused about Mississippi charter school law. □Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	

Т	1			1	VEISIOII 12.14.22
governance c	□Board development and evaluation plan is particularly strong.	□Clear lines of authority and roles and responsibilities between board and school leadership. □Governance plan is clear, with strong governing documents (bylaws, policies, conflict of interest, etc.) and reasonable structure.	□Board development or evaluation plan shows some areas of weakness.	□Governance of school is confusing or inadequate. □Governing documents missing or inadequate. □Governance plan raises serious questions about the effective operation of the school. □Roles and responsibilities of	The proposal provides comprehen sive opportuniti es for developing and monitoring board members. For example, the proposal states that Board members will attend virtual or inperson presentatio ns hosted by the authorizer and collaborate with subject matter

		experts to
		provide
		board
		training.
		When
		appropriate
		, the board
		will also
		hold
		internal
		professiona
		İ
		developme
		nt sessions
		led by
		committee
		members.
		Board
		members
		will also
		track high-
		qualitytraini
		nghosted
		by localand
		regional
		education
		associations
		. (p. 54).

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	6	5	2	0	
				board and staff not delineated.	
Leadership support and development	□Leadership develop and support plan is particularly strong.	□School has a clear, thoughtful plan for leadership support and evaluation that ties to professional development and personnel decisions.	□Some parts of the leadership development plan are clear but other parts are vague.	□ No plan for leadership support and development. □ Plan for leadership support and development is vague.	The proposal provides a clear plan for leadership developme nt and evaluation. (p. 60-62). This includes a range of professiona l developme nt opportuniti es, including

			coaching. Leaders will be monitored based on a performanc e plan. (p. 60-62).
Subtotal			17

C. Likelihood the School Will Result in Academic Gains for Children

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	6	5	2	0	
Clear learning goals	□School has very rigorous goals for student achievement and/or grade-level exit or graduation.	□School has clear goals for student achievement, including gradelevel exit standards and graduation requirements, as applicable.	□School has some clear goals, but some areas of the plan are less clear.	□Goals for student achievement are not clear. School states it will not use state learning standards.	The proposal provides rigorous goals for student achievemen t. This rigor is conveyed through the applicant's focus on collecting and monitoring student data and responding to that data instructiona lly (p. 65).

			1	1	
Support for special populations and struggling learners	□ Plans to support special populations and/or students below grade level are especially strong.	□Clear, effective plans to serve special populations, such as students with disabilities and English learners. □Clear, effective plans to support students below grade level to achieve growth and, over time, proficiency.	□Some areas of plan to serve special populations are clear and effective but some areas are weak. □Some areas of plan to support students below grade level are clear but plan has some weaknesses.	□No or vague plans to serve special populations. □ Plans to serve special populations are ineffective or may be harmful. □No or vague plans to support students below grade level. □ Plans to serve students below grade level are ineffective.	Using RTI intervention s, the applicant will have the capacity to provide differentiat ed support for a wide range of students' needs (p. 68). Moreover, the proposal emphasizes that the curriculum will be designed to be inclusive and accessible to all learners,incl uding students

			with disabilities, struggling students,gif ted students, and English language learners. (p. 99).
Subtotal			11

D. Reasonableness of the Budget

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and meets all of the following:	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	
Points Available	12	9	3	0	
Budget and budget narrative	□Budget is exceptionally strong. □Budget narrative is very clear and very detailed.	□The overall school budget is complete and clear. □Budget balances. □Budget is realistic for proposed school model. □Budget and budget narrative align. □Budget narrative clearly describes all revenue, expenses, and assumptions.	□ Budget is clear but miscalculated.	□ Budget does not balance. □ Budget is not complete or is missing. □ Budget narrative is vague or missing. □ Budget contains unreasonable assumptions for revenue. □ Budget contains unreasonable assumptions for revenue. □ Budget contains unreasonable assumptions for expenditures. □ Budget and budget narrative do not align. □ Budget is not realistic for proposed school model.	The budget narrative is clear and provides an explanation of all of the associated expenses for the school start up as well as the assumption s that are guiding

their implementa tion (p. 563- 568).

Risk Assessment 5

Risk	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as meeting Risk Category 5.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□YES <mark>□ NO</mark>	Choose an item.

If applicant meets Category 5, applicant may not achieve authorization and therefore may become ineligible for a CSP subgrant.

SECTION III SUMMARY SCORE

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS
A	9 (of 15)
В	17 (of 18)
С	11 (of 12)
D	9 (of 12)
Points Earned	46
Possible Points	57
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	81
Percentage Points Earned X 30%	24

SUMMARY SCORE FOR SECTIONS I-III

Section	Score
Section I—Application Requirements (50%)	38
Section II—Assessment of Risk (20%)	14
Section III—Overall School Plan Quality (30%)	24
TOTAL BASE SCORE	76

Applicant's score crosses the minimum threshold of 75 points? □ Yes □ No

If no, stop scoring. Applicant is ineligible for a CSP subgrant.

Section IV. Competitive Preference Priorities

Met	Not Met	Points Available		
Meets ALL of the following	Meets any of the following	Points Available	Points Earned	
□ Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority.	□ Applicant did not check box. □ Application does not meet definition of priority.	10	The application meets the definition of this priority.	
□ Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority.	□ Applicant did not check box. □ Application does not meet definition of priority.	8	The application meets the definition of this priority.	
□ Applicant at least one checked box <u>AND</u> application meets definition of at least one of the following: a conversion charter school, a turnaround school	□Applicant did not check box. □Application does not meet definition of priority.	6	The application meets the definition	
	Meets ALL of the following □ Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □ Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □ Applicant at least one checked box AND application meets definition of at least one of the following: a conversion charter school, a	Meets ALL of the following □Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □Applicant at least one checked box AND application meet definition of priority. □Applicant at least one checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □Applicant at least one checked box AND application meets definition of at least one of the following: a conversion charter school, a turnaround school Meets any of the following in Applicant did not check box. □Applicant did not check box.	Meets ALL of the following □Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority. □Applicant did not check box. □Application does not meet definition of priority. □Applicant did not check box AND application meets definition of priority. □Applicant at least one checked box AND application does not meet definition of priority. □Applicant at least one checked box AND application does not meet definition of priority. □Applicant did not check box. □Application does not meet definition of priority. □Applicant did not check box. □Application does not meet definition of priority. □Applicant at least one checked box. □Application does not meet definition of priority.	

			priority
for comprehensive	out prevent school, or		
support and improvement under	locating in an LEA with		
ESEA.	multiple schools identified		
	for comprehensive support		
	and improvement under		

	Met	Not Met	Points Available	
Priority	Meets ALL of the following	Meets any of the following	Points Available	Points Earned
	ESEA			
Educator-led and community centered charter school models: School features meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets.	□ Applicant checked box. □ Copy of the community asset map or assessment on which this application is based attached. □ A clear explanation as to how community assets as described in the submitted map or assessment informed the development of the charter school □ Clear explanation of what protocols and practices the applicant will implement to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties. □ Timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning,	□ Applicant did not check box. □ Application does not meet definition of priority.	6	Application does not meet this priority definition.

	development, and implementation of the charter school attached.		
TOTAL			24

STAGE 3—SCORING

Component	Total
Base Score (Sections I-III)	76
Competitive Preference Points (Section IV)	24
FINAL TOTAL	100

Reviewer Name: Date: 9/04/2024 Reviewer Signature: