REVIEW SUMMARY

Reviewer Name:	Applicant Name: Instant Impact Global	
	Prep	
Dates of Review: February 2023	Total Score: 94	

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

Section I. Rubric for a Non-CMO Applicant without an ESP

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	Cana
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	Score
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
B. Parent, family,	☐ Applicant	☐ Applicant has a	☐ Applicant does	☐ Applicant has no	2. In Nov. 2022, the
and community	reserves a seat on	parent and/or	not have a parent	method of soliciting	applicant held true
engagement,	its governing board	community advisory	and/or community	and considering	to the promises in
	specifically for a	body or council that	advisory body or	input from parents	their MCSAB
part 1	current parent.	reports to the	council that reports	and community	application and
		governing board. <u>OR</u>	to the governing	members on the	created a
		Applicant has	board. <u>AND</u>	implementation and	community advisory
		another robust	Applicant's other	operation of the	council with two
		method of soliciting	methods of soliciting	school.	seats reserved for
		and considering	and considering	☐ Applicant has no	parents. They also
		input from parents	input from parents	process for	have plans to
		and community	and community	accepting parent or	develop parents as
		members on the	members on the	student objections	leaders in the school
		implementation and	implementation and	to any policy/	community. For the
		operation of the	operation of the	decision, procedure,	broader community,
		school.	school are weak.	or practice.	any advisory group
		☐ Applicant has a	☐ Applicant's	☐ Answer is too	that is officially
		clear process for	process for	vague or confusing	established by the
		accepting parent or	accepting parent or	to evaluate.	IIGP Board will elect
		student objections	student objections is		representatives to
		to governing board	not likely to be		attend every IIGP
		policies and	effective OR is not		Board meeting.
		decisions,	applicable to all of		However, applicant
		administrative	the following: policy/		does not reserve a

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	Score
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	36016
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		procedures, and	decisions,		voting seat for
		school practices.	procedure, and		parents on their
			practice.		governing board.
C. Parent, family,	☐ Plan to engage	☐ Plan to engage	☐ Opportunities for	☐ Engagement plan	
and community	parents is	parents is robust,	engagement may be	presents few or no	3. The Board and the
engagement,	exceptional, with	with meaningful and	effective, but they	opportunities for	founding team have
part 2	multiple, meaningful	effective	are not meaningful.	ongoing	already had
part 2	and effective	opportunities for	☐ Opportunities for	engagement.	community events
	opportunities for	ongoing parent,	engagement omit	☐ Engagement plan	to show parents
	ongoing parent,	student, and	any of the following:	presents no effective	what the school has
	student, and	community	parents, students, or	strategies.	to offer. They are
	community	involvement.	community	☐ Parent or student	using Epstein's
	involvement.	\square No parent or	members.	expectations are	framework for
		student		likely to prevent	parental
		expectations are		interested families	involvement. They
		likely to prevent		from being able to	have a Parent
		interested families		attend the school.	Coordinator who will
		from being able to		☐ Parent volunteer	meet parents
		attend the school.		requirements do not	when/where they
		<u>OR</u> Parent volunteer		include a waiver.	are. They do have
		requirements		☐ Answer is too	systems for
		include a waiver to		vague or confusing	Parent-Teacher
		consider individual		to evaluate.	Collaboration.
		circumstances.			
Subtotal					5

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	□ YES × NO	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	18	9	0	
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	☐ 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	21. Budget narrative is aligned to the budget form and clearly outlines planned activities. Planning v implementation funds are relatively obvious. Sustainability plan is lacking for how revenue will be replaced if need be (i.e., planning for facilities is addressed but does not include cost assumptions for

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	
		narrative. 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 replaced if need be.		18-month maximum. □ 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/expenses are not justified or necessary. □ Sustainability plan is unclear or likely to be ineffective. □ Answer to any item is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	potential renovations).

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.	
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	☐ YES × NO	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	□ Very strong evidence of demand for school <u>OR</u> school is already full or oversubscribed.	☐ Attachment 6 presents clear evidence of demand for the school (e.g., letters of support or intent to apply forms from families and students). OR Supplemental materials strengthen the school's case for demand (e.g., information on	☐ Some evidence of demand for school either in Attachment 6 or supplemental materials, but whether charter school will achieve and maintain enrollment projections is not clear.	 □ No evidence of demand for 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. 	2. Applicant presents clear evidence of demand. The involvement of advisory boards and the hiring of a parent coordinator give confidence that enrollment projections can be
		waiting lists, data on access to seats in high-quality schools in feeder districts,			sustainable.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	Score
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	Score
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		and family interest in proposed specialized 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.			
(2) Projected student enrollment	☐ Strong rationale for the number of students and grade levels served in year one and the basis for the growth plan, tied directly back to the needs analysis.	☐ Projected student enrollment is clear for duration of grant. ☐ Methodology and calculations for enrollment and growth are clear. ☐ Clear rationale for the number of	☐ Methodology is clear and rationale is adequate, but calculations are incorrect.	☐ Projected enrollment is omitted for one or more years of the grant period. ☐ Rationale is not supported by the needs analysis.	2. Projected student enrollment is clear and aligned to growth plan.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	Score
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	Score
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		students and grade		☐ Answer is too	
		levels served in year		vague or confusing	
		one and the basis		to evaluate.	
		for the growth plan.			
(3) Student	☐ Plans to establish	☐ Clear analysis of	☐ Description of	☐ School's projected	
demograph	and maintain a	the school's	why establishing a	demographics are	
ics	racially and	projected student	diverse student	not clear or missing	
ICS	socio-economically	demographics	body is unlikely is	for race or	
	diverse student	(including race and	missing one of the	socio-economic	
	body, including	socio-economic	following: why it is	status.	
	proposed strategies	status) and a	unlikely that the	\square Description of the	2. Applicant has a
	(that are consistent	description of the	school will be able to	demographics of	clear and compelling
	with applicable legal	demographics of	establish and	relevant public	description of why it
	requirements) to	students attending	maintain a racially	schools from which	is unlikely that the
	recruit, admit,	public schools in the	and socio-economic	students are, or	school will be able to
	enroll, and retain a	local community in	diverse student	would be drawn, is	establish a diverse
	diverse student	which the charter	body, how the	not clear or missing	student body given
	body are strongly	school would be	anticipated racial	for race or	the racial and
	likely to succeed	located and the	and socio-economic	socio-economic	socio-economic
	based on evidence	school districts from	makeup of the	status.	makeup of the
	presented.	which the students	student body will	☐ Plans to establish	community.
		are, or would be,	promote the	and maintain a	
		drawn.	purposes of CSP,	racially and	
		☐ Clear description	and the anticipated	socio-economically	
		of plans to establish	impact of the	diverse student	
		and maintain a	proposed school on	body, including	
		racially and	the racial and	proposed strategies	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
Points Available	following:	2	1	0	
		socio-economically	socio-economic	(that are consistent	
		diverse student body, including	diversity of the public schools and	with applicable legal requirements) to	
		proposed strategies (that are consistent	school districts from which students	recruit, admit, enroll, and retain a	
		with applicable legal requirements) to	would be drawn.	diverse student body are not clear or	
		recruit, admit,		are clearly not legal.	
		enroll, and retain a diverse student		☐ Description of why it is unlikely	
		body <u>OR</u> clear and compelling		school will establish a diverse student	
		description of ALL of		body is missing two	
		the following: why it is unlikely that the		or more of the following: why it is	
		school will be able to establish and		unlikely that the school will be able to	
		maintain a racially and socio-economic		establish and maintain a racially	
		diverse student		and socio-economic	
		body, how the anticipated racial		diverse student body, how the	
		and socio-economic makeup of the		anticipated racial and socio-economic	
		student body will		makeup of the	
		promote the purposes of CSP,		student body will promote the	

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	Score
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	30016
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		and the anticipated		purposes of CSP,	
		impact of the		and the anticipated	
		proposed school on		impact of the	
		the racial and		proposed school on	
		socio-economic		the racial and	
		diversity of the		socio-economic	
		public schools and		diversity of the	
		school districts from		public schools and	
		which students		school districts from	
		would be drawn.		which students	
				would be drawn.	
				☐ Answer is too	
				vague or confusing	
= .				to evaluate.	0.01
(4) Robust	☐ School design was	☐ Clear description	☐ Description of	☐ Description of	3. Clear vision for
family and	family and	of how families and	how families and the	engagement in the	the importance of
community	community led	the community	community were,	vision and design of	community
engagemen	through a	were, are, or will be	are, or will be	the school is	involvement and
t plan	stakeholder 	engaged in the	engaged in the	unclear.	how the broader
t plati	visioning process.	vision and design of	vision and design of	Plan to engage	community can be
		the school, including	the school, but no	families is unclear or	involved in the
		specific examples of	specific examples of	families will clearly	school community.
		input incorporated	input incorporated	not be engaged.	Plans for on-site
		into the vision and	into the vision and	Plans omit more	programming for
		design.	design provided.	than one of the	families. Strong
		☐ Clear plan to	☐ Plan to engage	following: student	recruitment plan,
		meaningfully engage	with families is clear,	recruitment,	including ways to

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and meets all of the	Meets all of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Meets any of the following:	Score
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		with families and the	but it is unclear if it	admissions,	target families. The
		community to create	will lead to strong	enrollment, and	recruitment and
		strong and ongoing	and ongoing	retention.	enrollment team
		partnerships.	partnerships.	☐ Plans for student	actively partners
		☐ Clear and	\square Plans omit one of	recruitment,	with community
		effective plan to	the following:	admissions,	service
		foster a	student recruitment,	enrollment, and	organizations that
		collaborative culture	admissions,	retention do not	have contact with
		involving the	enrollment, and	include more than	the families of
		families of all	retention.	one of the following:	potential students.
		students, including	☐ Plans for student	English learners,	
		underserved	recruitment,	students with	
		students, in	admissions,	disabilities, or	
		ensuring input in	enrollment, and	students of color.	
		decision-making.	retention do not	\square No description of	
		☐ Clear and	include one of the	how	
		effective plan for	following: English	the applicant has	
		student recruitment,	learners, students	engaged or will	
		admissions,	with disabilities, or	engage families and	
		enrollment, and	students of color.	the community to	
		retention that will		develop an	
		engage and		instructional model	
		accommodate		to serve the targeted	
		families from		student population	
		various		and their families,	
		backgrounds,		including students	
		including English			

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	Score
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	Score
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
		learners, students		with disabilities and	
		with disabilities, and		English learners.	
		students of color,			
		including by			
		providing			
		enrollment and			
		recruitment			
		information in			
		widely accessible			
		formats (e.g., hard			
		copy and online in			
		multiple languages;			
		as appropriate, large			
		print or braille)			
		through widely			
		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			

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 model to serve the targeted student population and their families, including students with disabilities and English learners.			
(5) Responsive operations plan	☐ Description provides examples of how community feedback was directly incorporated into the operations plan.	Clear description of how the applicant's plans for school operations reflect the needs of students and families in the community, including consideration of district or community assets and how the school's location, or anticipated location if a facility has not been secured, will facilitate access for the targeted student population.	□ Description 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 community assets or how the school's location will facilitate access for the targeted student population.	2. Applicant has a clear plan to support the community, including free transportation, and supporting parents and families on-site with expertise from the community, local higher education, etc.

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	
(6) Impact on desegregati on efforts	☐ School's plans will actively increase racial or socio-economic integration.	□ School district in which school is, or will be, located or from which students are, or would be, drawn is not under an ongoing court order or voluntary agreement to create and maintain desegregated public schools OR clear description of effective steps the applicant has taken or will take to ensure the school will not hamper, delay, or negatively affect any desegregation efforts in the community in which the school is, or would be, located and the districts from which students	☐ Description of steps taken to ensure the school will not hamper, delay, or negatively affect any desegregation efforts is clear but steps are of unclear utility. ☐ Description of 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 is clear but steps are of unclear utility.	☐ Description of steps taken to ensure the school will not hamper, delay, or negatively affect any desegregation efforts is vague or missing. ☐ Description of steps taken to ensure that the proposed charter school would not otherwise increase racial or socio-economic segregation or isolation is vague or missing. ☐ Evidence suggests school will exacerbate racial segregation either by hampering, delaying, or negatively affecting	2. Applican't's school is not in a school district or pulls students from a school district that is under an ongoing court order or voluntary agreement to create and maintain desegregated public schools.

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	
		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.		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					13

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for any question?	☐ YES × NO	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	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	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.	6. Applicant's transportation plan includes summer/afterschool /extracurricular programming and budgets for 100% of students.

Eligibility

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	☐ YES ☐ NO	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 ability to enroll and remain enrolled.	☐ 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 (e.g., transportation	☐ Applicant explains disclosure plans clearly but these plans omit either policies and requirements or services. ☐ Applicant explains disclosure plans but these happen post-enrollment.	☐ 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.	3. Applicant responded with an N/A.

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	
		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 X NO	Choose an item.

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

Application Requirements Summary Score

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS
В	2 (of 3)
С	3 (of 3)
D	21 (of 21)
E	13 (of 18)
F	6 (of 6)

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS
G	3 (of 3)
Points Earned	48
Possible Points	54
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	88.9%
Percentage Points Earned X 50%	44%

Reviewer Name:	Date: 02/18/2023	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	☐ YES × NO	Choose an item.
Virtual School	☐ YES × NO	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 3	☐ Applicant provides multiple, clear examples of managing <u>federal</u> grants or subgrants. ☐ Applicant provides a clear description of how the fiscal management of multiple federal grants was successful—e.g., within budget, clean audit, timely reporting and drawdowns, etc.	☐ Applicant provides a clear narrative of managing at least one federal, state, or private grant or subgrant. ☐ Applicant provides a clear description of how the fiscal management of the grant was successful—e.g., within budget, clean audit, timely reporting and drawdowns, etc.	□ Applicant provides evidence of managing one or more grants or subgrants, but it is unclear as to whether the fiscal management was successful.	□ Applicant provides no evidence of managing grants or subgrants. □ Grant program was clearly fiscally mismanaged. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	2. Applicant provides examples of managing federal grants and does mention they were aligned with goals and outcomes, and it appears the work was successful.
Question 4	 □ Applicant has at least one financial staff person or contractor with a CPA. □ Applicant's financial staff or contractors have 	 □ Applicant has at least one financial staff person or contractor with a four-year degree in accounting. □ Applicant's financial staff or 	☐ 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. 	3. Applicant's CFO has strong financial management experience.

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	
	compelling experience.	contractors have some experience.			
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.	3. N/A
Question 6	☐ Applicant has never been designated a high-risk grantee by any grantor.	☐ Applicant is not designated a high-risk grantee by any current grantor.	☐ Applicant was previously considered a high-risk grantee but is not longer.	☐ Applicant is currently considered a high-risk grantee.	3
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	☐ 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	2

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	
			development and implementation. No financial policies, procedures, or practices BUT very strong timeline and plan for full development and implementation.	timeline and plan for full development and implementation.	
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 receiving CSP or within 30 days of receiving CSP.	☐ 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 remaining needed coverage.	□ No insurance coverage.□ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	3
Subtotal		receiving cor.			16

Eligibility & Risk Assessment 2a

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

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

For applicants responding to questions 9-23 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	
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	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	2. Quickbooks

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	
		days of receiving CSP.		contractor with such software. □ Accounting software used is not named.	
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 can (or will be able to) produce detailed, accurate reports quickly (automated or fewer than 24 hours).	☐ 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 determine whether it is attributable to a grant. ☐ Applicant requires more than 24 hours to produce detailed, accurate reports of grant expenditures.	☐ 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.	3

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	
	meets all of the following:	following:	following:	following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
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.	2. Description is a bit vague to be considered clearly efficient.
Question 13	□ Financial statements are (or will be) reviewed and approved by the head of the entity or unit <u>at least monthly</u> and reviewed and approved <u>more frequently than quarterly</u> by board or board committee.	□ 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. □ Review process is adequate to identify and quickly correct inaccuracies or fraud.	□ 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, either at least quarterly or otherwise.	☐ 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 are only reviewed for accuracy through audits. ☐ Review process is not likely to identify and quickly correct inaccuracies or fraud.	2

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		
				☐ 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.	3	
Questions 22-23		*informational only*				
Subtotal					12	

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 × NO	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	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	
	meets all of the	following:	following:	following:	
	following:				
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
Audit findings	Not applicable	□ School audit (and ESP audit, if applicable) noted an unqualified or unmodified opinion. If applicable, □ ESP appears in 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) identified non-material weaknesses. If applicable, □ ESP financial health presents some concerns.	□ School audit (and/or ESP audit, if applicable) expresses a qualified, modified, adverse, or disclaimed opinion. □ 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) identified non-compliance material to the financial statements of federal or state awards. □ School audit (and/or ESP audit, if	Click or tap here to enter text.

Question	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Score
	Meets Standards and	Meets all of the	Meets any of the	Meets any of the	
	meets all of the following:	following:	following:	following:	
Points Available	3	2	1	0	
				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					Click or tap here
					to enter text.

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 □ NO	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.	Click or tap here to enter text.
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 reasonable, AND the applicant did not use CSP funds on the school.	☐ Applicant spent CSP funds on one or more never-opened charters. ☐ One or more charters expired or were relinquished by applicant due to delays or any other reason and no reasonable explanation is provided.	Click or tap here to enter text.

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	
Subtotal					Click or tap here to enter text.

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 □ NO	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	☐ Applicant's	☐ Applicant's	☐ Some applicant	☐ Applicant's other	
applicants ONLY:	schools have	schools, as a whole,	schools have strong	schools have low	
	exceptional	have strong	or exceptional	performance in two	Click or tap here to
	performance	performance	academic	or more areas	enter text.
	academically,	without any notable	performance, but	(academic,	
		academic, financial,	some schools have		

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	
	operationally, and financially.	or operational issues.	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.	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.	
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 recognized assessments;	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 for subgroups for at least three years.	Click or tap here to enter text.

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	
		□ has no significant issues in the areas of student safety, financial and operational 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, and □ has demonstrated success in increasing student academic achievement,		☐ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	

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	
		including graduation rates where applicable, for each of 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.			

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	
		☐ If applying for an expansion grant, applicant showed success in increasing student achievement, including graduation rates, for subgroups for at least three years.			
Subtotal					Click or tap here to enter text.

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	□ YES □ NO	Choose an item.	

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

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 □ NO	
Category 2	☐ YES ☐ NO	
Category 3	☐ YES ☐ NO	
Category 4	☐ YES ☐ NO	
Number of Categories Met 2-4	Click or tap here to enter text.	
TOTAL NUMBER OF CATEGORIES MET	Click or tap here to enter text.	

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	16 (of 17 points)	12 (of 14 points)	Click or tap here to enter text. (of 2 points)
C*	Click or tap here to enter text. (of 6 points)		
D*	Click or tap here to enter text. (of 12 points)		
Points Earned	16	12	Click or tap here to enter text.
Possible Points	17	14	Click or tap here to enter text.
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	94%	85.7%	Click or tap here to enter text.
Percentage Points Earned X 20%	18.8%, 17.14%		

^{*}as applicable

Reviewer Name: Date: 02/18/2023 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 student population's needs.	□ 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. □ No clear connection between school model and targeted student population. □ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	3. Applicant has a clear mission and vision for their school that is clearly connected to the Natchez community.
Curricular plan	☐ School names specific high-quality curriculum for core subjects.	☐ School has a clear, well-considered plan for curriculum.	☐ School has a clear plan for some aspects of the curriculum but no or	☐ School has no specific plan for curriculum or plan is confusing or vague.	2. Applicant plans to follow Mississippi's HQIM for Math and ELA,

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 explains how curriculum is high quality, rigorous, and culturally relevant. ☐ Curriculum choices align with proposed school model.	weak plan for 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.	but more specifics are not included.
Educator	☐ School describes	☐ School has a	☐ School's plan aims	☐ School has no or	2. Applicant shares
development and culture	educator input in design of coaching and/or professional development plan or design of evaluation.	clear, effective plan for coaching and developing personnel. School has a clear, thoughtful plan for evaluation that ties to professional development and personnel decisions. School describes how it will foster a	to foster a positive and professional culture among and between school leadership and staff but does not articulate how.	vague plan for coaching and developing personnel. School has no or vague evaluation plan. Evaluation does not tie to professional development or personnel decisions.	their PD cycle for staff as a whole, but does not mention a coaching plan to develop personnel individually. Evaluation details are lacking, but they will be using MDE's Growth tools for teachers

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	
		positive and professional school culture among and between leadership team and staff.			and school leaders.
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.	1.Applicant includes details on the hiring process, but details are lacking regarding the recruitment process.
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	☐ 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	2. Their educational model includes a lot of education-speak jargon, so caution that it can be difficult for parents and families to follow. However, the school plan is coherent and

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	
		already been approved.		about feasibility or legality. ☐ School plan does not align with proposed budget and budget narrative. ☐ School is unlikely to be approved.	aligns to financial plans.
Subtotal				·	10

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	
Qualifications of	☐ School leader has	☐ School leader has	☐ School leader has	☐ School leader no	2. Identified staff
school leader and	significant	strong experience in	some experience	experience leading	have strong
leadership team	experience in	leading	leading schools, but	schools AND has not	experience
	operating	high-performing	the quality of those	completed a state or	supporting schools
	exceptional charter	schools <u>OR</u> school	schools is mixed or	nationally	and the community.
	schools.	leader has	ambiguous.	recognized charter	The outcomes of
		completed a state or			their work are

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	
		nationally recognized charter school leadership development program. ☐ Other identified staff have strong experience supporting high-performing schools. ☐ Board members have strong skills and experience.	☐ School leader is strong but other 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 leadership program. 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.	ambiguous. Board members have diverse skills and experience.
Strength of governance	☐ 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 (by-laws, policies, conflict of	☐ 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 	5

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	
		interest, etc.) and reasonable structure.		effective operation of the school. Roles and responsibilities of 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.	5
Subtotal					12

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 grade-level 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.	6. Performance goals are very rigorous.
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. 	6. Applicant has a strong plan to support diverse learners.
Subtotal				inchective.	12

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 expenditures. □ Budget and budget narrative do not align. □ Budget is not realistic for proposed school model.	12. Budget assumptions are fair and reasonable.

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 × NO	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	10 (of 15)
В	12. (of 18)
С	12 (of 12)
D	12 (of 12)
Points Earned	46
Possible Points	57
Percentage Points Earned	90.10/
(Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	80.1%
Percentage Points Earned X 30%	24.03%

SUMMARY SCORE FOR SECTIONS I-III

Section	Score
Section I—Application Requirements (50%)	44%
Section II—Assessment of Risk (20%)	18%
Section III—Overall School Plan Quality (30%)	24%
TOTAL BASE SCORE	86%

Applicant's score crosses the minimum threshold of 75 points? $x Yes \square No$

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

Section IV. Competitive Preference Priorities

Priority	Met	Not Met	Points Available	Points Earned
	Meets ALL of the following	Meets any of the following	Points Available	
Charter high schools: Serve grades 10-12 or, if the school's instructional model is competency-based or dropout prevention-focused, provide students a pathway to a standard Mississippi high school diploma	☐ Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority.	☐ Applicant did not check box. ☐ Application does not meet definition of priority.	10	0
Rural charter schools: A rural area is defined as an area with a "town" or "rural" locale code according to the National Center for Education Statistics	☐ Applicant checked box AND application meets definition of priority.	 □ Applicant did not check box. □ Application does not meet definition of priority. 	8	8
Charter schools with other diverse models: A conversion charter school, a turnaround school (closure/restart), a drop-out prevent school, or locating in an LEA with multiple schools identified for comprehensive support	☐ 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 (closure/restart), a drop-out prevent school, or locating in an LEA with multiple schools	☐ Applicant did not check box. ☐ Application does not meet definition of priority.	6	0

Priority	Met	Not Met	Points Available	Points Earned
	Meets ALL of the following	Meets any of the following	Points Available	Points Earned
and improvement under ESEA.	identified for comprehensive support and improvement under ESEA			
Educator-led and	☐ Applicant checked	☐ Applicant did not		
community centered	box.	check box.		
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.	□ 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,	☐ Application does not meet definition of priority.	6	0

Priority	Met	Not Met	Points Available	Points Earned
	Meets ALL of the following	Meets any of the following	Points Available	Polits Earlied
	development, and			
	implementation of the			
	charter school attached.		_	
TOTAL				8

STAGE 3—SCORING

Component	Total	
Base Score (Sections I-III)	86%	
Competitive Preference Points (Section IV)	8	
FINAL TOTAL	94%	

Reviewer Name: Date: 02/18/2023 Reviewer Signature: