REVIEW SUMMARY

Reviewer Name: ███████	Applicant Name: **Mississippi Global Academy**
Dates of Review: August 26, 2024-Sepetember 9, 2024	**Total Score: 93.32**

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	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**	
A. CMOs; ESPs		☐ 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 reasonable. ☐ Duration of the contract is clear. ☐ Roles and responsibilities of the ESP are clear and do not represent full or substantial management services if the ESP is for profit.	☐ 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 are unreasonable. ☐ Roles and responsibilities represent full or substantial management services if the ESP is for profit.	**2** **Proposal pg. 7-8**: Applicant indicated yes **Application pgs. 575-599**: Mississippi Global and the GPCF do not have a management agreement. The two entities will enter an agreement for GPCF to provide services, resources, materials and access to the Model. A draft (see attached) has not been finalized. The GPCF will provide MS Global with the scope of services outlined above. As consideration for the ESP Services provided by GPCF to MS Global, MS Global agrees to pay to GPCF each [academic year] a fee in an amount equal to nine percent (9%) of MS Global's

				operating budget for such [academic year]. Fees are all inclusive of GPCF contractors' travel and other reasonable expenses. Duration of services agreement: Five (5) years—Aligned with one term of Mississippi Global's charter contract. The Global Public Charter Foundation will provide critical services, resources, access to an award-winning academic model that it is exclusively privy to, and materials to Mississippi Global, but not act as a management organization include academic model, charter start-up services, marketing
ESP requirements (1)(A)				

	Not applicable				

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 administers or supervises the administration of the grant in accordance with 34 CFR 75.701 are clear and effective.		☐ 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 school makes all programmatic decisions, that school maintains control over CSP, that school directly administers or supervises CSP.	**Proposal pg.9:** The MS Global Board will not be purchasing or leasing items from the ESP. For service costs, the board will conduct independent market research to determine fair market values. **Application pg.575:** Academic Model. GPCF will provide MS Global access to an award-winning academic model aligned to Washington Global Public Charter School's model, to which GPCF has exclusive access and is exclusively privy. Access includes the following: academic and non-academic resources and materials, academic logistical support, professional development (see below), and personnel with proven expertise executing the model effectively.

					Proposal pgs. 11-12: MS Global will implement strict internal controls and oversight measures to ensure it maintains full control over all CSP funds and directly administers the CSP subgrant to include separate accounting, board oversight.

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**	
				☐ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	
ESP requirements (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	**2** **Proposal pg. 14:** The only financial relationship between MS Global and the Global Public Charter Foundation is the service fee outlined in the service agreement. The ESP does not own, operate, or control any property used by the school **Application pgs.51-52:** Provide board information. **Application pgs. 398-531:** Board member information

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:*	**Score**
Points Available	**3**	**2**	**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.	**Proposal pg. 16:** To resolve actual or perceived conflicts of interest: a. Board members serving on both boards will recuse themselves from voting on matters related to the service agreement between MS Global and GPCF. b. All board members complete annual conflict of interest disclosure forms. c. The board will establish a Conflict of Interest Policy that outlines procedures for identifying, disclosing, and managing potential conflicts. d. Independent legal counsel will review all agreements between MS Global and GPCF to ensure arm's-length negotiations.

ESP requirements (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.	**2** **Application pg. 573:** Mississippi Global's Board is independent and self-governing and does not report to the Board of the Global Public Charter Foundation. The two entities are completely separate, with separate Boards of Directors and separate legal counsel. While two GPCF board members also serve on the MS Global Board, that membership has been disclosed, the board members are aware of their respective duties to each board and the separate bylaws and other governing documents. Those board members, as well as all board members, also fill out a yearly conflict of interest disclosure forms. **Pro. pg.17:** MS Global will procure accounting and auditing services independently of the ESP by: 1. Issuing an RFP for these services, to be reviewed and selected by the Board's Finance Committee. 2. Ensuring that selected firms have no ties to GPCF. 3. Engaging these services

					through contracts directly with MS Global, not involving GPCF. 4. Regularly reviewing and re-bidding these services to maintain independence.

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 requirements (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.	**2** **Proposal pg. 19:** To ensure compliance: 1. The contract includes a severability clause, allowing individual provisions to be struck down without invalidating the entire agreement. 2. MS Global maintains operational independence, ensuring it can continue operations if the contract is severed. 3. The contract duration is explicitly tied to the charter term and cannot exceed it. 4. Renewal requires an affirmative vote by the MS Global Board, as stipulated in the agreement.

ESP requirements (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	**2** **Proposal pg. 20:** To maintain control over student records and ensure timely transfer: a. MS Global will maintain a secure, digital student information system accessible only to authorized school personnel. b. The school will establish clear protocols for record transfers, including timelines and secure transmission methods. c. A designated staff member will oversee record management and transfers. d. The school will comply with all relevant state and federal laws regarding student records, including Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-45(6)(t) and 37-15-3. e. Regular audits of record-keeping practices will be conducted to ensure compliance and security. f. The school will provide records to receiving schools or districts within 14 days of a student transfer request, as required by state law
		☐		☐	

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.		unclear, absent, or ineffective. ☐ 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 are unclear, absent, or ineffective.	
Subtotal					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 ☐ NO	Criteria Met

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	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**	
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, procedure, and practice.	☐ 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.	**2** **Application pgs. 50-57:** Currently, there are no plans to create advisory bodies. The board does not want to add more complexity or administrative oversight. However, the board is open to seeking additional guidance to thoroughly consider all aspects of difficult decisions to ensure the best choices are made for the school. The ideal founding board member will have demonstrated skills in leadership development, international education expertise, finance, law, international affairs, fundraising and development, data analysis, facilities

				management, board governance, community engagement, and nonprofit management. Currently, facility expertise is provided by a member of the applicant team. The board's top recruitment priorities are individuals with data analytics and facilities management expertise. Mississippi Global provides a formal grievance procedure to address concerns or complaints regarding school operations, staff, or policies. This structured process aims to facilitate open communication and ensure fair resolution of issues and includes the following: informal complaint along with others. **Application pg. 47:** Community board representation to ensure community voice in school implementation and management

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:*	**Score**
Points Available	**3**	**2**	**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.	**2** **Proposal pgs. 22-23:** In addition to the formal structures and processes outlined above, MS Global will employ the following methods to solicit and consider input from parents and community members: 1. Annual Stakeholder Survey: We will conduct a comprehensive annual survey to gather feedback on all aspects of school operations, including academics, culture, communication, and governance. 2. Town Hall Meetings: Quarterly town hall meetings will be held to discuss major school initiatives, gather feedback, and address community concerns. 3. "Coffee with the Principal": Monthly informal meet-and-greet sessions where parents can discuss school matters

					with the principal in a relaxed setting. 4. Community Partnership Council: We will form a council of local business leaders, nonprofit representatives, and community advocates to provide input on how the school can best serve and integrate with the broader community. 5. Digital Suggestion Box: An online platform where parents and community members can submit ideas and feedback anonymously or publicly. 6. Social Media Engagement: Active presence on social media platforms to share updates and gather real-time feedback. 7. Parent-Teacher Conferences: Bi-annual conferences will include a feedback component on school operations. 8. Focus Groups: Periodic focus groups on specific topics (e.g., curriculum, extracurricular activities) to gather in-depth insights. 9. Community Events: Host and participate in community events to maintain an open dialogue with the broader community. 10. Multilingual Outreach: Ensure all engagement efforts are accessible to non-English speaking

| | | | | | families through translation services. By employing these diverse methods, MS Global will ensure continuous, meaningful engagement with parents and the community, allowing us to be responsive to their needs and concerns in the implementation and operation of the school. **Application pg. 46:** Mississippi Global has collaborated with community members who are enthusiastic about increasing high-performing school options. The Boys & Girls Club of the Greater Delta is a strong partner, interested in co-locating with Mississippi Global to provide robust after-school and summer programs |
| *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 ☐ NO	Criteria Met

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:*	**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 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.	**18** **Application pgs. 548-569:** All required documents align. **Proposal pgs. 26-28**: Goals for the CSP subgrant include: 1. Hire and onboard 100% of Year 1 leadership team (Principal, Director of Operations, Dean of Students) and provide at least 80 hours of professional development to each team member by July

					31, 2025. 2. Procure and deploy instructional materials and technology for 125 students and 13 staff members, including 1:1 student devices, by July 31, 2025, with all purchases aligned to the approved budget. 3. Complete all necessary facility renovations and modifications to meet code requirements and obtain certificate of occupancy by July 15, 2025. Make first three months of lease payments (August-October 2025) using CSP funds. 4. Achieve full enrollment of 125 students for Year 1 by conducting at least 10 community outreach events and implementing a comprehensive marketing plan by July 31, 2025. 5. Develop and finalize 100% of Year 1 global studies curriculum units (at least 4 units per grade level) and train all instructional staff on project-based learning methodology through a minimum of 20 hours of professional development by July 31, 2025. Major

					planned activities to be supported with CSP subgrant funds, aligned with Section 4303(h) of the ESEA, include: 1. Preparing teachers, school leaders, and specialized instructional support personnel through professional development. 2. Acquiring supplies, training, equipment (including technology), and educational materials 3. Carrying out necessary renovations to ensure that a new school building complies with applicable statutes and regulations. 4. Providing one-time startup costs associated with providing transportation for students to and from the charter school. 5. Carrying out community engagement activities which may include paying the cost of student and staff recruitment. These planned activities are necessary for MS Global to open and operate a high-quality charter school because

83

					they: 1. Ensure a well-prepared and highly qualified staff through targeted professional development. 2. Provide students with the necessary resources and technology to engage in the school's rigorous, globally-focused curriculum. 3. Create a safe and compliant learning environment through necessary facility improvements. 4. Enable equitable access to the school through transportation support. 5. Build strong community relationships and ensure full enrollment through robust engagement and recruitment activities. These activities directly support the school's mission to cultivate globally competitive students and ensure that all necessary elements are in place for a successful school launch and sustained operation. MS Global's plan for sustaining operations after the completion of the CSP subgrant includes: 1. Relying primarily on

					per-pupil funding from the state, which will increase as enrollment grows. 2. Maintaining a conservative budgeting approach with built-in contingencies. 3. Implementing a flexible staffing model that can adapt to actual enrollment. 4. Building a cash reserve to ensure financial stability. 5. Continuously pursuing additional grant opportunities and partnerships to support school programs.

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 replaced if need 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/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.	

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	Score
	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 OR 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 waiting lists, data on access to seats in high-quality schools in feeder districts, and family interest in proposed specialized	☐ 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** **Application pgs. 340-350:** Letters of support included from organizations and community members. Pro. pgs. 31-32: 1. Partnership with Boys & Girls Club: The school has formed a robust partnership with the Boys & Girls Club of the Mississippi Delta, which will provide high-quality afterschool and summer programming for students. 2.

					Community Ties: Board members like Tony Anderson (Pastor of Azion Missionary Baptist Church) and Kennard Speed (Managing Director of Alumni Affairs at Teach For America) have deep roots in the community, providing valuable insights into local educational needs. 3. Community Engagement: The school has conducted grassroots outreach, including in-person conversations at local establishments to gauge interest in the school model. 4. Addressing Local Needs: MS Global aims to provide a compelling educational alternative in an area where existing schools have consistently received low ratings (D or F) on the Mississippi Statewide Accountability System 5. Unique Offering: The school's focus on global competitiveness and project-based learning addresses a gap in current educational options in the area. Benefits to the community include: 1. Providing a high-quality

					educational option in an area with underperforming schools. 2. Offering innovative programs like global studies and project-based learning. 3. Fostering community partnerships and engagement. 4. Preparing students for success in a global economy

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	
		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 students and grade levels served in year one and the basis for the growth plan.	☐ 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. ☐ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	**2** **Application pg. 7:** Mississippi Global will launch in the 2025-2026 school year, initially serving 125 students in grades 4 and 5. This focused approach allows for a strong start and personalized attention during the school's inaugural year. The school will then gradually expand by one grade level annually, reaching

90

					grades 4-9 by year 5.

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:*	**Score**
Points Available	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**	
(3) Student demographics	☐ Plans to establish and maintain a racially and socio- economically 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 socio-economically 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 socio-economic 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 socio-economic status. ☐ Plans to establish and maintain a racially and socio- economically 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	**2** **Proposal pgs. 55-59:** The school's projected student demographics include the following: West Bolivar Consolidated School District demographics:-2.9% White-94% Black-1.5% Hispanic/Latino-1.6% Two or More Races-100% eligible for free and reduced-price meal program. MS Global's approach to establishing and maintaining a racially and socio-economically diverse student body includes: 1. Open enrollment: The school will be open to all students in the district, regardless of race or socioeconomic status. 2. Targeted outreach: The school plans to conduct targeted recruitment efforts in

				diverse communities within the district. 3. Inclusive model: The school's educational model, focusing on global competitiveness and project-based learning, is designed to appeal to and benefit students from all backgrounds. 4. Support services: The school will provide comprehensive support services to ensure the success of all students, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds. 5. Community partnerships: Collaborations with organizations like the Boys & Girls Club of the Mississippi Delta will help reach a diverse range of families. Given the demographics of the district, maintaining racial diversity may be challenging. However, the school is committed to serving and supporting the existing diverse needs of the student population. o Question 5a: Describe why it is unlikely that the school will be able to establish and maintain

					a racially and socio-economic diverse student body because either the charter school would be located in a racially or socio-economically segregated or isolated community or due to the charter school's specific education mission.

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

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**	
				students would be drawn. ☐ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	
(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,	**2** **Application pg. 47:** Mississippi Global believes engaging parents and the community is vital for student success and is committed to creating an inclusive environment that encourages ongoing involvement through: ● Community surveys and focus groups to inform service-learning initiatives and outreach programs ● Community events to provide information and engage in discussions ● Community board representation to ensure community

					voice in school implementation and management ● Parent volunteer opportunities inspired by the community school model, including assisting with events, chaperoning trips, sharing expertise, and participating in committees ● Ongoing communication and feedback through regular updates, annual surveys, and continuous improvement based on feedback. Mississippi Global aims to create a strong support system for students by actively engaging parents and the community, building lasting partnerships to provide an exceptional educational experience. **Proposal pgs. 45-46:** To foster a collaborative culture involving all families, including those of underserved students: 1. Diverse Communication Methods: We'll use multiple channels (digital, print, in-person) to reach all families. 2. Flexible

					Meeting Times: We'll offer meetings and events at various times to

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	
		students, in ensuring input in decision-making. ☐ Clear and effective plan for student recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and retention that will engage and accommodate families from various backgrounds, including English learners, students with disabilities, and 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	recruitment, admissions, enrollment, and retention do not include one of the following: English learners, students with disabilities, or students of color.	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.	

99

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:*	**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.			
(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	☐ 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	**2** **Proposal pgs.48-50**: To engage families and the community in developing our instructional model: Needs Assessment: We conducted surveys and focus groups to understand the

				educational needs and preferences of our target population. 2. Collaborative Design Sessions: We held workshops where families and community members could provide input on curriculum and instructional approaches. 3. Expert Consultations: We consulted with special education and ELL experts to ensure our model addresses these populations' needs. 4. Pilot Programs: We plan to run small-scale pilot programs of our instructional approaches, inviting family feedback. 5. Ongoing Feedback Loop: We've established a system for continuous family and community input on our instructional model as it develops. Our operations plan reflects the needs of students and families by: 1. Extended Day Program: Partnering with the Boys & Girls Club to provide after-school care, addressing the need for safe, enriching environments outside school hours. 2.

				Transportation: Planning to contract with a transportation company to ensure all students can access the school. 3. Meal Program: Implementing a comprehensive meal program to address food insecurity in our community. 4. Technology Access: Providing necessary technology and internet access to support learning both at school and at home. 5. Family Resource Center: Planning to establish a center within the school to connect families with community resources. 6. Flexible Communication: Implementing various communication methods to accommodate diverse family schedules and preferences. While we haven't secured a specific facility yet, we're prioritizing locations that are:-Centrally located within our target community-Accessible by public transportation-Large enough to accommodate our

					projected growth- Suitable for retrofitting to meet our specific program needs.

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:*	**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.	
(6) Impact on desegregation 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	☐ 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	☐ 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,	**3** **Proposal pgs. 52-53:** MS Global is committed to preventing any increase in racial or socio-economic segregation or isolation in our community. We have taken the following steps to ensure our school contributes positively to integration efforts: 1. Demographic Analysis: We've conducted a thorough analysis of the racial and socio-economic makeup of our target community to understand the current landscape and inform our recruitment strategies. 2. Balanced Recruitment: Our recruitment efforts are designed to attract a

					diverse student body that reflects the overall demographics of our community. We're implementing targeted outreach to ensure we reach families from all racial and socio-economic backgrounds. 3. Inclusive Admissions Process: Our admissions process is designed to be accessible and equitable, with no academic or financial barriers to entry. We provide application support to ensure that the process itself doesn't create unintended segregation. 4. Location Selection: In choosing our school location, we've considered accessibility from various neighborhoods to prevent geographic segregation. 5. Transportation Plan: Our plan to provide transportation services ensures that students from different areas of the community can access our school, preventing segregation based on proximity or access to transportation. 6. Diverse Staffing: We're committed to hiring a diverse staff that reflects our community, providing role models for all students and creating a culturally responsive environment.

					7. Inclusive Curriculum: Our globally-focused, culturally responsive curriculum is designed to appeal to and benefit students from all backgrounds, making our school an attractive option for diverse families. 8. Community Partnerships: We're fostering partnerships with a wide range of community organizations to ensure our school is known and accessible across all segments of the community. 9. Ongoing Monitoring: We will regularly monitor our student demographics and the impact of our enrollment on surrounding schools. If we notice any trends towards increased segregation, we will promptly adjust our strategies. 10. Transparent Reporting: We will maintain transparent reporting of our efforts to prevent segregation and our student demographics, making this information available to the community and relevant authorities.

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					*13*

Eligibility

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	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.	**4** **Application pgs. 71-72:** Mississippi Global will contract with a reputable transportation company to provide safe and reliable bus services for students. The chosen vendor must provide proof of insurance, verify that all drivers and aides have passed criminal background checks, and certify that vehicles meet state

Eligibility

					maintenance requirements.

Eligibility

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	☐ YES ☐ **NO**	Criteria Met

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:*	**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 <u>OR</u> 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 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.	**2** **Proposal pgs. 55-56:** MS Global is committed to full transparency with families during the enrollment process. We will disclose the following information: 1. Uniform Policy: Students will be required to wear school uniforms. The estimated cost is $30-50 per set. Financial assistance will be available for families in need. 2. School Supplies: A list of required supplies will

Eligibility

					be provided, with an estimated cost of $50-75 per student. The school will provide supplies for families unable to purchase them. 3. Transportation: We will offer bus transportation to all students living outside a 0.5 mile radius of the school at no cost to families. 4. Meal Program: We will participate in the National School Lunch Program, offering free and reduced-price meals to qualifying students. 5. Extended Day Program: In partnership with the Boys & Girls Club, we will offer after-school programming. While there may be a nominal fee, financial assistance will be available. 6. Family Engagement: While we strongly encourage family participation in school events and volunteer opportunities, it is not required for enrollment or continued attendance. 7. Special Education

111

Eligibility

					Services: We will provide all services required by students' IEPs at no cost to families. 8. English Language Learner Support: ELL services will be provided at no additional cost. This information will be clearly communicated through:-The school website-Enrollment information sessions-Written materials provided during the application process-Individual meetings with families upon request. We will emphasize that inability to pay for uniforms, supplies, or program. fees will not prevent any student from enrolling or remaining enrolled at MS Global.

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:*	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

Eligibility	YES/NO	If yes, please flag the school as being ineligible.
Did the applicant score "does not meet"?	☐ YES ☐ NO	Criteria Met

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

Requirements Summary Score

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

SUBSECTION	TOTAL POINTS
C	(2 of 3)
D	(18 of 21)
E	(13 of 18)
F	(4 of 6)
G	(2 of 3)
Points Earned	51
Possible Points	65
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	78.46
Percentage Points Earned X 50%	39.23

Reviewer Name: ▬▬▬▬▬   **Date:** August 26, 2024-September 9, 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	Meets Category Risk 1
Virtual School	☐ YES <mark>☐ NO</mark>	Criteria Met

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	☐ 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.,	☐ 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** **Proposal pgs. 58-60:** As a new developer, MS Global does not have direct experience managing grant programs. However, key individuals involved in the proposal have relevant experience: 1. Dr. Elizabeth Torres, President of the Global

					Public Charter Foundation (GPCF), has over 10 years of experience managing federal and state grants for Washington Global Public Charter School, including Title I, II, III, and IDEA grants. Under her leadership, all grants were managed within budget with timely reporting and drawdowns. Annual audits have resulted in no significant findings. 2. Lindsay Dawson, Board Treasurer, has experience overseeing grant management in her role as Board Chair for a nonprofit organization. This includes reviewing financial reports and ensuring compliance with grant requirements. 3. Lysa Scott, Board Chair, has experience managing school budgets and grants in her previous role as a school leader. The GPCF team will provide support and oversight in grant management to ensure MS Global follows best practices in financial management and compliance. MS Global

					plans to manage its finances as follows: 1. Director of Operations (Staff): Will oversee day-to-day financial operations, including accounts payable/receivable, payroll, and financial reporting. The ideal candidate will have a bachelor's degree in business or finance and 3-5 years of experience in school operations or nonprofit financial management. 2. Principal (Staff): Will work with the Director of Operations to develop and manage the school budget. The Principal will have experience in school leadership and budget management. 3. Board Treasurer (Volunteer): Will provide oversight of financial operations, review financial reports, and liaise between the school leadership and full board on financial matters. Lindsay Dawson, the current Board Treasurer, holds an MBA and has experience in nonprofit financial oversight. 4. Back Office Provider

					(Contractor): We plan to engage a reputable back-office provider with charter school experience to support more complex f financial functions, including grant management, audit preparation, and compliance reporting. 5. Global Public Charter Foundation (Contractor): Will provide guidance and support in financial management practices, particularly in the start-up phase. This team approach ensures multiple layers of expertise and oversight in managing the school's finances

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.	**2** **Application pg. 74:** The back office provider will be responsible for developing these controls, which will be reviewed by the Board and an external CPA to ensure their completeness.
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.	**2** **Proposal pg. 60:** Applicant indicated they have never been suspended of debarred.
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** **Proposal pg. 61:** Applicant indicated they have never been designated as high risk.

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.	**1** **Proposal 62-63:** We have not yet created financial policies, procedures, and practices. MS Global plans to develop and implement comprehensive financial policies, procedures, and practices according to the following timeline:-August-September 2024: Engage back-office provider Begin drafting financial policies and procedures.-October-November 2024: Complete initial draft of financial policies and procedures Board

					Finance Committee review and revision.-December 2024: Full board review and approval of financial policies and procedures.-January-March 2025: Develop implementation plan and training materials Begin staff training on financial procedures - April-June 2025: Finalize all financial systems and controls Complete staff training.-July 2025: Full implementation of financial policies, procedures, and practices. Throughout this process, we will work closely with our back-office provider and the GPCF to ensure our policies and procedures align with best practices for charter schools and comply with all relevant regulations

Question 8	☐ Applicant currently has very strong insurance coverage.	☐ Applicant has adequate insurance coverage to protect organization in the event of misallocation of funds. <u>OR</u> 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.	**2** **Proposal pgs. 63-64:** MS Global does not currently hold any insurance coverage. We plan to purchase the following insurance policies by July 1 2025: Version 12.14.22 1. General Liability Insurance: $2,000,000 aggregate / $1,000,000 per occurrence 2. Property Insurance: Coverage based on facility and contents value 3. Workers' Compensation: As required by Mississippi law 4. Directors and Officers (D&O) Liability: $1,000,000 5. Educators Legal Liability: $1,000,000 6. Employment Practices Liability: $1,000,000 7. Student Accident Insurance: $25,000 per accident 8. Cyber Liability: $1,000,000 9. Automobile Liability (for any school-owned or leased vehicles): $1,000,000 10. Umbrella Liability: $5,000,000 We will also explore obtaining a fidelity bond for board members and key employees who handle financial transactions. These

					coverage levels are based on recommendations for charter schools of similar size and will be reviewed annually to ensure they remain appropriate as the school grows.

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					*12*

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 ☐ NO	Criteria Met
Had applicant even been debarred?	☐ YES ☐ NO	Criteria Met
Did the applicant score "does not meet" for question 3, 4, 6, 7, and/or 8?	☐ YES ☐ NO	Criteria Met

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 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.	**2** **Proposal pg. 65**: MS Global will use Quickbooks to record accounting transactions
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.	**2** **Proposal pg. 65:** We track all funds separately by source as a routine practice.

125

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.	**2** **Proposal 66-68:** MS Global is committed to ensuring all reporting of grant financial activity is accurate, current, and complete through a comprehensive system of internal controls and regular oversight. Our approach includes: 1. Robust Accounting System: MS Global will utilize a recognized, regularly audited accounting system specifically configured for charter school and grant management. This system will allow for real-time tracking

of all financial transactions, including those related to the CSP grant. 2. Dedicated Financial Personnel: Our Director of Operations, overseen by the Principal, will be responsible for day-to-day financial management, including coding of expenditures and preparation of financial reports. This ensures consistency and accuracy in financial record-keeping. 3. Monthly Reconciliation: The Director of Operations will perform monthly reconciliations of all accounts, including grant-specific accounts, to ensure all transactions are accurately recorded and categorized. 4. Board Oversight: The Board Treasurer will meet monthly with the Director of Operations and Principal to review financial statements, including grant-specific reports. The full Board will receive and review comprehensive MS Global is committed to ensuring all reporting of grant financial activity is accurate,

127

				current, and complete through a comprehensive system of internal controls and regular oversight. Our approach includes: 1. Robust Accounting System: MS Global will utilize a recognized, regularly audited accounting system specifically configured for charter school and grant management. This system will allow for real-time tracking of all financial transactions, including those related to the CSP grant. 2. Dedicated Financial Personnel: Our Director of Operations, overseen by the Principal, will be responsible for day-to-day financial management, including coding of expenditures and preparation of financial reports. This ensures consistency and accuracy in financial record-keeping. 3. Monthly Reconciliation: The Director of Operations will perform monthly reconciliations of all accounts, including grant-specific accounts, to ensure all transactions are

128

					accurately recorded and categorized. 4. Board Oversight: The Board Treasurer will meet monthly with the Director of Operations and Principal to review financial statements, including grant-specific reports. The full Board will receive and review comprehensive financial activity complies with federal regulations, including EDGAR and Uniform Grant Guidance. 12. Technology Utilization: MS Global will leverage technology, including automated alerts and reminders, to ensure timely entry of financial data and completion of required reports. By implementing these measures, MS Global will ensure that all reporting of CSP grant financial activity is accurate, current, and complete, maintaining the highest standards of financial accountability and transparency.

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	**2** **Proposal pgs. 68-71**: Financial statements, including budgets to actuals, are reviewed and approved by the head of the entity or unit at least monthly and reviewed and approved at least quarterly by a board or other oversight body. MS Global has established a comprehensive process for reviewing financial statements for accuracy, including budgets to actuals. This process involves multiple levels of review and oversight, engaging both internal staff and external contractors: 1. Initial Preparation: The Director of Operations prepares monthly financial statements, including budget to actuals reports, using our accounting software (e.g., QuickBooks). These statements are typically ready within 10 business days after the end of each month. 2. First-Level Review: The Principal conducts an initial

				review of the financial statements, focusing on overall accuracy, alignment with school operations, and any significant variances from the budget. This review occurs within 2-3 days of receiving the reports from the Director of Operations 3. External Contractor Review: Our contracted back-office financial services provider conducts a thorough review of the financial statements, including:-Verifying accuracy of all entries-Ensuring proper categorization of expenses-Checking compliance with accounting standards and grant requirements-Analyzing budget to actuals and flagging any significant variances This review is completed within 5 business days of receiving the reports. 4. Board Treasurer Review: The Board Treasurer meets with the Principal and Director of Operations to review the financial statements, including a detailed examination of the budget to

					actuals report. This meeting occurs at least 3 days before the monthly board meeting. 5. Finance Committee Review: The Finance Committee, led by the Board Treasurer, reviews the financial statements, paying particular attention to:-Overall financial health-Significant budget variances-Cash flow projections-Compliance with financial policies and procedures This review occurs during the committee's monthly meeting, typically scheduled 1-2 days before the full board meeting. 6. Full Board Review: The full Board receives the financial packet, including budget to actuals, at least 48 hours before the monthly board meeting. During the meeting, the Board Treasurer presents a summary of the financial statements and any significant findings. The full Board discusses and votes to accept the financial statements. 7. Ongoing Monitoring: The Director of Operations

					and Principal continuously monitor financial activities, making real-time comparisons to the budget. Any significant variances or concerns are immediately flagged for review and potential action. 8. Annual Audit: An independent CPA firm conducts an annual audit, which includes a comprehensive review of all financial statements and processes. This multi-layered review process, involving both staff and external contractors, ensures the accuracy and integrity of MS Global's financial statements, including budgets to actuals. It provides multiple checkpoints for identifying and correcting any discrepancies, while also offering various perspectives on the school's financial health and performance

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	
	quarterly by board or board committee.	☐ Review process is adequate to identify and quickly correct inaccuracies or fraud.	either *at least quarterly or otherwise*.	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.	**2** **Proposal pgs. 72-73:** MS Global has implemented robust financial procedures and internal controls to prevent fraud, ensure good fiscal stewardship, and maintain compliance with all applicable regulations. Our key measures include: 1. Segregation of Duties: No single individual has control over all aspects of financial transactions. For

					example, the person who approves purchases is different from the one who processes payments. 2. Multi-level Approval Process: All expenditures require multiple approvals based on predetermined thresholds. For instance, purchases over $5,000 require Board approval. 3. Regular Reconciliations: Monthly bank reconciliations are performed by someone who does not handle cash receipts or disbursements. 4. Detailed Documentation: All financial transactions require supporting documentation, which is reviewed for completeness and accuracy before processing. 5. Automated Systems: Our accounting software flags potential duplicate payments and prevents processing without additional verification. 6. Budget Controls: The system is configured to prevent

				over-obligation of resources by not allowing expenditures that exceed budgeted amounts without proper override authorization. 7. Cost Allowability Checks: All expenses are reviewed against a pre-approved list of allowable costs, with particular attention to grant-funded expenses. 8. Regular Internal Audits: Quarterly internal audits review adherence to procedures and test controls. 9. Annual External Audit: An independent CPA firm conducts a comprehensive annual audit. 10. Continuous Monitoring: The Director of Operations and Principal continuously monitor financial activities, with oversight from the Board Treasurer and Finance Committee. 11. Staff Training: Regular training is provided on financial procedures, fraud prevention, and ethical practices These measures work together to create a robust system that prevents fraud,

					ensures good fiscal stewardship, and maintains compliance with all f financial regulations and grant requirements.
Questions 22-23	*informational only*				
Subtotal					*10*

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	Criteria Met

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	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	**3** **Proposal pg. 83.** Applicant indicated not applicable

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					*3*

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	Criteria Met.

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.	**6** **Proposal pg. 84-85** Applicant indicated no delays
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.	Applicant indicated not applicable.

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					6

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	Criteria Met

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, and financially.	☐ 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.	This section is not applicable to the applicant.
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	This section is not applicable to the applicant.

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	
		recognized assessments; ☐ 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, including graduation rates where applicable, for each of		for subgroups for at least three years. ☐ 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**	
		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			This section is not applicable to the applicant.

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					*Not Applicable*

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	This section is not applicable to the applicant.
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	This section is not applicable to the applicant.
If the applicant is applying for an expansion grant, did the applicant show three years of strong academic results and increasing student	☐ YES ☐ NO	This section is not applicable to the applicant.

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 ☐ NO
Category 2	☐ YES ☐ NO
Category 3	☐ YES ☐ NO
Category 4	☐ YES ☐ NO
Number of Categories Met 2-4	*0*
TOTAL NUMBER OF CATEGORIES MET	*1*

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		
B	Questions 1-8	Questions 9-23	Findings and Questioned Costs
	Click or tap here to enter text. (12 of 17 points)	Click or tap here to enter text. (12 of 14 points)	Click or tap here to enter text. (3 of 2 points)
C*	(6 of 6 points)		
D*	(0 of 12 points)		
Points Earned	33		
Possible Points	**51**		
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	64.70		
Percentage Points Earned X 20%	12.94		

*as applicable

Reviewer Name: ███████████   **Date:** August 26, 2024-September 9, 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	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**	
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.	**2** **Application pgs. 5-25**: Mississippi Global's mission is to cultivate globally competitive students through a rigorous, internationally-focused academic program, which integrates foreign language acquisition, project-based learning, service learning, research-based academic interventions, and

technological skills. Mississippi Global envisions a school where all students, regardless of background, are empowered to reach their full potential and graduate prepared for success in college, career, and global citizenship. Through Mississippi Global's relationship with the Global Public Charter Foundation the school will have access to this award-winning model. Key elements include: ● Rigorous, standards-aligned curriculum focused on college and career readiness ● Blended learning model with adaptive technology and personalized instruction ● Project-based and service-learning opportunities for critical thinking and global awareness ● Focus on equity and inclusion of all learners ● Intensive academic interventions and support services for struggling students ● Focus on foreign

		student population's needs.		☐ No clear connection between school model and targeted student population. ☐ Answer is too vague or confusing to evaluate.	language acquisition and global competencies. The success of this model in serving a diverse, high-need student population provides strong evidence that it will effectively improve academic achievement for targeted students in the Mississippi Delta.
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.	**2** **Application pgs. 12-15:** Our 4th-8th grade students use the Expeditionary Learning (EL) curriculum. Paperback versions of core texts and online access to modules, units, lessons, and shorter readings through UnboundEd provide comprehensive resources. The EL curriculum aligns with

150

Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards and broadly with the Achievement Network. Benchmark testing occurs twice yearly, with all students taking the MAAP exam in May. For grades 9-12, our school will consider utilizing McGraw Hill's StudySync ELA curriculum if it aligns with the school's enrolled student population's needs. This comprehensive program offers flexibility with thematic units, novel studies, teacher-created units, and chronological literature options. We utilize research-backed methods, such as Lexia and the Wilson Reading System. Our core curriculum, Eureka Math, provides a strong foundation aligned with MS CCRS. The school's Median Growth Percentile (MGP) for nearly every subgroup outperformed the sector in SY 2018-19. We utilize the STEMScopes curriculum to provide a robust learning

					foundation for our 4th-8th-grade students and Amplify for our 9th-12th-grade students. We utilize the IMPACT Social Studies curriculum for grades 4 and 5 and the Networks Social Studies curriculum for grades 6-12.

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	
		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 development plan or design of evaluation.	☐ School has a clear, effective plan for coaching and developing personnel. ☐ School has a clear, thoughtful plan for evaluation that ties to	☐ School's plan aims to foster a positive and professional culture among and between school leadership and staff but does not articulate how.	☐ School has no or vague plan for coaching and developing personnel. ☐ School has no or vague evaluation plan. ☐ Evaluation does not	**2** **Application pgs. 21,35, 60, :** Prioritize professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their effective curriculum delivery skills. Mississippi Global will ensure that professionals trained in health,

					wellness, and mental health are on-site at the school. Mississippi Global is committed to providing teachers with a robust and comprehensive professional development program designed to equip them with the essential tools needed for success in the classroom. This carefully crafted plan offers teachers ample opportunities for support and growth, including personalized one-on-one coaching sessions and a pre-service training period prior to the commencement of the academic year.
		professional development and personnel decisions. ☐ School describes how it will foster a positive and professional school		tie to professional development or personnel decisions.	

154

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.	**2** **Application pgs. 58-60:** Mississippi Global is committed to fostering a positive and supportive work environment that promotes collaboration, effectiveness, and shared dedication to student achievement. To achieve this, the following principles will guide the relationship between senior administrators and staff: 1. Open Communication: Regular meetings and communication channels will ensure staff are informed about updates, policy changes, and school-wide goals. Staff will be involved in

					decision-making processes when possible, and the rationale behind decisions will be transparently communicated. 2. Conflict Resolution: Clear procedures for addressing and resolving conflicts among staff will be established. Administrators and managers will receive training in conflict resolution techniques to facilitate constructive dialogue and maintain a harmonious work environment. 3. Resource Allocation and Professional Development: Staff will be provided with the necessary tools and resources to perform their roles effectively. Senior administrators will prioritize professional growth by offering high-quality professional development opportunities to both instructional and non-instructional staff. 4. Supportive School Culture: Senior administrators will foster a welcoming

				and inclusive school culture that values diversity and encourages collaboration, contributing to a sense of community among staff.
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	**2** **Application pgs. 5-78:** Application documents align with budget and activities are clear with embedded opportunity for community engagement among students and parents.

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	
				proposed budget and budget narrative. ☐ School is unlikely to be approved.	
Subtotal					*10*

B. Likelihood of Proposed Leadership Team's Success

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	
Qualifications of school leader and leadership team	☐ School leader has significant experience in operating exceptional charter schools.	☐ School leader has strong experience in leading high-performing schools <u>OR</u> 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.	5 **Application pgs. 399-536, 616-262:** Documents outline board members expertise and experience in addition to job descriptions.

158

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	
		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.	
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 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	**5** **Application pgs. 371-378**: Bylaws included and address various polices and areas of governance instead of management.

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:*	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.	5 **Application pgs. 538-542:** Evaluation rubric attached.
Subtotal					15

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.	**5** **Application pgs. 20-22:** 1) At least 80% of Mississippi Global's 4th-8th grade students will meet their projected iReady ELA typical growth goal, which measures progress from the assessment administered at the beginning to the post-test administered at the end of the school year. 2) At least 80% of Mississippi Global's 4th-8th grade students will meet their projected iReady Math typical growth goal, which measures progress from the assessment administered at the beginning of the school year to the post-test administered at the end of the school year. 3) 80%ofMississippi

					Global's 5th and 8th-grade students will demonstrate an increase of at least one proficiency level in Science on the MAAP until they reach proficiency. 4) By the end of the academic year, 80% of 12th-grade students taking the ACTFL Spanish exam, which is aligned with rigorous ACTFL/ MS World Languages Framework standards, will score at or above the "proficient" level in all four skill areas: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Mississippi Global sets clear expectations for student progression to ensure preparedness for future success. Grades 4-8 Promotion Criteria: ● Student Portfolio demonstrating progress and growth ● Grades indicating performance above, at, or near grade level, particularly in ELA and math ● Attendance, with chronic absenteeism and tardiness, potentially impacting eligibility for promotion High School Promotion

					Requirements (Carnegie Units): ● First-year students: 5 Carnegie Units ● Sophomores: 11 Carnegie Units ● Juniors: 16 Carnegie Units ● Note:Credit recovery programs and summer school are available to earn necessary Carnegie Units. Students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or 504 plans participate fully in college-bound promotion activities alongside peers. They must meet all promotion criteria unless their plan outlines specific, individualized goals. If a student is at risk of retention, proactive steps include developing an action plan with interventions, supports, and possible mandated tutoring. The principal makes final promotion decisions based on comprehensive data. Mississippi Global's policies prioritize student achievement and support, aligning with or exceeding many Mississippi

				public school promotion standards.
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.	**5** **Application pg.37-42:** Mississippi Global is committed to meeting the diverse needs of all students, including those with disabilities, English Learners (ELs), and students performing below grade level. Our educational model incorporates research-based strategies that have proven effective for diverse student populations: 1. Targeted academic interventions for students in grades 4-12 based on their specific needs, such as iReady for grades 4-8 (Curriculum Associates, 2019). 2. Daily secondary reading course for students in grades 4-8 who are two or more grade levels below in reading, modeled after

					the successful program at Washington Global. 3. Co-teaching and accommodations for students with disabilities in the general education setting, which research indicates benefits all students (Pratt, 2014). 4. Differentiation, scaffolding, and engaging lessons for all learners, with professional development to equip teachers with effective strategies (Subbon, 2006). 5. Project-Based Learning (PBL) model that allows for differentiation, scaffolding, and personalized instruction to cater to the diverse needs of students with disabilities. Mississippi Global is committed to serving all students, including students identified as English Learners (ELs). Mississippi Global will offer a comprehensive program for ELs that meet the needs of this diverse group of students.
Subtotal					*10*

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.	**9** **Application pgs. 548-569 and Proposal pgs. 26-28:** Budget information is realistic and aligns with narratives outlining spending of funds.

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	Criteria Met

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)
B	(15 of 18)
C	(10 of 12)
D	(9 of 12)
Points Earned	44
Possible Points	57
Percentage Points Earned (Points Earned/Possible Points X 100)	77.19
Percentage Points Earned X 30%	23.15

SUMMARY SCORE FOR SECTIONS I-III

Section	Score
Section I—Application Requirements (50%)	39.23
Section II—Assessment of Risk (20%)	12.94
Section III—Overall School Plan Quality (30%)	23.15
TOTAL BASE SCORE	**75.32**

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

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	**10** **Proposal pgs. 91-92:** Applicant is proposing a high school.
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** **Proposal pg. 91:** Applicant is proposing a school in a rural location.
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 and improvement under ESEA.	☐ Applicant at least one checked box AND 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 identified for comprehensive support and improvement under	☐ Applicant did not check box. ☐ Application does not meet definition of priority.	6	This section is not appliable to the applicant.

Priority	Met	Not Met	Points Available	Points Earned
	Meets ALL of the following	*Meets any of the following*	*Points Available*	
	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, development, and implementation of the charter school attached.	☐ Applicant did not check box. ☐ Application does not meet definition of priority.	6	This section is not applicable to the applicant.
TOTAL				18

STAGE 3—SCORING

Component	Total
Base Score (Sections I-III)	75.32
Competitive Preference Points (Section IV)	18
FINAL TOTAL	93.32

Reviewer Name: ██████████   **Date:** August 26, 2024-September 9, 2024   **Reviewer Signature:** ██████████