

**NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD**

NOTICE is hereby given of a meeting of the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board to be held on Monday, July 10th, 2017 beginning at 10:00 a.m. at the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board offices located at 239 N. Lamar Street, Suite 207, Jackson, MS 39201. Participation at this meeting may be by teleconference at locations different from the above location pursuant to Miss. Code Ann. §25-41-5(2013) with participation being available to the public at the location set forth above. The purpose of the meeting is to conduct the regular business of the board as set forth in the attached draft agenda.

This the 2nd day of July 2017.

BY: Marian Schutte
Executive Director

DRAFT AGENDA
MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD
July 10, 2017

- I. Call to order
- II. Adoption of the Agenda
- III. Adoption of the Minutes of the June 5th Meeting
- IV. Adoption of the Minutes of the June 28th Special Meeting
- V. Chair Report
- VI. Executive Director's Report
- VII. Committee Reports
 - a. Applications Committee
 - b. Performance and Accountability Committee
- VIII. New Business
 - a. 2017 Request for Proposals: Stage 2 Evaluation Results
 - b. FY18 Budget Revision
 - c. FY18 Epicenter Proposal
 - d. Communications Strategy Proposal
 - e. Cornerstone Consulting Contract
 - f. Approval of Invoices
- IX. Public Comment
- X. Next Meeting
 - a. September 11th
- XI. Adjourn

MINUTES OF THE
MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD
Special Meeting
Wednesday, June 28, 2017

A special meeting of the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board was held via teleconference at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 28, 2017. The meeting was open to the public at the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board office, located at 239 N. Lamar Street, Suite 207, Jackson, Mississippi. In attendance was:

Krystal Cormack, Chair

Participating via teleconference were:

Johnny Franklin, Vice Chair
Tommie Cardin
Dr. Karen Elam
Dr. Jean Young

Mr. Chris Wilson and Dr. Carey Wright were unable to participate. Executive Director Marian Schutte was also present. Chair Krystal Cormack called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

ITEM I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Adoption of Agenda

The Agenda was previously circulated to all Board members for review.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to adopt the agenda, as presented.

MOTION: Mr. Cardin

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a roll call vote in favor by all participating members, the motion carried.

ITEM II. FY17 BUDGET REVISION

A. FY17 Budget Revision

Executive Director Ms. Schutte presented budget revisions to the FY17 budget in order to adjust the budget to account for the proposal for boardroom technology received from Academic Technologies. The technology includes: a screen that will allow for video conferencing and presentation of documents to the public and microphones and a sound system that will interface with the Authorizer Board's conference call line. Ms. Schutte sought three quotes from different companies in order to furnish the boardroom. She received two quotes. The quote from

Academic Technologies was the lowest at \$30,714.79. The quote from Venture Technologies was higher at \$37,181.32.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the revised FY17 budget as presented to include the amount of technology and services for the Academic Technologies proposal.

MOTION: Mr. Cardin

SECOND: Dr. Elam

There being no additional discussion and following a roll call vote in favor by Ms. Cormack, Mr. Cardin, Dr. Elam, and Dr. Young and a vote against by Mr. Franklin, the motion carried.

ITEM III. FY18 ROBERT E. LEE BUILDING OFFICE SPACE LEASE

Ms. Schutte presented the lease from the Department of Finance and Administration for the Authorizer Board's office space at 239 N. Lamar Street, Suite 207, Jackson, MS 39201 for fiscal year 2018. The rent for the space will remain \$0.00 per month for a total cost of \$0.00.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the lease for the 2018 fiscal year and to allow Executive Director Ms. Schutte to sign the lease on behalf of the Authorizer Board.

MOTION: Dr. Young

SECOND: Mr. Franklin

There being no additional discussion and following a roll call vote in favor by all participating members, the motion carried.

ITEM IV. APPROVAL OF INVOICES

Ms. Schutte presented three invoices for approval: 1) Executive Director travel to Together Leader Workshop; 2) Together Leader Workshop Registration invoice; and 3) Cornerstone Consulting Invoices – April and May.

Mr. Cardin recused himself and left the teleconference call.

Chair Cormack requested a motion to approve the invoices for payment as presented.

MOTION: Dr. Elam

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no additional discussion and following a roll call vote in favor by all participating members, the motion carried.

ITEM V. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Cormack requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Mr. Franklin

SECOND: Dr. Young

There being no discussion and following a roll call vote in favor by all participating members, the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

ADOPTED, this the ____ day of _____, 2017.

KRYSTAL CORMACK, Chair

MCSAB Fall 2017 Stage 2 Evaluation NACSA Stage 2 Recommendations and Findings

Application	Threshold 1: Public Charter School Obligations	Threshold 2: Student Populations	Threshold 3: Startup Plan	Threshold 4: Personnel	Threshold 5: Financial Plan
Clarksdale Collegiate Public Charter School	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate
Kingdom Charter School	Substantially Inadequate	Substantially Inadequate	Substantially Inadequate	Substantially Inadequate	Substantially Inadequate
SR1 College Preparatory and STEM Academy	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate
Truth Academy STEAM Charter School	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate	Minimally Adequate

NACSA Findings

NAME OF APPLICANT: Kingdom Charter School

Name of Threshold	Criteria	Evidence
Threshold 1: Public Charter School Obligations	It is wholly lacking in or raises significant concerns about the applicant's understanding of, preparation to, and/or commitment to operating free of any prohibited application, admissions, or enrollment policies/practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant cites inappropriate requirements for admission and enrollment.
Threshold 2: Student Populations	It is wholly lacking in merit or raises significant concerns about the applicant's understanding of, preparation and/or commitment to meeting the needs of all special populations, including students with disabilities, ELLs, students requiring remediation or gifted and talented students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Special Populations and At-Risk Students section is completely inadequate and incomplete. The applicant did not provide a response beyond completing the demographics table indicating the percent of FRL and special education student they would serve. The applicant did not articulate appropriate procedures to identify students with special needs.

MCSAB Fall 2017 Stage 2 Evaluation

NACSA Stage 2 Recommendations and Findings

	<p>The funds allocated to serving special populations are wholly inadequate or plainly contradicted by the assumptions in other parts of the plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The funds allocated to serving special populations are inadequate and inconsistent throughout proposal.
	<p>Demographic projections fail to meet the statutory “80 percent rule” (i.e., the proposed school’s underserved student population is equivalent to at least 80 percent of the underserved student percentage of the school District in which the school will be located).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The demographics table indicates that the school would serve 1-2 percent special education students; the South Pike District serves approximately 13 percent; therefore, the applicant does not meet the 80 percent rule.
Threshold 3: Startup Plan	<p>The start-up plan fails to identify critical work streams required before school opening.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The startup plan provides a brief overview, but does not articulate specific tasks, such as a checklist.
	<p>The start-up plan fails to identify a specific and reasonable completion date for each milestone, and/or the time allocated to complete work streams within the start-up plan is wholly inadequate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The start-up plan lacks detail regarding deadlines for completing tasks, such as when technology will be acquired for delivery of the online content of the education program.
	<p>The start-up plan indicates that the applicants are entirely unprepared to meet compliance requirements or to understand what will be required to open on time and be ready to serve students effectively.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear what year the school proposes to open. In several sections across the application, the applicant indicates a 2017 start, whereas other sections indicate a 2016 start. MCSAB is only accepting applications for schools opening fall 2018.
Threshold 4: Personnel	<p>The proposed staffing structure is not viable, wholly lacking in merit, or is plainly and materially inconsistent with other parts of the plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffing plans are incomplete, inconsistent throughout the proposal, and not aligned with the budget. The budget is not viable or consistent with the narrative as it relates to staffing. Inconsistencies in the staffing plan do not support viable professional development and training for quality staff.
Threshold 5: Financial Plan	<p>The revenue assumptions are wholly lacking in merit or raise significant concerns about the applicant’s understanding of, preparation to, or ability to realistically account for state and federal per pupil funding streams.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some state revenue assumptions are not correctly accounted for, such as discrepancies in Mississippi Adequate Education Program (MAEP) funding.

MCSAB Fall 2017 Stage 2 Evaluation
NACSA Stage 2 Recommendations and Findings

	<p>Budget worksheets as presented are mathematically inaccurate, and/or revenue and expense lines are accounted for incorrectly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the allocations presented in the budget do not mathematically match the assumptions.
	<p>Budget projections for any year(s) result in a cash-negative position.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cash Flow Statement shows a continuous negative net operating income.
	<p>Expenditure assumptions are not provided, wholly lack merit or are unsustainably high or low on their face. Any assumption detail fails to provide a credible rationale for accepting the facially invalid assumptions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expenditure assumptions have significant gaps. The assumptions sheet is incomplete, (including entries for staff, personnel, facilities operations and maintenance, etc.), and there are no assumptions provided in the notes column.

TO: Members of the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board

FROM: Applications Committee

DATE: June 26, 2017

RE: Kingdom Charter School Stage 2 Recommendation

Overview

The Stage 2 Evaluation is the process used by the Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board (MCSAB or the Board) to determine whether complete and eligible applications submitted in response to its 2017 Request for Proposals meet the minimum quality threshold required to merit a comprehensive application evaluation. Between June 6 and June 26, independent evaluators assessed each application against MCSAB's published Stage 2 Evaluation Criteria. The findings from those evaluations were provided to the Applications Committee for consideration. This report constitutes the Application Committee's recommendation based on those findings.

Stage 2 Evaluation Process

Independent evaluators assess critical elements of each application against the published Stage 2 evaluation criteria in five to seven (as applicable) Quality Thresholds: Public Charter School Obligations, Student Populations, Start-up Plan, Personnel, Financial Plan, Performance History (for existing operators), and ESP Relationship (for applicants proposing to contract with an education service provider). Evaluators assign a Substantially Inadequate rating to any response that plainly fails to address the RFP requirements or criteria for approval, or that wholly lacks merit.

Report Structure

The introduction to this report includes an executive summary of the recommendation and a table showing the elements of the application that were rated Substantially Inadequate. Following the executive summary, analysis is provided for each Substantially Inadequate element.

Stage 2 Recommendation and Analysis

Name of Applicant: Kingdom Charter School

Executive Summary

The Applications Committee recommends that the application for Kingdom Charter School be denied at Stage 2. Stage 2 evaluators found that the application does not meet the minimum quality threshold in five critical areas of the application: 1) public charter school obligations; 2) student populations, 3) the startup plan, 4) personnel, and 5) the financial plan. In these areas, the application failed to address the RFP and/or statutory requirements, and thus does not qualify for a comprehensive Stage 3 evaluation.

Summary of Kingdom Charter School Substantially Inadequate Ratings

Stage 2 Threshold	Rating
Threshold 1: Public Charter School Obligations	Substantially Inadequate
Threshold 2: Student Populations	Substantially Inadequate
Threshold 3: Startup Plan	Substantially Inadequate
Threshold 4: Personnel	Substantially Inadequate
Threshold 5: Financial Plan	Substantially Inadequate

Analysis

Threshold 1: Public Charter School Obligations

The evaluation team finds the application to be Substantially Inadequate in **Threshold 1: Public Charter School Obligations**. Specifically, the application raises concern about the applicant’s understanding of, preparation to, and/or commitment to operating free of any prohibited application, admissions, or enrollment policies/practices.

The applicant cites prohibited requirements for admission and enrollment. On page three of the proposal narrative, the applicant states, “Our only requirements are that all paper work is adequately filled out and turned in accordingly and that all technology and uniform fees are paid in full. These fees are not to exceed \$250 annually or \$150 monthly.” Requiring fees may present a barrier to admission for some students and families and may be in violation of the Mississippi Public Charter School Act of 2013 (the Act). The Act states, “Except as otherwise provided under subsection (8)(d) of this section, a charter school may not limit admission based on ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, income level, disabling condition, proficiency in the English language, or academic or athletic ability.”¹ The technology and uniform fees may create a barrier to admission for families of limited economic means. The fee requirement is particularly problematic as the applicant proposes to locate in the South Pike School District, which serves a student population that is 100 percent Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL). As such, the admission requirements

¹ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23(3)

demonstrate a lack of understanding of the community the applicant intends to serve.

Similarly, the application states that test scores and Individual Education Plans (IEPs) are required prior to acceptance.

“All students who meet the required State paperwork shall be accepted upon signing the Student handbook and parent’s signature of Parent Handbook. The required paper work includes: 1. Application stating parents, legal guardians, contact info, and special needs and medical conditions; 2. Signature of Parent/Guardian on handbook of school policies; 3. 121 Form (Shot Records), Birth Certificate, Social security card or number, and transcript (grades, behavior, test scores, IEP, and all pertinent to education paper work from previous school).”²

Requiring this sensitive information as a condition of admission may be a violation of the Act, which, as noted above, prohibits charter schools from limiting admission based on “disabling condition” and “academic or athletic ability.”

Sources of Evidence

- Proposal Narrative
 - Executive Summary
 - Enrollment Summary

Threshold 2: Student Populations

The evaluation team finds the application to be Substantially Inadequate in **Threshold 2: Student Populations**. Specifically, the application lacks critical detail and raises significant concerns about the applicant’s understanding of, preparation and/or commitment to meeting the needs of all special populations, including students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), students requiring remediation, or gifted and talented students. In addition, the funds allocated to serving special populations are inadequate, and demographic projections fail to meet the statutory “80 percent rule” (i.e., the proposed school’s underserved student population must be equivalent to at least 80 percent of the underserved student percentage of the school District in which the school will be located).

The Special Populations and At-Risk Students section of the application is wholly inadequate and incomplete. The applicant did not provide a response or any detail beyond completing the demographics table indicating the percentage of FRL and special education students they would serve (Proposal Narrative, p.17). As such, the applicant failed to describe the overall plan to serve students with special needs, or discuss how the course scope and sequence, daily schedule, staffing plans, and support strategies and resources will meet or be adjusted for the diverse needs of students (MCSAB 2017 RFP, p. 16). In addition, the applicant did not provide any plans or provisions for identifying or meeting the needs of English Language Learner (ELL) students or gifted and talented students.

The percentage of special education students the applicant intends to serve is inconsistent throughout the application and does not meet the 80 percent rule. The demographics table indicates that the school would serve one percent special education students (Proposal Narrative, p.17). In the Executive Summary (p.3), the applicant provides data referencing the South Pike School District, which indicates that the district serves two percent special education students;

² Proposal Narrative, p.3.

however, this data is not cited, nor is it in alignment with data provided to applicants by the Board, which indicates that the South Pike School District actually serves approximately 13 percent special education students. The applicant states here that they will serve two percent special education students, (Executive Summary, p. 2). Regardless of the inconsistency, neither percentage is close to the actual number of special education students the applicant would need to serve to satisfy the rule.

The applicant did not articulate appropriate procedures to identify students with special needs. The only reference to identification is found in the discipline policy (Attachment 7, p.1), which states that, “All children with disabilities must list so on enrollment documentation, or they are considered regular education at Kingdom Charter School and will follow policy accordingly without consideration of accommodations.” This policy improperly places the onus on parents and guardians to identify their children as special needs and also may present a potential barrier to admission based on ability, which may not be aligned with Mississippi law as it relates to enrollment provisions.

The funds allocated to serving special populations are inadequate and inconsistent throughout the application. For example, the Budget Narrative (Attachment 21, p. 1) indicates that the school will hire one special education teacher at \$44,000; however, the Staffing Chart (Attachment 14, p. 1) only includes one classroom teacher and one lead teacher. Review of the Financial Plan Workbook indicates that the special education teacher is not included in the budget (Attachment 20, Personnel and Assumptions tabs).

Sources of Evidence

- Proposal Narrative
 - Special Populations and At-Risk Students
- Attachment 7: Discipline Policy
- Attachment 20: Budget Narrative
- Attachment 21: Financial Plan Workbook

Threshold 3: Startup Plan

The evaluation team finds the application to be Substantially Inadequate in **Threshold 3: Startup Plan**. Specifically, the startup plan fails to identify critical work streams required before school opening, as well as specific and reasonable completion dates for each milestone. Significant gaps and omissions in the start-up plan indicate that the applicant is not fully aware of what would be required to open on time and be ready to serve students effectively. In addition, there are several references indicating that the applicant proposes to open in the fall of 2017, which is unrealistic and not aligned with the Board’s *2017 Charter School Request for Proposals for Charter Schools Opening Fall 2018 and Beyond*.

The applicant’s startup plan provides a brief overview of tasks that were completed to launch what the applicant considered a trial run in 2016. However, the plan does not detail specific tasks and timelines, such as a checklist, that would need to be completed for the school to open as a fully functioning charter school in 2017 (Attachment 19). Many critical components are completely omitted from the startup plan. For example, the plan does not address how transportation will be handled (e.g. purchasing of buses and hiring drivers or securing a contract with a transportation company), or how technology will be acquired for delivery of the online content described in the education plan. In addition, the identified facility has only two classrooms, but the startup plan failed to address what renovations would be done to ensure that the facility is ready to accommodate 90 students over five grades in year one.

Phase three of the school's startup plan outlines some of the key tasks that will need to take place for the school to open, but the lack of detail and specificity in the timeline demonstrates that the applicant does not have a full understanding of the planning and implementation that will be needed to open on time. For example, the startup plan indicates that the applicant will "have 90 students enrolled and 10 FTE on staff with signed contracts by Wednesday, June 14, 2017. We want to be sure our numbers are as close to the proposed budget as possible" (Attachment 19, p. 8). This level of detail is insufficient in that it does not articulate the basic steps required to enroll students or hire staff, such as developing a marketing and branding strategy, creating an enrollment application, creating job descriptions, or developing staff recruitment and selection processes. The plan does not indicate who would be responsible for completing each step, nor the incremental deadlines to achieve each task.

Finally, it is unclear when the school proposes to open. As noted, the startup plan does not include a timeline; however, there are several due dates scattered throughout the application that imply different start dates. For example, the application includes multiple references to a 2017 start (e.g. the Proposal Cover Sheet, Staffing Chart, and the Enrollment Summary on p. 3 of the Proposal Narrative). Other application sections, such as the School Calendar and Schedule, indicate a 2016 start (Proposal Narrative, p. 13). As noted above, the Board is only accepting applications for schools opening Fall 2018.

Sources of Evidence

- Proposal Narrative
 - Executive Summary
 - Educational Program Design & Capacity
 - Operations Plan & Capacity: Facilities
- Attachment 19: Startup Plan
- Attachment 20: Budget Narrative
- Attachment 21: Financial Plan Workbook

Threshold 4: Personnel

The evaluation team finds the application to be Substantially Inadequate in **Threshold 4: Personnel**. Specifically, the proposed staffing structure is not viable and is plainly and materially inconsistent with other parts of the plan.

Staffing plans are incomplete, inconsistent throughout the application, and not aligned with the budget. The Staffing Chart (Attachment 14) indicates that the school intends to open with two teachers (including one lead teacher), a paraprofessional, and a substitute teacher. This staffing plan is wholly insufficient to serve 90 students across Grades 5-9; two teachers would likely not have the capacity to cover the depth and breadth of content for Grade 9, let alone across five grades. Further, the applicant notes that class sizes will be small and not exceed a 15 to 1 student to teacher ratio. It is unclear how this approach would be feasible with the proposed staffing structure (Proposal Narrative, p. 16).

The budget is not viable or consistent with the narrative with regard to staffing. The budget indicates that in year one the school will hire a lead teacher/CFO at \$55,000, an extracurricular teacher/coach at \$29,000, and three classroom teachers at \$17,000 each. This is inconsistent with the staffing plan and the teacher salaries are inappropriately low, as they are not competitive with district averages (Attachment 20, Financial Plan Workbook, Personnel Tab). For example, the applicant notes that they plan to partner with Teach for America (TFA) to hire teachers (Attachment 19, p. 8); however, the TFA Mississippi website indicates that the average teacher salary for a first-

year corps member teacher is \$35,000.³ Given the proposed salary levels, the applicant is unlikely to attract high quality candidates. The school plans to hire a principal, director, and part-time CFO—all in year one—and a superintendent in year two; these organizational roles seem excessive and duplicative given the low teacher salaries and the number of students the school plans to serve in year one. In the application and budget (Attachment 20, Personnel Tab), the applicant indicates that 75 percent of staff are volunteers and many staff will work for free and be expected to make donations to the school. The application goes on to state that, “Our executive team is guaranteed paid positions because of the long hours they may accrue and due to the fact that they have young families. The others can volunteer because they are either retired or not the bread winner of their family” (Proposal Narrative, p. 28). The overreliance on volunteer labor and the large discrepancy in administrator and teacher salaries is not only unsustainable but may also be discriminatory.

Finally, inconsistencies across the proposed staffing plan illuminates an insufficient and underdeveloped professional development (PD) and training program. For example, the application indicates that deans and curriculum coordinators will orient staff and deliver PD for the “non-traditional curriculum” (Proposal Narrative, p. 24). However, the staffing plan indicates that the dean will not start until year three and the curriculum coordinator line is blank (Attachment 14). Coupled with the low salaries and lack of detail in the startup plan referenced above, the applicant has failed to put forth a viable or cohesive plan for the recruitment, hiring, support, and development of instructional staff.

Sources of Evidence

- Proposal Narrative
 - Executive Summary
- Attachment 11: Organizational Chart
- Attachment 14: Staffing Plan
- Attachment 20: Budget Narrative
- Attachment 21: Financial Plan Workbook

Threshold 5: Financial Plan

The evaluation team finds the application to be Substantially Inadequate in **Threshold 5: Financial Plan**. Specifically, the revenue and expenditure assumptions are wholly lacking and raise significant concerns, budget worksheets are inaccurate, and budget projections result in a cash negative position in each year.

The revenue and expenditure assumptions have significant gaps, raising concerns about the applicant’s understanding of, preparation to, or ability to realistically account for state and federal per pupil funding streams. The revenue allocations presented in the budget do not mathematically match the assumptions. For instance, the school estimates MAEP per student funding to be \$4,715. For 90 students—the number of students anticipated in year one—this would mean a total allocation of \$424,350, but the budget has allocated for \$428,594. The enrollment tab in the financial plan workbook indicates an enrollment of 50 gifted students and 25 career/technical students by year four, yet the applicant does not reference teachers to serve these students in the narrative or account for their salaries in the budget.

The expense assumptions sheet is incomplete—including entries for staff, personnel, facilities operations, and maintenance—and there are no assumptions provided in the notes column. There are no core teachers listed on the personnel worksheet or the revenue/expense assumptions tab.

³ <https://mississippi.teachforamerica.org/teaching-here>

The teacher expenses in the five-year budget range from \$80,000 in year one up to \$264,000 in year five; however, the rationale for these amounts are not supported by a reference in the proposal narrative or the budget narrative. The technology and uniform fee that is collected with student registration is not mentioned in the revenue, nor is there any mention of technology expenses in the budget. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) expenses decrease annually for the first six years; however, there is no explanation or assumption provided. These omissions prevented the evaluation team from assessing the rational and soundness of the assumptions.

Finally, the Cash Flow Statement shows a continuous negative net operating income. In order to receive a minimally adequate rating for this criterion, applicants are required to show a positive cash position for each year of operation. As such, the applicant does not meet the minimum requirement.

Sources of Evidence

- Proposal Narrative
 - Executive Summary
 - Section 3. Financial Plan & Capacity
- Attachment 20: Budget Narrative
- Attachment 21: Financial Plan Workbook

Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board
 FY18 Budget - \$546,692

\$237,000 Appropriation with FY16 (\$56,078), FY17 (\$120,000) 3% Admin, and FY18 (\$133,614) 3% State Admin

Approved 6/5/2017

Proposed 7/10/17

Category	Estimated Line Item	Estimated Line Item
Personnel		
Salaries	\$ 190,000.00	\$ 190,000.00
Fringe	\$ 57,000.00	\$ 57,000.00
Workers Comp, etc.	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00
Sub-Total	\$ 248,500.00	\$ 248,500.00
Travel		
In-State	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00
Out-of-State	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500.00
Sub-Total	\$ 19,500.00	\$ 19,500.00
Contractual		
Intern Stipend	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
Employee Training	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 3,500.00
Postage	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00
Advertising/Promotional Expense	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Membership Dues	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 1,250.00
Software	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
Wireless	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
Professional Services - IT	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
Professional Services - NACSA	\$ 48,765.00	\$ 48,765.00
Professional Services - PR	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
Prof. Services - Cornerstone	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 12,500.00
Prof. Services - Charter School Data System	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Other Fees (Court Reporter, etc)	\$ 161,427.00	\$ 117,427.00
Sub-Total	\$ 258,692.00	\$ 258,692.00
Commodities		
Office Supplies	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 6,500.00
Food for Business	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
Office Furnishings	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Other Supplies	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00
Sub-Total	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 14,000.00
Equipment		
Computer Equipment	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
Office Machines	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
Sub-Total	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 546,692.00	\$ 546,692.00

FY18 Guaranteed and Estimated Revenue

	Guaranteed Dollars	Estimated Dollars
Appropriation	\$237,000.00	
FY 16 Admin Fee	\$56,078.00	
FY 17 Admin Fee	\$120,000.00	
State Admin Fee		
2515-Reimagine Prep	\$60,979.23	
2525-Midtown PCS	\$30,597.66	
2535-Smilow Prep	\$42,037.26	
Total State	\$133,614.15	
Local Admin Estimate		
2515-Reimagine Prep		\$32,400.00
2525-Midtown Public Charter School		\$16,848.00
2535-Smilow Prep		\$20,250.00
Total Local	\$0.00	\$69,498.00
Total Guaranteed Revenue	\$546,692.15	
Total Estimated Revenue		\$69,498.00
Total Guaranteed and Estimated		\$616,190.15