



MISSISSIPPI CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER BOARD

**STAGE 3: INDEPENDENT EVALUATION TEAM
REVIEW FORM – Resilience Academy of
Technological Excellence (East Tallahatchie)
NEW CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION
For Schools Opening Fall 2023 & Beyond**

Recommendation

DO NOT RECOMMEND FOR INTERVIEW

Applicant Information

Proposed School Name:	Resilience Academy of Teaching Excellence – East Tallahatchie	Education Service Provider (ESP)	No
		Name (# of ESP schools)	N/A

School Information

Grade Configuration at Start:	K – 1	Proposed Location:	East Tallahatchie School District
Grade Configuration at Scale:	K – 5	Year Opening:	2023
Enrollment at Start:	80	Enrollment at Scale:	360

Mission Statement: The mission of Resilience Academy of Technological Excellence is to cultivate, develop, and prepare young scholars to ensure college-and-career-readiness through high-quality instruction, integrated technology, and project-based learning with an emphasis on the whole child.

Summary Recommendation

Section 1: Educational Program Design & Capacity

The applicant proposed an elementary school campus in East Tallahatchie with a focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM), and agriculture. They have a proposed Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Chief Operating Officer (COO), who both have extensive experience in leadership positions at charter schools. However, the applicant did not present comprehensive plans for how they will effectively serve all students, including students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), students who are intellectually gifted, and students who are academically underperforming and at risk. Additionally, they identified multiple instructional strategies and methods, but did not state how they work together cohesively, nor did they provide evidence that their proposed model would be successful with the targeted student population. Finally, while the applicant identified STEM and agriculture as the main areas of focus, they did not demonstrate how these areas will be embedded within the school model or how they will approach them in an innovative manner.

Section 2: Operations Plan & Capacity

Upon approval, the Board of Resilience Development Corporation – the sponsoring entity – will transition to become the school’s Governing Board. However, the applicant did not state how the Board will effectively make the transition, nor did they describe how the Board will assume its new duties in addition to continuing duties related to the existing organization. In addition, there is misalignment between the organizational charts, staffing charts, and budget; thus, it is unclear if they have planned and budgeted for appropriate staffing. The applicant also did not present how their compensation packages, system, and strategy will attract and retain strong staff. Also, a review of the budget found that the proposed salary for the principal is \$55k-\$65k, which is low, and the budget indicated that the CEO and COO will work part time (0.5 FTE) in Years 1 and 2; thus, it is unclear if they will have the capacity to get the school off to a strong start.

Section 3: Financial Plan & Capacity

The applicant group has provided a budget/financial plan that is practical. Assumptions made are reasonable (with a few potentially being low) and seem to align with the dollar amounts presented in the financial plan. The financial plan currently shows the school ending Year 1 (\$305k) through Year 5 (\$320k) with six-figure net incomes – roughly \$1.3M over the first five years of operation. Those surpluses, contingent on Charter School Project (CSP) funding in Year 1, on a year-to-year basis would allow the school to build a reserve and remain solvent year-to-year. The start-up period and Year 1 includes \$250k of CSP funding as well as \$300k from Resilience CDC. It is unclear if the funding from Resilience CDC is a grant or loan. If the latter, there is no pay back of the loan included in the financial plan. Given the current projected net incomes in Year 1 (\$305k), without CSP funding and other unsubstantiated revenue sources the school may not be viable. The financial plan appears to be underfunded in certain areas related to personnel (CEO and COO funded at \$50k combine) and other than personnel services (OTPS), accounting/audit and a few other lines include no annual escalation amounts).

Review Summary

Area	Rating
Curriculum and Instructional Design	Does Not Meet the Standard
Pupil Performance Standards	Meets the Standard
<i>High School Graduation Requirements</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
School Calendar and Schedule	Does Not Meet the Standard
School Culture	Partially Meets the Standard
Supplemental Programming	Does Not Meet the Standard
Special Populations and At-Risk Students	Does Not Meet the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Meets the Standard
Student Discipline	Partially Meets the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Partially Meets the Standard
Educational Program Capacity	Does Not Meet the Standard
Organization Charts	Partially Meets the Standard
Legal Status and Governing Documents	Meets the Standard
Governing Board	Partially Meets the Standard
<i>Advisory Bodies</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Grievance Process	Meets the Standard
Staff Structure	Does Not Meet the Standard
Staffing Plans, Hiring, Management, and Evaluation	Does Not Meet the Standard
Professional Development	Partially Meets the Standard

Performance Management	Does Not Meet the Standard
Facilities	Partially Meets the Standard
Start-up & Ongoing Operations	Partially Meets the Standard
Operations Capacity	Partially Meets the Standard
Financial Plan	Partially Meets the Standard
Financial Management Capacity	Meets the Standard

Rating	Characteristics
Meets the Standard	The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant’s capacity to carry out the plan effectively.
Partially Meets the Standard	The response meets the criteria in many respects but lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas.
Does Not Meet the Standard	The response meets the criteria in some respects but has substantial gaps in a number of areas.
Falls Far Below the Standard	The response is wholly undeveloped or significantly incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant’s ability to carry it out.