



Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction – Charter School Sub-grant Application Technical Review (Rev. 10-2024)

Instructions: DPI reviewer completes the checklist below and, as needed, provides comments in the indicated “Comments” field. Once the technical review is completed, DPI reviewer indicates whether or not the application is in compliance with all applicable requirements. Additional information may be requested from applicants to ensure eligibility requirements have been met.

Applicant: _____ Subgrant Type _____ Planning _____

DPI Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Criteria Reviewed Prior to Peer Review	Met or NA	Not Met or Additional Info Needed
1. Implementation Grants Only: Applicant did not begin serving students prior to July 1, 2022	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Implementation Grants Only: Applicant has never received a CSP grant from the USDE or DPI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Expansion Grants Only: Applicant is adding one or more grades or significantly increasing enrollment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Assurances and Certification Regarding Lobbying signed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Applicant provides charter contract, board resolution, minutes, or approval letter from authorizer approving the new, expanded, or replicated charter school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Narrative is within page-limit, uses acceptable font size/style, and application is complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Letters of support contain names, signatures, dates, and contact information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Needs analysis includes community served	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Applicant hasn't received a direct Charter Schools Program grant award from the U.S. Department of Education under ESSA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The individual who signed the application as the Authorizer/Chartering Authority Official is not the same person who signed the application as the Charter School Planning Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Replication and Expansion Grants Only: Applicant provided the following charter school data		
a. Evidence of three years of improved educational results, including evidence of improved graduation rates, if applicable, for all students and for each subgroup	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Student assessment results for all students and each subgroup for last three years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Attendance, student retention data, suspension and expulsion data for three most recently completed school years for all students and each subgroup	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Replication and Expansion Grants Only: If applicant previously received CSP funds, the applicant provided evidence of at least three years of improved educational results and has not requested funds for the same or for a substantially similar purpose.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Criteria Reviewed Prior to Award Determinations	Met/NA	Not Met
13. Replication and Expansion Grants Only: Applicant meets additional high-quality elements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Applicant has no significant student safety issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Applicant has no significant financial and operational management issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Applicant has no significant statutory or regulatory compliance issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:		

