

CGMI-C Compliance Mapping CSP Grant Rubric

State Guidance

Formal mapping of CGMI criteria to the federal Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant rubric.

CGMI-F v1.0 · Published 2026-01-01

Contents

- 1 Purpose of This Document**
- 2 How to Use This Mapping**
- 3 Mapping Overview**
- 4 Section H — Governing Board Quality**
- 5 Section A — Grant Project Goals**
- 6 Section F — Financial Management & Sustainability**
- 7 Section E — Student Demand and Community/Local Support**
- 8 Appraisal Evidence in Your CSP Application**
- 9 Quick Reference Matrix**

This document maps CGMI framework criteria to the federal Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant application rubric. Schools can use their CGMI appraisal report as supporting evidence when completing CSP applications.

1 Purpose of This Document

The federal Charter Schools Program (CSP) is the primary federal grant program for charter schools. CSP applications are evaluated against a detailed rubric that assesses governance quality, financial sustainability, academic planning, and community support.

This document provides a formal, criterion-by-criterion mapping between the CSP rubric sections that address governance and the corresponding CGMI domains, practice areas, and maturity level criteria. The purpose is to enable schools to use their CGMI appraisal report as structured evidence in CSP applications — reducing the burden of assembling governance evidence from scratch and ensuring that evidence is comprehensive, objective, and formatted for evaluator consumption.

This mapping is part of CGMI-C (Compliance Integration), which connects CGMI maturity ratings to external accountability frameworks. Schools at CGMI Level 2 and above can generate a CGMI-C compliance exhibit as part of their appraisal output.

2 How to Use This Mapping

When completing a CSP grant application:

- **Step 1: Complete a CGMI appraisal.** A Self-Assessment (Level 2 cap) is sufficient for basic evidence. A Guided Appraisal (Level 4 cap) produces stronger evidence with automated evidence citations. A Certified Appraisal provides the highest evidentiary weight.
- **Step 2: Generate your CGMI-C compliance exhibit.** This is produced automatically at Guided Appraisal close for Level 2+ schools. It includes a cross-reference table mapping your appraisal findings to CSP rubric criteria.
- **Step 3: Reference the mapping tables in this document.** For each CSP rubric section, identify the CGMI domains and practice areas that provide evidence. Cite your domain ratings, practice area scores, and specific evidence from your appraisal report.
- **Step 4: Attach the CGMI-C exhibit to your application.** The exhibit is formatted for direct attachment. It provides evaluators with a structured, third-party-validated governance evidence package that supplements your narrative responses.

Important: The CGMI-C exhibit supplements your CSP application; it does not replace narrative responses. CSP evaluators expect applicant-written narratives that address rubric criteria directly. The CGMI-C exhibit provides the structured evidence base that supports those narratives.

3 Mapping Overview

The CSP rubric contains multiple sections. Four sections have direct governance components that map to CGMI domains:

CSP Rubric Section	Primary CGMI Domain	Supporting CGMI Domains	Available at
Section H Governing Board Quality	D1 Board Composition & Competency	D2 (Processes), D3 (Oversight)	Level 2+
Section A Grant Project Goals	D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability	D5 (Charter Promise Fidelity)	Level 2+
Section F Financial Management & Sustainability	D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability	D2 (Compliance)	Level 2+
Section E Student Demand and Community Support	D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability	D3 (Charter Promise)	Level 2+

4 Section H — Governing Board Quality

CSP Section H evaluates the quality and capacity of the school's governing board. This is the most directly governance-focused section of the CSP rubric and maps primarily to CGMI Domain D1 (Board Composition & Competency).

CSP Criterion	CGMI Domain / Practice Area	Evidence from Appraisal	Strongest at Level
Board has necessary skills and experience	D1.PA1 Board Composition D1.PA2 Member Competency	Board seat count, required positions filled, role-specific certification completion rates, skills gap assessment	L3+
Board demonstrates governance independence	D1.PA4 Diversity & Independence	Independence from management and EMO/CMO, conflict of interest policy enforcement, board composition diversity	L3+
Board has plan for continuity and succession	D1.PA3 Succession Planning	Officer election cycle documentation, recruitment pipeline status, transition protocols, knowledge transfer processes	L3+
Board exercises effective oversight of school leadership	D3.PA2 Leadership Oversight	Executive evaluation process documentation, performance metrics, accountability mechanisms, management separation	L3+
Board operates through documented governance processes	D2.PA1 Meeting Management D2.PA2 Records & Documentation	Meeting notice compliance rate, quorum achievement, minutes quality and timeliness, policy library completeness	L2+
Board members receive adequate training	D1.PA2 Member Competency	Foundational training completion rates, role-specific certification status, ongoing professional development tracking	L2+

5 Section A — Grant Project Goals

CSP Section A evaluates the applicant's project goals, performance measures, and logic model. The governance components focus on strategic planning, academic accountability, and charter promise fidelity.

CSP Criterion	CGMI Domain / Practice Area	Evidence from Appraisal	Strongest at Level
Clear, measurable project goals aligned to charter mission	D3.PA1 Strategic Planning	Strategic plan existence and currency, board role in plan development, monitoring of strategic milestones	L3+
Performance measures tied to charter commitments	D3.PA4 Charter Promise Fidelity	Monitoring of charter commitments, enrollment targets, grade expansion plans, program fidelity tracking	L3+
Board oversight of academic performance	D3.PA3 Academic Accountability	Board oversight of academic data, documented response to underperformance, charter mission alignment in board discussion	L3+
Logic model connects governance to outcomes	D3.PA1 Strategic Planning D3.PA2 Leadership Oversight	Strategic plan-to-outcome linkage, executive evaluation tied to charter commitments, academic accountability as board-level activity	L4+

6 Section F — Financial Management & Sustainability

CSP Section F evaluates the school's financial management capacity and long-term sustainability. This maps primarily to CGMI Domain D4 (Financial Governance & Sustainability).

CSP Criterion	CGMI Domain / Practice Area	Evidence from Appraisal	Strongest at Level
Board provides effective financial oversight	D4.PA1 Financial Oversight	Budget approval and monitoring process, fund balance management, Treasurer engagement, board financial literacy assessment	L2+
Sound audit and internal control processes	D4.PA2 Audit & Internal Controls	Annual audit completion status and timing, audit committee function, response to audit findings, internal control policy documentation	L2+
Plan for long-term financial sustainability	D4.PA3 Financial Sustainability	Revenue diversification status, reserve fund management, multi-year financial planning documentation, facility cost management	L3+
Procurement and fiscal compliance	D4.PA4 Procurement & Compliance	Procurement policy compliance, conflict of interest in contracting, CMO/EMO financial independence, grant management processes	L2+
Financial reporting and transparency	D5.PA1 Public Transparency D2.PA4 Legal & Regulatory Compliance	Financial document publication, annual report availability, compliance with financial reporting requirements	L2+

7 Section E — Student Demand and Community/Local Support

CSP Section E evaluates the school's community engagement and public accountability. This maps primarily to CGMI Domain D5 (Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability).

CSP Criterion	CGMI Domain / Practice Area	Evidence from Appraisal	Strongest at Level
Meaningful community engagement mechanisms	D5.PA2 Community Engagement	Parent and community input mechanisms, stakeholder communication processes, public comment procedures, community engagement tracking	L3+
Public transparency in governance	D5.PA1 Public Transparency	Meeting notice publication, agenda and minutes availability, annual report publication, public access compliance	L2+
Responsive to authorizer and stakeholder feedback	D5.PA3 Authorizer Relationship	Quality of authorizer communication, proactive disclosure, response to authorizer requests, renewal readiness	L3+
Culture of continuous improvement	D5.PA4 Continuous Improvement	Board self-assessment practice, governance review cycles, learning from failures, benchmarking against peers	L3+

8 Appraisal Evidence in Your CSP Application

Schools at different CGMI levels will have different strengths in their CSP applications. The table below provides guidance on how to position your CGMI evidence based on your current maturity level.

Your CGMI Level	Evidence Strength	How to Position in CSP Application
Level 2 Developing	Foundational	Emphasize compliance readiness: meeting processes in place, audit completed on time, training underway, policies documented. Your CGMI rating demonstrates that basic governance infrastructure exists. Reference specific practice area scores to show concrete compliance evidence.
Level 3 Established	Strong	Emphasize governance quality beyond compliance: 100% board certification, active strategic plan, formal executive evaluation, proactive processes. Your CGMI rating demonstrates governance maturity that exceeds minimum requirements. The capability profile shows balanced strength across domains.
Level 4 Advanced	Excellent	Emphasize data-driven governance: year-over-year improvement, peer benchmarking, skills matrix, multi-year financial planning. Your CGMI rating places you in the top quartile of comparable schools. Evidence of sustained improvement across multiple cycles is especially compelling.
Level 5 Exemplary	Exceptional	Emphasize institutional governance capability: sector contribution, authorizer recognition, zero compliance incidents, expert-tier training. Your Certified Appraisal provides the highest evidentiary weight. Reference the authorizer citation as third-party validation.

Tip: CSP evaluators review many applications. A structured CGMI-C compliance exhibit stands out because it provides objective, evidence-cited governance data in a format that is easy to scan and verify. Attach the exhibit as a supporting appendix and reference it from your narrative responses.

9 Quick Reference Matrix

Complete mapping of all CSP rubric governance criteria to CGMI practice areas.

CSP Section	Criterion	Primary PA	Supporting PAs
H	Skills and experience	D1.PA1, D1.PA2	D1.PA4
H	Independence	D1.PA4	D2.PA3
H	Succession planning	D1.PA3	D1.PA1
H	Leadership oversight	D3.PA2	D3.PA1
H	Documented processes	D2.PA1, D2.PA2	D2.PA3
H	Board training	D1.PA2	D1.PA1
A	Project goals	D3.PA1	D3.PA4
A	Performance measures	D3.PA4	D3.PA3
A	Academic oversight	D3.PA3	D3.PA2
A	Logic model	D3.PA1	D3.PA2
F	Financial oversight	D4.PA1	D4.PA2
F	Audit and controls	D4.PA2	D4.PA1
F	Sustainability	D4.PA3	D4.PA4
F	Procurement	D4.PA4	D2.PA4
F	Financial transparency	D5.PA1	D2.PA4
E	Community engagement	D5.PA2	D5.PA1
E	Public transparency	D5.PA1	D5.PA2
E	Stakeholder responsiveness	D5.PA3	D5.PA4
E	Continuous improvement	D5.PA4	D5.PA3

CGMI-C · Compliance Integration — CSP Grant Rubric Mapping

Contact: cgmi@chartervision.org · Web: www.cgmi.institute/integration/compliance
 © CGMI. All rights reserved. CGMI is a trademark of Charter Vision.