

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2024 12:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A240009)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	35
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	100

Priority Questions

CPP 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP2	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 3		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 4		
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 5		
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	3	3
Sub Total	3	3

Total

110

110

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - State Entities Panel - 2: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A240009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (up to 5 points);

Strengths:

Applicant has completed a fully developed, thoroughly researched, logic model that addresses key priorities and demonstrates the rationale, by including appropriate inputs, activities, outputs, short- and long-term outcomes, assumptions and external factors(e828). There is a clear path showing all the supports for new or struggling schools, and activities to develop a high-quality statewide charter sector, through quality authorizing and sharing of best practices. The logic model description in the narrative includes how the state entity will build on the previous success of the CSP program in the state (e28), continuing to train and support all partners statewide through workshops (e26), web resources (e27), tracking student outcomes (e28), and awarding supplemental funding for established criteria and focus areas supporting traditionally underserved students (e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible (up to 5 points); and

Strengths:

Applicant presents a list of fully developed methods of evaluation using sound objective performance measures using the SMART style (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely) (e30). There is a rationale provided for each goal that clearly states how they are related to the project outcomes, using qualitative and quantitative measures. All measures are able to be reported annually (e30- e34). Measures include technical assistance participation and attendance by authorizers (e15,e30,e31) and subgrantees (e32), pipeline metrics (e31), academic performance,(e33, e34)) advertising the opportunity for subgrants an technical assistance (e20, e27, e929, e33, e34), and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned (e33, e34).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entity program (up to 5 points).

Strengths:

Applicant presents a fully developed description of an ambitious and attainable goal to award up to 70 subgrants (e34), justified with comprehensive explanations of the projected pipeline based on statewide school and district data (e36, e41), previous awards metrics under CSP (e38), and trends in charter school enrollment data (e35).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. The extent to which the projected number of subgrant awards for each grant project year is supported by evidence of demand and need, and the extent to which the proposed average subgrant award amount is supported by evidence of the need of applicants (up to 20 points).

Strengths:

The evidence-based proposal for the projected number of subgrants and the average award is fully developed. The proposal details the prior CSP program awards and rate of awards to support the that the projected pipeline is realistic (e38), plus the additional publicity for competitions (e41), additional applicant technical assistance (e32), and reflection on eligibility and application criteria (e32, e36). The applicant includes a waiver, clearly outlined in the budget, to support subgrantees initially supported under the prior CSP (e37, e75, e913, e922). There are details, a formula, and rationale for funding up to [REDACTED] per subgrantee (e37, e38). They describe the increase in awards based on higher costs in the current economic climate. There are well defined supplemental funding criteria based on important subgroups (e38, e40, e42, e47).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program and improve education results for students (up to 15 points).

Strengths:

Applicant demonstrates a fully developed program with a rigorous eligibility screening and peer review process showing the likelihood of increasing the number of high-quality schools (e48). Applicant provides examples of universal and targeted monitoring to inform the risk of successful completion of subgrant projects (e53). Applicant outlines support and flexibility for diverse school models supported by state law with examples for diversity of student populations, CTE, and rural charter schools (e19, e23, e25, e42, e80). Applicant presents a thorough plan for subgrant application requirements, definition of high quality, eligibility screening, peer review process, award process and addressing transportation needs (e43, e47, e49, e51). This provides positive insight into the likelihood of subgrantees meeting the objectives for quality

and improved education results.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

1. Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program (up to 10 points);

Strengths:

Applicant presents a convincing description of fully developed monitoring plan and protocols, ensuring compliance with the charter school program, state, and federal requirements (e52). They cite aligned budgets, academic programming and achievement, continuous evaluation, with timely benchmarks. The universal and targeted monitoring are to be completed by well trained staff and are designed to identify risk and quickly address any deficiencies promptly. There are established processes for monitoring and the timeline is clearly visible (e53). Applicant describes enrollment reports, site visits, and independent financial audits (e54). There is technical assistance provided to subgrantees to address any concerns and all monitoring results are publicly available (e51, e54). The applicant specifically addresses sustainability once the subgrantee funds are no longer available and how subgrantees must demonstrate how they will meet the needs of all students (e51-e57).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies (up to 5 points);

Strengths:

Applicant is fully aware of and completely outlines the undue burden on charters and authorizers where there is a duplication of efforts (e59). There is a full description of the plans to avoid duplication of work through ongoing technical assistance with authorizers, streamlining systems, and increase engagement with charter authorizers through universal activities. Universal activities include dissemination of best practices, eliminating redundancy and duplication, and prioritizing efficient and effective oversight. Collaboration between the applicant and authorizers is evident throughout the description provided (e60).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

3. Provide technical assistance and support for--

- i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
- ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State (up to 10 points);**

Strengths:

Applicant details a fully developed and comprehensive technical assistance plan for subgrantees with universal and targeted approaches (e60). The description of tools includes webinars, one-on-one meetings, partnerships with outside expert groups, consultants, interested developers and authorizer networks. Presentations, workshops, and meetings are designed to address recruitment, enrollment, retention, all while promoting full inclusion. Applicant specifically mentions reducing the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom. Data is used to determine targeted TA that is directly related to the subgrantees (e61, e62).

The applicant has taken great care to provide evidence of the previous and intended support of quality authorizing statewide. It is evident that authorizers are included in conversations about program specifics, best practice activities, and all areas, including but limited to school closure procedures, efficacy of future authorizers, and building capacity for current and future authorizers (e64, e65, e66).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State (up to 5 points); and

Strengths:

The state entity's plan to solicit and consider input from stakeholders is fully developed. Applicant requires all subgrantees to present parent and community involvement with descriptions of continuously seeking input regarding the school's education program. Data is used from the statewide mandatory local control and accountability plan to develop budgets and plans and all information regarding this activity is publicly available on the school's website (e67). Applicant has provided a timeline for parent and community involvement (e68).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

5. The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law (up to 5 points).

Strengths:

Applicant provides a fully developed description of how they plan to work to maximize flexibilities given to charter schools statewide. Applicant notes the flexibilities in state law for charter schools (e68). Applicant mentions working with subgrantees to maximize the amount of flexibility available through TA and partnerships with charter school support associations (e69).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 10 points);**

Strengths:

Applicant provides a fully developed management plan that has a convincing description of effectively managing federal grants and outlines a reasonable description of the staff's ability to achieve the objectives of the program on time and within budget (e68, e69). There are several in house supports listed and the attached resumes detail the substantial background of all CSP office staff (e82 through e91). The logic model and ambitious attainable performance measures align with the expectations of not only the charter school program but the state department of education (e70). Applicant documents the management of external partners with clear distinction between their work and program staff (e71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (up to 3 points);**

Strengths:

The evidence provided for adequacy of the procedures for feedback and continuous improvement are fully developed. The description of a sound management plan includes opportunities for progress checks and reflection, using the continuous improvement mindset, led by the project director (e71). Applicant provides a detailed table of the frequency of communication between program staff and partners with feedback sources (e72).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

- 3. The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 2 points).**

Sub

Strengths:

The description of the time commitments for project staff is fully developed. All project personnel are qualified and have clear expectations for the time involved in running a successful program, meeting the objectives outlined in the narrative (e73, e74, e916).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

CPP 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: At Least One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a Local Educational Agency, or An Appeals Process (0 or 1 Points)

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

- a. Allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State ; or
- b. In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, the State has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing the appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Please specify whether they meet (a) or (b) and clearly explain why in the strengths.

Strengths:

CPP1 is fully developed. Applicant has noted "California has an appeal process for charters denied by a local authorizer" (e13) and has detailed "a robust appeals process that includes multiple review agencies under state law" (e16).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Equitable Financing (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.

Strengths:

CPP 2 is fully developed. Applicant has demonstrated that charter schools receive equitable financing by explaining the type and amount of financing available in comparison to traditional public schools, in a timely manner. The State's "funding mechanisms and the alternate systems have been designed to ensure charter schools receive funding on par with traditional district schools and in a timely manner for opening a new school." (e18)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.

Strengths:

CPP3 is fully developed. The applicant presents evidence of previous statewide technical assistance workshops including participants from charter and traditional schools, "underscoring the ongoing demand for the sharing of best practices resources from charters", trainings conducted with outside experts "disseminated to audiences which included both charter and district staff" and specifies preparation to "expand these TA activities under the 2024 CSP." (e19-e20)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) **Funding for facilities**
- b) **Assistance with facilities acquisition**
- c) **Access to public facilities**
- d) **The ability to share in bonds or mill levies**
- e) **The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings**
- f) **Low- or no-cost leasing privileges**

Strengths:

CPP4 is fully developed. The applicant has demonstrated that it is located in a state that provides charter schools with access to public facilities and funding for facilities related expenses. "State law requires public school facilities be shared fairly with charter schools." "The California Charter School Facility Program (CSFP) has made \$1.4 billion in state bond

proceeds available to charter schools for facilities construction or renovation". (e21-e22)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found; the applicant provided at least one of the criteria.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 5 - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Serving At-Risk Students (up to 3 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.

Strengths:

CPP5 is fully developed. Applicant has extensive documentation for the support and service of at risk students as noted below. "California's articulated educational priorities include dropout prevention and recovery, chronic absenteeism, credit recovery, student safety, graduation rate, career counseling services, and support for English learners and foster youth." (e22) "Supplemental LCFF funding is provided to support instructional activities and services for at-risk students, which may include hiring additional counselors, classroom assistants, bilingual aides, or after school tutors." (e22, e23) "As part of the 2024 CSP subgrant request for application (RFA), applicants will address how the charter school will attract, recruit, admit, enroll, serve, and retain educationally disadvantaged students" and includes "Plans to address chronic absenteeism, middle and high school dropout, and high school graduation rates." (e23)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/16/2024 12:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2024 08:12 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A240009)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	35
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	100

Priority Questions

CPP 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP2	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 3		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 4		
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 5		
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	3	3
Sub Total	3	3

Total

110

110

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - State Entities Panel - 2: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A240009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (up to 5 points);

Strengths:

The applicant presents a thorough and compelling argument that it meets the Secretary's criteria in its project design. For example, the logic model contains key priorities with each being supported by a robust research model (p. e25). A review of the logic model (p. e828) and its exhibits in Appendix F10 establish the applicant's solid footing in this application. The logic model contains the necessary components including inputs, activities, and outputs that lead to well-articulated short- and long-term outcomes (p. e827). The applicant presents assumptions and external factors that influence the logic model. The applicant has established a reasonable and thorough rationale meeting the expectations of this component.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible (up to 5 points); and

Strengths:

The applicant presents a bifurcated model for evaluation that includes quantitative and qualitative measures that inform progress of the objectives. The objectives utilize a SMART goal writing system that produces clear and measurable objectives (p. e29). There is evidence of at least one of the performance measures' objectives(s) that can be reported on annually. The applicant has included baseline data that augments its ability to measure progress in a meaningful form. For example, the applicant's Objective 1 is established to improve authorizing quality and support the implementation of best practices for all state authorizers (p. e30). The SMART goal (i.e., 1.1) notes that the authorizers will annually be provided with best practice resources and training materials (p. e30). The applicant appreciates the importance of technical assistance that will need to be provided as new charter schools are authorized by local educational agencies.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entity program (up to 5 points).

Strengths:

The applicant presents a complete and thorough explanation that its objectives and key performance metrics are ambitious and attainable. These objectives are aligned and designed metrics of measurement are reasonably anticipated to provide quality feedback (p. e30). In addition, the research underpinning the applicant's development of the objectives together with a robust measurement model of key performance indicators strengthens the assertion by the applicant that these are both ambitious yet attainable. A review of the applicant's logic model (p. e827) shows an attainable objective pathway to outcomes. An example of this is Objective 4, improving academic achievement. The applicant states that it will annually increase 4th and 8th grade charter school students' performance in mathematics and language arts as measured by adopted State assessments; it sets an ambitious performance outcome of less than 3% of non-charter school students across the state (p. e34).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. The extent to which the projected number of subgrant awards for each grant project year is supported by evidence of demand and need, and the extent to which the proposed average subgrant award amount is supported by evidence of the need of applicants (up to 20 points).

Strengths:

The applicant submits a fully developed application that addresses all of the sub criteria in this area. The proposed number of subgrants are stipulated at 70 subgrants over a 5-year period (p. e34; e913; e926). This ambitious plan is supported with four types of subgrant funding for a maximum term of 36 months. The proposed pipeline is well described with ample evidence. For example, the applicant proposes 9 total awards for the 2024-25 school year; four are new school (planning and implementation) awards (p. e35). The background trends are convincing beginning with an explanation of the historically observed reduction from the 2019-20 to 2020-21 school years due to the pandemic (p. e35). Since that event, the applicant shows a 57% increase in the number of charter schools opened from 2022-23 through 2023-24 school years (p. e35). The applicant presents a detailed award rate and includes the average CSP award calculations. The proposed subgrant funding maximum is anticipated to be [REDACTED] per subgrantee (p. e37). These are addressed in the applicant's budget narrative (p. e905; e926). The budget methodology and calculations to determine the number of proposed subgrants along with the average and maximum subgrants is thoroughly presented (p. e36; e37). The applicant is requesting a waiver, and the budget clearly outlines funding for applicable subgrantees (p. e37; e830; e913). The applicant requests a waiver of approximately [REDACTED] in CSP funds in the form of a carry-forward to CSP subgrantee schools; these schools have 1-2.5 years remaining on their current projects (p. e913).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants

1. **The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program and improve education results for students (up to 15 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant includes rigorous eligibility screening along with a review process to predict that these subgrants are likely to achieve high-quality school outcomes (p. e41). The use of universal screening is a reasonable control to ensure likelihood of meeting the project and fiscal goals; in addition, it operates as a fiscal and programmatic control to limit risk. The activities, timelines, and processes were thoroughly reviewed in the grant management plan and are consistent with the Secretary's criteria in this component (p. e41; e70; e830) and are consistent with the applicant's logic model (p. e828). The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting diverse charter school models based on research. The applicants for subgrants will need to present a compelling argument of how they will recruit, serve, and retain a population of students who are historically marginalized (p. e42). This is part of the applicant's thoroughly presented competitive process for subgrantees (p. e43). The needs analyses are an active component of the process, and the applicant demonstrates that this is a crucial component based on six requirements for subgrantees (p. e47). The applicant presents a justified proposal of high-quality charter school components (p. e48). This example of quality assurance is compliant with the Secretary's expectations in this component. The applicant has presented a well-developed plan.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. **The State entity's plan to--**

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

1. **Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program (up to 10 points);**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a thoroughly developed and comprehensive plan to effectively and systematically monitor eligible applicants. Both technical assistance and monitoring begin early in the process (p. e51). The applicant's statement of frequency of monitoring is reasonable and likely to inform subgrantee performance on a timely basis (p. e52). The applicant notes California's monitoring protocols are well established and measure continuous engagement along with communication with subgrantees (p. e52). The universal screening is a convincing element of good and proper evaluation (p. e53). An ample discussion of targeted in-depth monitoring and risk assessment criteria is included in the application (p. e55). The applicant provides a comprehensive process to monitor the subgrantees' expenditures (p. e57). A review of the applicant's monitoring process manual (p. e837) indicates a comprehensive process that is codified for the State. It includes TA for review, budget tracking, and enrollment monitoring. The applicant has fully developed its plan for this component. The applicant's response to this criterion is fully developed.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies (up to 5 points);

Strengths:

The applicant provides a reasonable plan to avoid duplication of work (p. e59) by working with other agencies. This is aligned with the NACSA Principles and Standards to avoid duplication of work and streamline the systems. The applicant's discussion of universal and targeted practices support the response to this component.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. Provide technical assistance and support for--

i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and

ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State (up to 10 points);

Strengths:

i. The applicant has dedicated full-time staff that will conduct monitoring training throughout the grant period (p. e58). Included areas of TA include internal grant systems, funding sustainability, and timeline reporting deadlines. The State's manual (p. e837) addresses and defines training for staff around processes, procedures, and other criteria. Specific targeted 1:1 TA is a convincing outreach to subgrantees and is likely to increase capacity (p. e60). The applicant's summaries of TA to support subgrantees is comprehensive (p. e61).

ii. The applicant presents a thorough plan to support quality authorizing (p. e64) begun under the 2020 CSP initiative. It includes a comprehensive discussion of universal and targeted authorizer supports (p. e64). In addition, the applicant presents a clear plan to provide oversight of the authorizing activity and notes its history of providing guidance and TA to counties, districts, and charter schools in the areas of academic accountability, attendance, and financial (p. e65). A review of the applicant's resources in this area demonstrates strong response to this component (p. e691).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State (up to 5 points); and

Strengths:

The applicant presents convincing evidence and a thoughtful plan to include input from parents and stakeholders (p. e67). The plan includes a comprehensive description of parent and community involvement activities from all subgrantees. In the universal screening, this aspect of performance is also included in the California Local Control

Sub

and Accountability Plan. In accordance with State law, a charter petition must include assurances of consultation and involvement of parents relative to the educational plans and programs (p. e67). Site councils are a statewide expectation with stipulated parental and stakeholder involvement (p. e67). The applicant’s parent and community involvement schedule is informative (p. e68).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

5. The degree of flexibility afforded by the State’s charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law (up to 5 points).

Strengths:

The applicant cites the 1992 Charter Schools Act (p. e68) that creates the authority to establish and maintain charter schools operating independent of the LEA. Under that authority is the flexibility for an exemption from significant portions of state laws that pertain to LEAs. While broad flexibility exists, the State monitors and works with the charter schools’ organizing bodies for assurances (p. e69).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 10 points);

Strengths:

The key staff personnel are well credentialed to manage and oversee the objectives of this plan (p. e69). The applicant has a strong history (p. e93) of effectively managing federal grants. A review of the key personnel resumes suggests that they are well credentialed and experienced to lead, manage this project (p. e82). The applicant presents a comprehensive discussion of timelines and milestones for this project (p. e70). A review of the applicant’s grant management plan (p. e829) supports a fully developed rating for this component.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (up to 3 points);

Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully developed response to this component. The management plan includes analysis of progress and reflection on feedback (p. e71). The applicant uses a continuous improvement model that focuses on four key objectives. The activity table includes a variety of ways that feedback is systematically solicited that informs progress and improvement. The monitoring plan is an active component of this process.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

3. The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 2 points).

Strengths:

The applicant fully meets the criteria of this component. The time commitments of the Project Director and the PI are reasonable (p. e73). A review of the budget relative to FTE substantiates this review of the applicant's response to this component (p. e905).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

CPP 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: At Least One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a Local Educational Agency, or An Appeals Process (0 or 1 Points)

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

- a. Allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State ; or
- b. In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, the State has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing the appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Please specify whether they meet (a) or (b) and clearly explain why in the strengths.

Strengths:

(b) The applicant presents multiple appeal processes (p. e16). This meets the criterion 1b for the CPP #1 noting that the State has the appeal authority.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses notes.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Equitable Financing (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.

Strengths:

A review of the applicant's proposal confirms that California's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) fund both charter schools and traditional district schools with the same base grant rates (p. e17). The applicant asserts that this equitable funding system is designed to reduce longstanding disparities in funding, improve outcomes for high-need students, and equalize funding across the state. A review of materials in the appendix (p. e801) confirms the applicant's assertion relative to equity in funding.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.

Strengths:

The applicant makes a strong argument in this competitive priority as it has numerous models of charter schools serving a diverse population of students (p. e19). Its dissemination of best practices cuts along a variety of needs in schools. Its technical assistance for struggling schools and LEAs features a three-tiered system of support (p. e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) Funding for facilities
- b) Assistance with facilities acquisition
- c) Access to public facilities
- d) The ability to share in bonds or mill levies
- e) The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges

Strengths:

The applicant describes its access to public facilities that is grounded in State law (p. e21). This meets 4c in this priority. In addition, the applicant provides annual grants to offset ongoing facilities issues (4a) and provides [REDACTED] in state bond proceeds (4d) (p. e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 5 - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Serving At-Risk Students (up to 3 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.

Strengths:

The applicant commits to supporting at-risk students in the State and this is grounded in State law (p. e22). In addition, the applicant asserts that the State extends this commitment by requiring all charter schools to deliver and update a Local Control and Accountability Plan that addresses California's priorities in collaboration with their communities and families (p. e22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/17/2024 08:12 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2024 08:59 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A240009)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	32
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	34
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	96

Priority Questions

CPP 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP2	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 3		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 4		
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP 5		
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	3	3
Sub Total	3	3

Total

110

106

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - State Entities Panel - 2: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A240009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 32

Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (up to 5 points);

Strengths:

The applicant convincingly demonstrates a rationale which is effectively supported by research. A clearly designed logic model depicts the proposed project inputs which are likely going to achieve the proposed outputs when coupled with the anticipated activities (p. e-828). The activities appropriately include the administration of the sub-grant competition, monitoring activities, and the provision of technical assistance to charter and non-charter schools and authorizers (p. e-828). The rationale clearly supports the objectives that seek to improve authorizing quality and support the implementation of best practices for all authorizers in California; increase the number of high-quality charter schools in California, particularly those focused on improving academic outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students; support sharing of best practices among charter schools and other schools in California; and increase academic achievement among charter school students in California (p. e-25-29). Innovatively, the rationale considers relevant assumptions such as favorable charter school laws and the continued funding of CSP programs (p. e-828). The consideration of external factors such as the availability of appropriate facilities strengthen the quality of the project design (p. e-828).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible (up to 5 points); and

Strengths:

The applicant proposes several effective objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project (p. e-29). The objectives effectively include improving authorizing quality and support the implementation of best practices for all California authorizers; increasing the number of high-quality charter schools in California, particularly those focused on improving academic outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students; support sharing of best practices, including improving academic achievement, among charter schools and other traditional public schools in California; and increase academic achievement among charter school students in California (p. e-30-34).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly indicate how quantitative and qualitative data will be produced and only states that quantitative and qualitative data will be generated.

Reader's Score: 4

3. The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entity program (up to 5 points).

Strengths:

The applicant comprehensively demonstrates that the State entity's objectives are ambitious. The applicant effectively provides baseline data for the proposed objectives which underscores the ambitiousness of the objectives. For example, objective four which seeks to increase academic achievement by 3% above the state average in Mathematics among 4th grade students (p. e-928). The baseline data from 2022-23 is 39.6%, and the projected 3% annual increase is considered ambitious.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. The extent to which the projected number of subgrant awards for each grant project year is supported by evidence of demand and need, and the extent to which the proposed average subgrant award amount is supported by evidence of the need of applicants (up to 20 points).

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to award up to 70 subgrants during the proposed project which include planning grants, implementation subgrants; replication subgrants for charter organizations operating more than one high-quality charter school; and expansion grants for existing high-quality charter schools adding grade levels or expanding by more than 25 percent (p. e-34).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: The applicant proposes to award an average of 14 subgrants annually, which is significantly higher than the 11 subgrants that were awarded in 2023-24. Given the modest increase in charter school enrollment of 5%, the award of 14 subgrants is not fully supported by evidence (p. e-34).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program and improve education results for students (up to 15 points).

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a comprehensive plan that ensures eligible applicants receiving subgrants will likely meet the state's objectives for the quality charter program and improve education results for students. The applicant details the application criteria for each type of subgrant which supports an objective selection of eligible applicants. A rigorous peer-

review mechanism ensures that only high-quality applicants are awarded subgrants (p. e-43). Once awarded subgrants, all charter schools are effectively monitored to ensure compliance. The applicant convincingly notes that its state's laws require all charter schools to show evidence of strong academic results which strongly contributes to improved education results for students. The requirements appropriately necessitate not having significant issues in the areas of student safety, financial and operational management, or statutory or regulatory compliance; demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students served by the charter school; and demonstrated success in increasing student academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for each of the subgroups of students (p. e-51).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 34

Sub

1. Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program (up to 10 points);

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately proposes an adequate monitoring plan. The monitoring activities are implemented to monitor subgrantees regularly, identify risks quickly and address any deficiencies (p. e-52). The applicant is effectively proposing to utilize a risk assessment rubric that helps determine the level of compliance within each charter school. For example, the rubric provides a checklist that helps monitor if the school has missed any reporting deadlines or whether the school submitted non-allowable charges in expenditure requests (p. e-55). The applicant effectively proposes a continuous monitoring system that effectively includes CSP monitoring indicators (p. e-60).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies (up to 5 points);

Strengths:

The applicant generally indicates that it seeks to reduce duplication of work through collaboration with the Charter Authorizer Support Initiative (CASI) which serves as a technical assistance provider (p. e-263, e-60). The applicant proposes to collaborate with charter organizations, charter authorizers, and charter authorizer support organizations to identify nationally recognized standards (p. e-60).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly describe how collaborative efforts will reduce duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies.

Reader's Score: 4

3. Provide technical assistance and support for--

- i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
- ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State (up to 10 points);**

Strengths:

- i. The applicant appropriately proposes to provide technical assistance (TA) and support for eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program. The TA to be provided is effectively categorized into universal TA and targeted TA. For example, universal TA is designed to reach a broad group of educational partners with timely, relevant, and accurate information whereas targeted TA is going to be provided in small group and 1:1 setting to provide relevant capacity-building content (p. e-60-61). TA is effectively delivered in areas such as student recruitment, enrollment, and retention. Additional areas where TA may be needed are fittingly identified by data analyses within the state's dashboard which contains pertinent information such as student suspensions and expulsions. A Regional Technical Assistance and Coaching (RTAC) program will appropriately deliver additional targeted TA activities through a series of comprehensive webinars (p. e-60-62).
- ii. The applicant proposes effective universal and targeted TA to support quality authorizing. The Charter Authorizer Support Initiative (CASI) will provide TA in areas such as assessing annual performance data of authorized schools; financial review and assistance with audits; holding charter schools accountable to their performance agreements; reviewing processes related to renewal, non-renewal, or revocation; and establishing clear plans and procedures to assist students enrolled in a charter school that closes (p. e-64). The applicant proposes to build on the NACSA Quality Practices Project by adding its own evidence-based practices and thus making it a resource that specifically serves as a guide to state-wide charter authorizers (p. e-66).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses are noted.
- ii. No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State (up to 5 points); and

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately indicates that charter schools are required to have a School Site Council (SSC) or a School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) that are tasked with approving the charter governing board, monitoring its implementation, and evaluating the effectiveness of the related goals, actions, and services described in the plan of the charter school (p. e-67). The SSC is required to contain the school principal or designee and school personnel including classified and certificated staff, and the parent and/or community group members (p. e-67). The State appropriately collects interviews with families, administrators, and board members to ensure that parent and community involvement aligns with the subgrant application and state law (p. e-67-68).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

5. The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law (up to 5 points).

Strengths:

The applicant effectively indicates that its State's Charter School Law, The Charter Schools Act of 1992, was established to allow charter schools to operate independently from non-charter school districts. Flexibility is provided to charter schools as they are exempt from certain requirements that apply to non-charter schools. The applicant appropriately demonstrates that charter schools have flexibility to develop innovative ideas, respond to the needs of smaller communities, create their own programs, determine educational delivery format, determine the grade levels to be served, and hire their own administrative staff, and teachers. Charter schools also maintain total control over contracting for services, managing expenditures, and budgeting. The applicant innovatively verifies that the flexibility afforded to its charter schools meets the needs of students. Subgrantees are informed of charter school flexibility through TA workshops and through charter school support associations (p. e-69).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 10 points);

Strengths:

The applicant provides an adequate management plan aiming to achieve the objectives on time and within budget (p. e-830-835). The proposed plan is effectively organized to demonstrate the varying activities supporting each proposed objective. General timelines ensure the mostly timely completion of activities. For example, in February 2025, annual subgrantee universal monitoring will be conducted by CDE and CSD staff (p. e-831).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (up to 3 points);

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately demonstrates that it solicits feedback from subgrantees, peer reviewers, authorizers, TA participants, TA contractors, and the state (p. e-72). Specific types of feedback such as quarterly progress from TA contractors, one-on-one TA events, and target monitoring interviews will effectively be captured via surveys, reports, interviews, and email responses (p. e-72).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

3. The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 2 points).

Strengths:

The applicant effectively proposes three full time key project personnel which are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. For example, 1.00 FTE Project Director, 1.00 FTE: Education Program Consultant, and 1.00 FTE: Analyst (p. e-916).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

CPP 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: At Least One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a Local Educational Agency, or An Appeals Process (0 or 1 Points)

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

a. Allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State ; or

b. In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, the State has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing the appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Please specify whether they meet (a) or (b) and clearly explain why in the strengths.

Strengths:

(b) The applicant appropriately demonstrates an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school. For example, if a charter school application is denied, a charter petition is submitted to the local traditional school district and the appeal would be granted by the district's board. If the district denies the appeal, an appeal will need to be submitted to the county. If the county denies the appeal, the state will review the appeal and will either grant the appeal or deny the

appeal (p. e-16-17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Equitable Financing (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that it ensures equitable financing as compared to traditional public schools. For example, state law requires that charter schools and traditional district schools are awarded the same base grant rates; with additional Supplemental and Concentration Grant rates that are based on the number and concentration of students who are classified as English Learners, meet income requirements to receive a free or reduced-price meal, are foster youth, or any combination of these factors (p. e-17). In addition, the state provides equitable financing for charter schools and traditional district schools through average daily attendance (ADA) base funding (p. e-17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately demonstrates that the proposed project includes funding for charter schools to develop and disseminate innovative models and best practices to other LEAs. For example, RTAC subgrantees have conducted multiple regional workshops across Northern, Central, and Southern California with targeted advertisements to struggling schools (p. e-18-21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities (up to 2 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) Funding for facilities
- b) Assistance with facilities acquisition
- c) Access to public facilities
- d) The ability to share in bonds or mill levies
- e) The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges

Strengths:

(c) The applicant demonstrates that charter schools have access to public facilities. For example, state law requires public school facilities be shared fairly with charter schools (p. e-21). Traditional districts have to make facilities available to charter schools operating within their districts. The facilities must be similar to those that non-charter students attend with costs based on the space occupied, will be charged to the charter school (p. e-21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP 5 - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Serving At-Risk Students (up to 3 points)

To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately demonstrates that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students and requires all charter schools to meet the needs of low achieving students, students with disabilities, and/or are English learners (p. e-22). Supplemental funding is available dropout prevention and recovery, chronic absenteeism, credit recovery, student safety, graduation rate, career counseling services, and support for English learners (p. e-22-23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/16/2024 08:59 AM