

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2024 09:38 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado League of Charter Schools (S282A240003)

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 | 2 |
| Sub Total | 3 | 2 |

Total

110

109

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Colorado League of Charter Schools (S282A240003)

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 supplied a fully developed research-based logic model (e25) with an acceptable four-point rationale including past performance of charter schools in the state (e26), successfully implementing targeted start up support (e27), effective authorizers (e28), and continuous improvement of the overall state public schools as a result of the charter schools (e24, e29). Applicant provides details for all key priorities and gives a description about impacting school quality, including how the applicant will support struggling charters to improve outcomes (e30).

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 fully developed performance measures using the SMART framework (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timely), (e30), where data will be collected via qualitative and quantitative means and produce annual reporting (e31, e32).

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).

Sub

Strengths:

The Applicant has given careful consideration to the current educational landscape when determining the fully developed ambitious, but attainable goals, keeping in mind the potential outcome for disadvantaged students. They recognize a demand for high-quality public-school options (e33, e35). There are priority points for prospective applicants to serve underserved populations (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:

Applicant shows comprehensive evidence of demand and need for the projected number of subgrants (e35), including a landscape analysis (e37), majority of voters having favorable views of charters (e36), strong enrollment (e39), supply of quality operators (e41), robust pipeline (e61), diversity of school models (e61), and incorporating lessons learned from past CSP programming.

The proposed average subgrant awards are fully developed. Award calculations consider quality growth initiatives, facility-related costs, and timing of awards (e37, e38, e39).

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 provides a fully developed explanation that they will likely meet program objectives (e40). They are using lessons learned from past CSP program management along with feedback from federal department monitoring and describes in detail how they plan to keep exemplary practices regarding publicization (e40), applicant trainings (e42), eligibility and capacity reviews (e46), and quality peer review (e47), resulting in improved educational outcomes. More specifically, statewide partnerships with authorizers (e41), a series of technical assistance trainings with asynchronous access, budget webinars (e45), an Allowable Cost Guide (e16, e42, e43), evidence of academic results for expansion schools (e43), needs analysis (e45), encouraging diverse and innovation models with applicable subgroups, including rural schools (e45), peer reviewer training (e46), and a management review that includes reasonableness, necessity, along with a preliminary risk assessment (e48).

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 fully developed and thorough monitoring plan (e48) with timeline including a fully developed description of the activities, trainings (e49), eligibility screening (e50), risk assessment (e51), pre-award verification (e53), fiscal and enrollment desk reviews (e56), annual reviews of policies (e63) and school academic, operational, and financial data, including authorizer reports (e49), site visits (e51), risk mitigation, all the while maintaining transparency (e48) and sharing of the results (e52).

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 has a fully developed description of duplication avoidance, and notes the strong relationship with authorizers across the state, partnering with authorizer support organizations, and the collaboration efforts to reduce administrative burden (e52). Applicant gives examples of this work with authorizers by following a four-pronged approach (e53): a standard verification form to expedite fulfillment of eligibility for CSP monies, aligning criteria in the application with the state's standard application, streamlining the drawdown process for timely access to funds, and partnering with authorizer support organizations to share high quality materials (e54).

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);

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully developed technical assistance plan with a strategic approach to support to eligible applicants that consists of building the capacity of developers to overcome common barriers during pre-opening and early implementation, tailored support for subgrantees throughout the grant lifecycle, and a suite of supports designed to elevate the overall statewide authorizing (e54). There is a plan for annual workshops, targeting critical need areas, topic-based trainings, virtual workshops, annual formative review cycles that identify trends where additional TA would be helpful (e54). Prior to final awards and once subgrants activities begin, personalized budget coaching will be provided to optimize the impact of CSP funds and sustain high quality growth (e56). Training during subgrant implementation will be provided for governance, compliance, budget oversight, facility management, school safety, transportation, and community engagement. Applicant describes the unique approach to the second year of implementation where review teams use a rubric to evaluate the school's long-term health and provides a written report with suggestions for both short- and long-term school improvements (e57).

The applicant provides an exhaustive description of proactive measures they will take, along with high quality partnerships, ensuring the adoption of authorizer best practices, including a mentorship program, an inaugural charter school authorizer conference, targeted initiatives for rural and small authorizers, professional development trainings for non-authorizer staff, specialized support for unique academic models, and a guide for special populations to assist authorizers and schools ensuring equitable education to each student (e58, e59).

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 (e59). The applicant cites six standards in their family, school, and community partnerships: welcoming to all, effective communication, student success, advocating, power sharing, and collaborating by creating an inclusive culture, trusting relationships, capacity building, and proper resource allocation (e59). Details include how this intentional family and community input will exist statewide with ongoing efforts, specific prompts, and involvement in decision making (e60). Applicant documents how the overall family and community engagement process aligns with national best practices, how it will support sector wide data collection initiatives with a dissemination of survey tools, and documentation in annual performance reports (e61). A complete timeline is provided for these activities (e66).

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 plan to maximize flexibility provided to charter schools is fully developed with the applicant citing state law supporting flexibility by describing automatic waivers for charter schools, such as developing their own calendars, exercising at will employment, establish their own academic model, with charters allowed to seek additional non-automatic waivers (e61). The applicant provides evidence of prior involvement in the creation of the described

Sub

flexibilities and provides a convincing description of how they take these flexibilities seriously along with the responsibility to preserve and even expand charter school autonomy (e62, e63).

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 applicant fully explains the management plan's adequacy with an experienced grant management staff dedicated to providing the human capital and resources needed to administer this grant (e63). Responsibilities for each staff member and partner organizations are well defined throughout the application and this section (e64), with detailed resumes provided for key personnel (e83). There is an associated table with a timeline and milestones for project tasks with reasonable deadlines aligned to the budget submitted (e68, e382).

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 description of the adequacy of procedures for feedback and continuous improvement is fully developed. The applicant describes a data strategist position that will create and continuously collect data throughout the grant period, including surveys for: RFA and monitoring, protocols for authorizers, annual input from all stakeholders, community surveys given by schools, and feedback requested by authorizers (e69).

All anonymized data will be reviewed by the project team to inform the pipeline, approve shifts in programming, training, and timeline changes in order to fulfill performance measures outlined in the logic model (e70).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Sub

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 time commitments of staff are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives. The applicant used national norms for informing the personal allocations of successful CSP projects and the proposed amount of subgrantees. The applicant has provided the budget line items to support the project narrative (e70, e382).

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:

The application meets the priority, CPP1. There is at least one Authorized Public Chartering Agency that is not a local education agency (e15).

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:

The applicant fully demonstrates that the state ensures equitable financing: with charter schools receiving 100% of the district per-pupil revenues allocated annually by the state legislature (e16), state law requiring any local property tax revenue to be distributed to district authorized charter schools (e16), and recent passage of H. B. 24-1394 ensuring that state authorized charter schools are fully equalized starting in FY25 (e17). The state department of education uses a Consolidated Application for federal funds, additional technical assistance will be provided to CSP subgrantees, and state law allows for a charter school to be treated as a local education agency for the purpose of applying for other state or federal competitive grants (e17).

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:

Applicant fully demonstrates that the state has passed The Innovation Schools Act (C.R.S. 22-32.5-101, et seq.) encouraging traditional district and schools to develop innovation plans that would allow schools to use autonomies that had previously been the exclusive preserve of charter schools to better meet the needs of their students. The applicant provides details of the impact for these Innovation Schools (e19). There is evidence that effective practices designed within the charter school arena were codified and disseminated for the benefit of districts and schools statewide in support of recovery efforts for students who lost considerable learning time during the pandemic (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:

Applicant has a fully developed and clear outline describing in detail, all but one of the six listed examples of charter school facility financing including: funding for facilities, access to public facilities, assistance with facilities acquisition, the ability to share in bonds or mill levies, low- or no-cost leasing privileges (e20, e21, e22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 provides fully developed evidence to document the state's approach to utilizing nontraditional methods of instructional delivery for specialized missions designed to meet the educational needs through an alternative education campus (AEC). There is comprehensive evidence that the applicant has helped play a foundational role in creating the conditions that allow multiple AECs and therefore will proactively support schools with at-risk students. Applicant will provide a range of TA designed to promote inclusive and equitable education including engagement and recovery for at-risk students (e22, e23, e24).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specifically state the activities of "dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services" nor do they provide a plan to ensure equitable access to the listed supports.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/17/2024 09:38 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/17/2024 08:11 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado League of Charter Schools (S282A240003)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 35 | 34 |
| 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 | 14 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 98 |
| 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

108

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Colorado League of Charter Schools (S282A240003)

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: 34

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a sound and appropriately defined rationale including a clear logic model. For example, the project includes four empirically developed propositions (p. 24) that establish a reasonable basis for its design. The applicant cites recognition of quality charter schools present in the State (p. e26), and it notes that external factors include a pent-up need with two thirds of high-quality charter schools maintaining wait lists (p. e25). In addition, the applicant cites data around key growth metrics demonstrating students' academic success in charter schools; in measurable areas of ELA and mathematics (both elementary and high school) it shows greater academic performance than District schools (p. e26). The disaggregated data for charter schools demonstrates improved outcomes across all ESEA demographics (p. e27). The logic model is well developed and builds a thorough and defined component—including both short, mid, and long-term outcomes (p. e25). The short-term outcomes are ambitious noting that it intends to award 11 subgrants in the first two years. This is consistent with the applicant's overarching goal of increasing the number of high-quality charter schools in Colorado. The applicant's rationale and plans support its intentions to leverage best practices to benefit struggling schools (p. e29), and its dissemination activities are reasonable to inform the professional community relative to its work as labs of innovation (p. e30).

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 identifies two principal objectives (p. e30) that includes both quantitative and qualitative measures to inform its efficacy. The specific proposed methods and metrics are well defined to meet its intended outcome of generating actionable information for continuous improvement. The variety of key performance indicators are sufficient to meet its intended outcome; for example, the applicant states that 6,500 seats will be added and that 35% of the funded applications will have priority points for implementation of a diverse model that meets the needs of historically disadvantaged populations (p. e31). The use of tightly aligned SMART goals (p. e205, e221) is well

Sub

established in the application.

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 provides a convincing argument that the awarding of 30 new subgrants in the first two years of the project is ambitious (p. e33). It is clear that there is sufficient need for the additional charter school opportunities, and the applicant's plans are bold but attainable. The applicant ties the logic model to ambitiousness by leveraging CSP funds to open an additional 6,500 seats. Of particular interest, the applicant demonstrates its diversity models aim to meet the needs of historically disadvantaged populations (p. e33). The data presented by the applicant for the 2023-24 school year generally supports its ambitious yet attainable objectives, and its commitment to support sub-grantees to address high-leverage growth areas is an example of bridging ambition to attainable outcomes (p. e34).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not fully demonstrate the ambitiousness of the project due to a lack of clear baseline data. In addition, the applicant's narrative fails to fully discuss the framework (p. e35).

Reader's Score: 4

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 presents a well-developed plan that includes the proposed number of subgrants by each project year along with average funding amounts tied to its budgets (p. e386). The applicant's plan to issue 30 subgrants to new, expanding and replicating schools is specific and clear. The anticipated award cadence shows a reasonable rollout of the subgrants (p. e 36). The applicant notes that while the enrollment in district schools has declined charter school enrollment has increased. The included survey results that show a significant percentage of Colorado votes have favorable views of charter schools (p. e36). The applicant states the average award amount for the subgrants and stipulates the maximum subgrant award of [REDACTED] (p. e38). Applicant clearly defines the methodology around the anticipated average subgrant award.

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:

A review of the applicant's sub granting process indicates that it describes in detail how the model will support diverse charter models, the sub granting process (p. e42, e43), and how it will encourage community-centered projects (p. e41). The applicant addresses the likelihood that the subgrants will support the improvement of education results for students in several ways. For example, the applicant provides technical assistance in pre-award trainings (p. e42), SMART goal setting training, and compliance measures to ensure that the use of Federal funds are being used to meet student need (p. e42). In addition, the applicant notes that subgrantees often struggle with creating strong systems (p. e43), and the applicant works with the subgrantees to identify leverage areas across grade levels. The applicant's commitment for subgrantees to demonstrate strong overall performance by outperforming district averages on relevant SPF indicators, percentile ranking, and significant growth statistics (p. e43) are reasonable assurances for the readiness to improve student performance and learning. The five-phase method is thorough and anticipated to fully meet the criteria stipulated by the Secretary (p. e40). The applicant carefully each phase, and examples of its process include collaborating with subgrantees (p. e41), providing pre-award technical assistance (p. e42), and training for its internal reviewers (p. e47) to ensure that awards are consistent with the Secretary's guidance. In addition, the applicant provides specifics on how a budget narrative that requires subgrantees to provide a sustainability plan that reasonably attends to activities post-funding (p. e45). Finally, the applicant has identified a process that attends to receiving more applications than the funding; the applicant will rank order applicants to ensure all funds are encumbered in the project (p. e48).

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 six-point plan that attends to the Secretary's criteria. For example, it attends to risk mitigation (p. e49, e51), compliance with Federal expectations (p. e49), and verifies expenditures are supporting the needs of all students, particularly educationally disadvantaged students (p. e49). The applicant's timeline for each activity was reviewed and it is ambitious and reasonable. The applicant presents good and proper controls, and the site visits is another opportunity to ensure that the subgrantees are meeting the expectations stipulated in the funding (p. e51). Finally, the applicant attends to communication expectations and presents a process for ensuring efficiency through on-going monitoring (p. e52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

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's plan to leverage resources and in doing reduce duplication of work meets the standard as defined by the Secretary. For example, collaborative activities throughout the project are aimed to reduce administrative burdens for eligible applicants (p. e52). The systemic use of standard forms for subgrantees is a designed efficiency (p. e53). Lastly, the applicant's plan to leverage publicly available data is intended to reduce the need for custom reports (p. e53).

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:

The applicant presents three essential elements around technical assistance. These include sector-wide supports designed to build capacity along with mitigating access issues; tailored support for subgrantees during pre-opening phases along with support with needs assessments; and providing a variety of additional supports to enhance success (p. e54). The applicant provides a thorough discussion of each essential technical support. For example, the applicant notes that there are challenges in the pre-opening phase, and it provides workshops for subgrantees; topics include serving economically disadvantaged students (p. e55). All supports support the logic model. An example of the tailored supports include assistance with developing valued added budgets (p. e56). Finally, the applicant addresses additional supports (p. e57) that include proactive measures around best practices. Of particular recognition is the applicant's inclusion of targeted initiatives around rural and small authorizers (p. e58).

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 identifies four essentials and six standards that include creating an inclusive culture, capacity building opportunities, and building trusting relationships (p. e59). A review of Appendix F (p. e95) supports the applicant's assertion that there are a number of additional resources and commitments. There are specific parent involvement strategies designed by the applicant. In addition, the applicant commits to the National Charter School Resource Center's publication around leveraging community assets through partnerships (p. e60). Through the use of surveys, the applicant's design includes a number of family-facing questions to gauge parental satisfaction (p. e60). The use of parents as cultural liaisons (p. e61) is an effective strategy to reach multilingual families.

Sub

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 addresses the use of automatic waivers to ensure autonomy. These carveouts include site specific calendars, hiring practices, and exercise at-will employment (p. e61). The flexibility to work around certification requirements is an example of the anticipated flexibility. The anticipated flexibility allowed for LEAs to waive certain requirements is aligned with the criterion. Finally, the use of templates for APRs provides for narratives of policies and practices along with adjustments to meet evaluation findings.

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: 14

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 ample discussion around components of the management plan. The applicant presents a clear plan with duties, responsibilities, timelines, and milestones (p. e66). Included in the management plan discussion is a summary of key project personnel's qualifications (p. e63). The applicant provides a discussion of resources for all project tasks with clear delineation of technical assistance activities and administrative tasks (p. e65). For example, the applicant provides several letters of support around technical assistance.

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);**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant presents numerous opportunities for feedback throughout the application. For example, the process for new subgrantee applications feature community feedback via a tool to gather this important communication (p. e61). The data strategist has a line of responsibility to gather data for continuous improvement throughout the life of the project (p. e62). From exit tickets to full survey methodologies, the applicant presents a cogent and thoughtful plan to query program progress at key intervals around key performance indicators.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not fully develop and define its timeline. A measurement period of twice annually for feedback may not be fully appropriate to adequately inform progress and on-target decisions (p. e69, e70).

Reader's Score: 2

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 thoroughly demonstrates that the FTE budgeted for the project is appropriate. A review of the budget narrative (p. e382) clearly establishes the criteria in this component. The applicant's use of a national tool for analysis of FTE responsibilities strengthens the application (p. e70). The applicant clearly explains how the key personnel will attend to the project implementation.

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:

The applicant meets the criterion for CPP 1 with an appeals process to the State Board of Education (p. e15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 asserts that the charter schools in the State receive 100% of the district per-pupil funding (p. e16), which establishes equity of funding. In addition, State statutes establish per-pupil funding for charter schools at a greater than or equal to 95% of the rate of non-charter schools.

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 that it has a history of supporting struggling schools and LEAs with charter schools since the enactment of the 1993 State charter schools' law (p. e17). The applicant's detailed experience and commitments around meeting the diverse needs of students is well supported (p. e18). In addition, the applicant notes its structural flexibility has improved outcomes for high-need students (p. e19).

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's longstanding history of funding for facilities is well documented. For example, Colorado's General Assembly appropriated ██████████ in FY23-24 to support the Charter School Capital Construction Assistance Fund (p. e20). This is a five-fold increase in a decade. In addition, the applicant addresses other criteria including access to public facilities, ability to share in bonds or mill levies, and low- or no-cost leasing privileges (p. e22).

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 has the statutory underpinning to utilize nontraditional processes to meet the needs of high-risk students (p. e22). The applicant addresses other at-risk activities through a wide range of technical assistance for an inclusive and equitable education (p. e24, e290). The applicant shares an example of comprehensive services for students who have dropped out or are at-risk of dropping out with the RiseUp Community School (p. e22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/17/2024 08:11 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2024 08:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado League of Charter Schools (S282A240003)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 35 | 34 |
| 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 | 14 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 97 |
| 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

107

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Colorado League of Charter Schools (S282A240003)

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: 34

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that the project design is based on a strong rationale. The applicant appropriately seeks to award 30 new subgrants which would provide access to charter schools for 6,500 students (p. e-8). The proposed logic model supports a rationale that is based on four assumptions. The rationale is based on the applicant's proven track record of providing high-quality educational options for all students; that start-up supports will lead to quality charter schools that are sustainable; that effective authorizing practices lead to improved school-level outcomes; and that innovative charter schools positively contribute to the public-school systems' infrastructure (p. e-8-9). The applicant provides relevant data that demonstrates the success of its current charter schools which outperform traditional schools in English/Language Arts and Mathematics (p. e-26). Common barriers of charter school successes such as the lack of appropriate funding for new charter schools are effectively addressed and convincingly support the rationale for the proposed project (p. e-27). For example, to increase the number of high-quality charter schools and seats for 6,5000 students, the applicant effectively proposes to create and administer a rigorous and efficient subgrant competition that prioritizes diverse schools serving educationally disadvantaged students while designing a transparent and objective peer review process and conducting risk-based monitoring (p. e-25). The applicant appropriately anticipates that widely publicized subgrant availability, pre- and post-award trainings; an estimated 10 or more high-quality subgrant award per year; a RFA scoring rubric and Peer Review training materials; 1:1 trainings and workshops; and a monitoring guide and rubric will lead to the increase of high-quality charter schools and high-quality charter school seats for 6,500 students (p. e-25).

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates methods of evaluation which are clearly related to the intended project's outcomes. The project outcomes anticipated are an increase the number of high-quality charter schools and high-quality charter school seats in Colorado; and an improvement of the quality of Colorado's charter school sector and an increase in its impact on overall school quality and school improvement across the state (p. e-30). Two clearly developed objectives with corresponding performance measures support the proposed outcomes (p. e-31-32). For example, objective one which effectively seeks to increase the number of high-quality charter schools and high-quality charter school seats in Colorado, the corresponding performance measure appropriately seeks to demonstrate the award of 30 subgrants. This performance measure, which will be evaluated through appropriate methods such as GSC administrative data and CDE School Performance Framework Reports (p. e-32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 mostly demonstrates that the proposed objectives are ambitious as the proposed 30 new subgrants and 6 continuation subgrants will increase the amount of available charter school seats by 6,500 students or 5% of the total state-wide charter school population (p. e-33). Objectives relevant to increased student learning outcomes are ambitious. For example, the applicant proposes that 90% of its charter schools are anticipated to receive a School Performance Framework rating by the end of the 5-year project. Currently, 85% of its character schools received a School Performance Framework rating in 2022.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not fully demonstrate that the proposed objectives are ambitious as the corresponding data does not fully detail the rationale for a 5% increase in charter school seats. The applicant does not provide data showing recent increases in charter school enrollment, which makes it difficult to fully determine if the proposed 5% increase in state-wide charter school seats is ambitious (p. e-33). For example, the applicant simply notes that 15.7% of public-school students were enrolled in a charter school and states that enrollment in charter schools has increased by 41% since 2013 (p. e-33).

Reader's Score: 4

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 grant awards to 30 new, expanding, and replicating schools and anticipates granting 6 continuation awards. The applicant appropriately indicates that it analyzed the demand and need for additional charter schools. For example, demand and need for charter schools is partially evident as an increase of 51% in the number of operating charter schools was observed in the past decade (p. e-36). Evidence of demand and need are effectively demonstrated by current charter schools seeking to increase their capacity which is due to increased

Sub

interest from students and parents and an anticipated population influx which is appropriately believed to increase the demand for charter schools. For example, the applicant determined the need for additional charter school expansions as 16 current charter schools anticipate adding 4,795 seats in the next few years (p. e-36). Nineteen letters of interest from potential developers support the demand and need of charter schools (p. e-36). The applicant proposes that the average amount of each charter school award will likely be [REDACTED] with a maximum award amount of [REDACTED] (p. e-38). Developers of existing charter school operators will demonstrate the needed funding amounts through a subgrant application process. The applicant encourages high-quality applications that include budget proposals that are peer-reviewed for relevance and accuracy (p. e-47).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 effectively demonstrates an appropriate plan that will likely lead to high quality charter programs and improve education results for students (p. e-42-48). The applicant's measures to ensure that subgrants meet the State's objectives include a rigorous 5-phase process. This process appropriately includes a quality overview of project objectives, key personnel, award availability, subgrant application requirements, and allowable costs which is purposefully tailored to attract high-quality applicants (p. e-42). For example, after the peer review has concluded, a management review innovatively examines essential application components such as subgrant budget submissions and applicant's self-risk assessments to determine the quality of applications (p. e-48). Potential expansion and replication subgrantees are required to demonstrate strong academic results including significant increases in student performance overall and within each ESEA subgroup (p. e-43). For example, the applicant requires that potential subgrantees demonstrate either an outperforming of the district average on relevant SPF indicators, an upward trend in academic achievement, or demonstrating significant growth, all of which support that eligible applicants improve education results for students (p. e-44).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

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

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a comprehensive plan which adequately monitors eligible applicants. The monitoring plan appropriately includes processes to identify and mitigate risk through pre-application evaluation, ongoing oversight, and timely interventions; ensure compliance with federal law, the Code of Federal Regulations, and the U.S. Department of Education's NonRegulatory Guidance; verify that expenditures are supporting the needs of all students, particularly educationally disadvantaged students; assess the extent to which subgrantee project objectives are being satisfied; identify trends that may require adjustments to TA content; and communicate proactively and transparently with authorizers, family members, and the general public (p. e-49-49). A complete monitoring timeline is provided in Table 5 (p. e-48-49). The proposed monitoring plan includes a relevant timeline that demonstrates adequate intervals for the thorough monitoring of subgrants (p. e-49). For example, on-site monitoring visits will effectively take place during the first two years of project implementation and focus on the implementation of the grant project through observations, interviews, document review, and inventory checks (p. e-49, p. e-51)). Monitors will receive adequate training on how to monitor subgrantees using objective tools such as rubrics and checklists (p. e-52).

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 appropriately demonstrates that it avoids duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies in several effective ways (p. e-52-54). For example, the applicant's selection criteria will be aligned with the Colorado Standard Application during the RFA completion phase which eliminates duplication of work (p. e-53). Additionally, subgrantees are appropriately encouraged to utilize data from their authorizers to comply with reporting to authorizers, which reduces their workloads and avoids duplication of work (p. e-53).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 effectively proposes to deliver technical assistance to subgrantees before potential awards are made and during the grant implementation phase (p. e-56). The technical assistance is customized to provide subgrantees with needed support to increase their effectiveness (p. e-56).
- ii. The applicant appropriately proposes to partner with an authorizer-support organization to develop tools and resources to increase the effectiveness of public chartering agencies in the area of technical assistance. Also

Sub

supporting quality authorizing efforts are proposed authorizer mentorship programs, an inaugural charter school authorizer conference, and the provision of professional development for boards that are not directly involved with the authorization process (p. e-57-59). Innovatively, the applicant proposes the development of a Special Populations in Colorado Charter Schools User Guide which will contain best practices for serving students with disabilities and other disadvantaged student subgroups (p. e-59).

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 effectively demonstrates that it solicits input from parents and community members in the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State. For example, the applicant proposes a plan that requires subgrantees to demonstrate how families and community members are involved in the operation of the charter school in the RFA stage. Subgrantees must show how community engagement strategies were beneficial and how families will remain engaged in the operation of the charter school (p. e-59-61).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe how input from parents and other members of the community is considered in the implementation of the proposed project. For example, the applicant relies on community surveys to gauge parental sentiment which is not sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the extent to which parents' and other members of the community input is considered in the implementation of the charter school (p. e-59-61).

Reader's Score: 4

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 demonstrates that state law provides automatic waivers which exempts charter schools from 15 provisions within state law. The exemptions allow charter schools the flexibility to develop their own school calendars; hire and terminate their personnel and set compensation structures; exercise at-will employment; adopt its own attendance requirements in accordance with state law; establish their own educational programs; and employ their own (possibly non-licensed) principals, teachers' aides, and other non-certified personnel. Additionally, non-automatic waivers for items such as performance management systems for personnel, teacher-pupil contact hours, food service policies, teacher transfers, can be obtained by the authorizers through additional applications by charter schools (p. e-63).

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: 14

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 proposed management plan effectively demonstrates that project objectives are achieved on time and within budget (p. e-63). The management plan is appropriately listing relevant activities that properly support each of the two objectives (p. e-66-68). For example, to improve the quality of the applicant's charter school sector and intensify its impact on overall school quality and school improvement across the state, it anticipates identifying scopes of work for technical assistance partners and conducting biweekly authorizer coaching and mentoring events (p. e-67-68). The applicant proposes the relevant personnel carrying out the activities and the corresponding timelines which are adequate to carry out the proposed tasks (p. e-67-68).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 applicant proposes to utilize surveys to gather charter school data that will be analyzed and triangulated by the Director of Data Strategy. Survey data is anticipated to inform pipeline cultivation, shape the development of new school models, and illuminate areas in which additional TA would be desirable (p. e-69-70).

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicates that findings from the data triangulation method will be disseminated twice per year which is not sufficiently frequent to make programmatic improvements and does not demonstrate a fully developed plan that shows how feedback will be used to make programmatic improvements (p. e-69-70).

Reader's Score: 2

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 time commitments of the key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. The applicant provides an effective list of the time commitments of its administration team toward the proposed project. The time commitments are .3 FTE for the Executive Lead, .6 FTE for the Project Director, .6 FTE for the Grant Technician, .2 FTE for the Fiscal Lead, and .6 FTE for the Fiscal Manager (p. e-382).

Sub

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:

(a) The applicant appropriately demonstrates that its State allows an entity other than a local education agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State. For example, the applicant effectively utilizes a statewide charter school authorizer, the Colorado Charter School Institute (CSI) (p. e-15). The applicant also demonstrates that the CSI authorizes those districts that meet predetermined standards, a status of "Exclusive Chartering Authority" (ECA) which allows them to authorize charter schools within their districts. Appropriate appeals processes are effectively established via State charter school statutes (p. e-16).

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 appropriately demonstrates that its State's laws require that charter schools receive the same funding as traditional public schools and thus demonstrating equitable financing (p. e-16). Charter schools receive 100% of the district per-pupil funding (p. e-16). The applicant effectively establishes that charter schools receive monthly payments in

12 approximately equal installments. The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) requires that LEAs transmit all state and federal payments owed to charter schools within three days of the LEA's receipt of the funds, which ensures prompt payments (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 effectively demonstrates that its State utilizes best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and Local Education Agencies (LEA). For example, the State adopted the Innovation Schools Act which provides a pathway for districts and schools to obtain waivers from state- and district-level policies in order to better meet the needs of their students. In addition, the Innovation Schools Act encourages diverse approaches to learning and education (p. e-17-20). The applicant appropriately demonstrates that subgrantees are expected to share best practices between charter schools and other public schools (p. e-163) which supports the improvement of struggling schools and LEAs.

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:

The applicant convincingly states that it is operating in a state with favorable laws for providing charter schools funding for facilities, assistance with facilities acquisition, and access to public facilities. For example, the state provides access to public facilities by requiring districts to submit an inventory of vacant or underutilized buildings or land in their possession.

Charter schools can request the use of the vacant facilities/land and if districts allow charter schools to use the vacant facilities/land, charter schools can use the facilities/land without paying rent (p. e-20-21).

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 charter schools can apply to operate alternative education campuses to serve at-risk students. Nontraditional teaching methods are encouraged to be utilized which effectively include comprehensive college and career counseling services for those students who are especially at risk of dropping out (p. e-22-24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/16/2024 08:56 AM