

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2024 02:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S282A240007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	29
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	12
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	31
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Sub Total	100	86

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

96

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - State Entities Panel - 4: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S282A240007)

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: 29

Sub

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

Strengths:

- The rationale for the proposed project is very clear and is supported by evidence, such as the 2023 CREDO study, to demonstrate the effectiveness of existing charter schools in New York, particularly for economically disadvantaged and underrepresented students. This provides a strong rationale for expanding the charter school system in New York State (e24-26).
- The proposal details how the activities proposed in the grant will lead to a continuation (e26) of the positive results that are detailed in page e24.
- The proposed project provides a logic model (e27) that clearly explains how and why it will build on the existing structures and successes of the organization, including integrating into existing authorization and oversight frameworks (e26-7).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 proposal provides a table that directly and clearly links each performance measure to one of the four main project objectives and outcomes (e28-30).
- Many of the performance measures provided are quantifiable, objective, and specific, such as the number of additional new charter school seats (e28-20).
- The proposal includes both quantitative and qualitative data: there is quantitative data such as test assessment data and qualitative data such as participant satisfaction with governance training (e26-28).

Sub

Weaknesses:

- A few of the data collection methods lack specificity: for example, in objectives 3a and 4c, the applicant does not specify how this qualitative data will be collected or analyzed (e28-30).

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 proposal states that the applicant intends to add enough seats to represent a more than 10% increase in the state's charter school capacity (e31), which is a substantial and ambitious growth target.
- In addition to expanding the number of seats, the application also proposes to improve academic performance during this expansion (e30-33), which is an ambitious goal given that charters are already outperforming district schools in many areas.
- The applicant has ambitious goals for continuous authorizer development, describing reviews of oversight practices and distribution of best practices (e30-33).

Weaknesses:

- The applicant identifies more modest goals for struggling schools, stating that they aim to decrease the number of charters identified for support by only one school per year (e32).

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 application notes significant demand for charter schools, citing an almost 10% enrollment increase between 2019-20 and 2022-23, while there has been an enrollment decline in traditional public schools during that time period (e34).
- The application uses historical data, cites recent legislative changes, and shares anticipated policy changes to support the number and timing of the subgrant awards (e35-39).
- The proposal notes New York's high costs, particularly in real estate and construction, in justifying the subgrant amount. It explains how the specific subgrant school models the applicant intends to fund – for example, schools focused on career and technical education (CTE) – require significant upfront investments (e39-41).
- The applicant provides significant evidence of demand and need, specifically for students with diverse needs that are not currently being met – for example, bilingual and dual language, CTE programs, new special education models, and alternative models for high schools (e34-41).

Weaknesses:

- The application focuses primarily on New York City, with more limited mention of other areas of New York State, such as Buffalo and Rochester (e34-41).
- The application relies on the significant assumption of future legislative changes that have not yet happened – namely, the approval of a legislative measure to allow new charters to be awarded in New York City (NYC) – in order to meet the proposed number of subgrant awards. The application does not present a backup plan for subgrant awards if this legislation is not passed(e35-36).

Sub

Reader's Score: 16

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 application describes the rigorous authorization process for new schools that includes peer reviews, interviews, written applications, and rigorous vetting, which increases the likelihood that high quality applicants will receive subgrants (e41-45).
- The applicant's process for expansion schools requires schools to demonstrate quality and need, in part based on schools' existing ability to provide a high-quality option for students (e45-47).
- The proposal details how the subgrant requirements would align with existing authorizer application requirements, which would help ensure that subgrant recipients are positioned to meet quality standards for both CSP and for the state (e43-44).
- The applicant's focus on prioritizing diverse and innovative school models increases the likelihood of improving educational results for a wide range of students, especially those most in need of improved school options (e48-49).

Weaknesses:

- The application has a limited description of ongoing performance metrics for subgrantees. While the initial selection process is thoroughly outlined in e41-49, there is less detail on how ongoing performance will be measured and how subgrantees will be held accountable for improving education results for students (e41-49).
- The application has minimal information about what standards must be met by replication schools in order to demonstrate that they are high quality (e42-43).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 31

Sub

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

Strengths:

- The application describes a comprehensive monitoring framework which includes desk audits, site visits, and detailed reviews of fiscal and operational practices (e49-53).
- The risk-based approach to monitoring allows the applicant to focus more on subgrantees with higher risk factors, such as fiscal instability or compliance concerns, and provides for targeted interventions where needed (e50-51).
- The Notice of Concern and Notice of Deficiency processes are structured corrective actions that can help ensure that subgrantees address deficiencies promptly, which supports program compliance (e52-53).

Sub

Weaknesses:

•The application describes a very resource intensive approach to monitoring each applicant (e49-53), which requires significant staffing resources. This could strain the program's capacity, especially with the large number of proposed subgrantees.

Reader's Score: 9

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 proposes to integrate the CSP subgrant application and monitoring processing into its existing authorization and oversight systems, which would minimize duplication of work for the schools and authorizers (e53-54).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 has provided decades of oversight to charter schools in New York state, which positions it to continue to provide targeted and effective technical assistance to subgrantees (e54). Its experience includes developing resource kits and delivering trainings over many years (e54-57).
•The applicant notes its existing networks for collaboration such as NYRISE (e55), which facilitates collaboration and knowledge sharing and continuous improvement efforts. This enhances the effectiveness of its technical assistance (e55-56).

Weaknesses:

•The applicant is vague about how the district-charter collaboration in the application will help provide technical assistance and support for either the subgrantees or authorizers in the state (e57-58).

Reader's Score: 8

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 proposal outlines a robust strategy to solicit input through community surveys and focus groups from across the state (e60-62). The plan has a particular focus on hearing from diverse communities, including those not

Sub

currently served by charter schools, to gain actionable insights to inform school development (e60-62).

Weaknesses:

•The plan outlines a high number of community engagement activities over the course of the five project years (e62), and there may be challenges in ensuring consistent and meaningful engagement across diverse communities throughout all five years.

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 describes the significant autonomy provided to charter schools in New York State in terms of governance, staffing, budgeting, and scheduling. Charter schools are also exempt from many of the state and local regulations governing traditional public schools (e62-64).
•The applicant’s plan includes guidance to schools on creative program design and resource allocation, and support in implementing new or unique educational models to maximize schools’ flexibility (e60-62).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 management plan includes well-defined responsibilities for the key personnel, such as the Project Director, Executive Director, and Chief of Staff (e64-68). Each individual’s roles are specific and actionable, ensuring accountability and efficient task allocation. The identified personnel have extensive and relevant experience in charter school oversight, administration, legal compliance, fiscal compliance, and program evaluation (e64-66).
•The management plan includes a detailed timeline with clear milestones that span the five-year project period, broken down into quarters (e67-38).
•The management plan provides clear allocation of responsibilities and time commitment of key personnel, which supports precise budgeting as it outlines who is accountable to what tasks and what percentage of their time will be dedicated to the project (e64-68).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The management plan has minimal detail about how program staff will provide oversight of the numerous outside contractors that are described in the plan (e62-68).

Reader's Score: 9

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 provides a robust framework for collecting qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources, including subgrantee reports, state databases, family surveys, and authorizer check-ins (e70-71). This ensures the applicant receives diverse feedback and insights to be used for continuous improvement during project operation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 notes that it has significant experience administering CSP grants and therefore the time commitments estimated for key personnel are realistic (e71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

There are two authorizers that are not local educational agencies (LEAs) for developers seeking to open a charter school in New York State (e14).

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 application notes the equitable per pupil spending for both district and charter students, particularly in New York City, which receive a base per-pupil allocation of more than [REDACTED] (e14-15).
- New York State has a funding formula that ties per-pupil allocations for charter schools to district expenditures (e14-15).
- Charter Schools in New York State are considered LEAs and are therefore able to access federal funds (e15) and also are entitled to free facilities or funding for facilities (e15).

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:

- New York State law mandates the annual review and dissemination of best practices used by charter schools to school districts, which ensures that successful practices are identified and shared across the state (e16-18).
- A collaboration in NYC ensures that high performing charter networks share training and best practices with the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) (e16-18).

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:

New York State provides charter schools funding for facilities through grants, acquisition of space in district facilities or lease assistance in NYC, access to public facilities across the state, and the ability to share in bonds (e18-20).

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:

New York State supports charter schools that are specifically designed to serve at-risk students, including recent immigrants, over-age/under-credited students, students with specific disabilities such as autism, English language learners, and other at-risk students (e20-22). The application specifies that it will continue to prioritize the creation and expansion of these specialized schools that serve at-risk students (e20-22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/15/2024 02:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2024 01:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S282A240007)

Reader #2: *****

	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	11
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	34
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Sub Total	100	91
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

101

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - State Entities Panel - 4: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S282A240007)

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 effectively communicates the goals, objectives, and anticipated impact of the proposed project through strong, evidence-based rationale (e24-e26). For example, the application provides compelling historical data showing that students in New York State's charter schools achieved the nation's second-largest improvements in both Reading and Math compared to students in traditional public schools (e25). Additionally, the application includes a detailed Logic Model that clearly delineates short-term, medium-term, and long-term objectives, as well as inputs, activities, outcomes, and expected impacts throughout the grant period (e26-e27).

Weaknesses:

: No weaknesses found.

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 demonstrates a thorough evaluation of objective performance measures that align with the project's outcomes outlined in the Logic Model. The application includes a detailed table that clearly defines each performance measure, including specifics such as data sources, criteria for successful outcomes, the timing of activities, and methodologies for impact assessment corresponding to each project objective (e27-e30, e662-e664). The applicant incorporates at least one measure suitable for annual reporting (e9). This methodical approach ensures quantitative and qualitative data that will be effective in monitoring project progress and the achievement of stated goals.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Sub

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 comprehensive set of ambitious yet attainable goals and performance objectives (e30-e34). Each performance measure is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound, ensuring clarity and accountability in assessing progress. The logic model integrates insights from rigorous research and the State's rich historical data analysis, providing strong evidence that the proposed goals and objectives are not only achievable but are highly likely to yield significant benefits for students upon implementation (e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 provides compelling statistical evidence that effectively demonstrates the significant demand and necessity for the proposed project statewide (e24-e27). The documented need for a minimum of 18,750 new school seats in institutions that historically cater to high-need student groups convincingly supports the rationale for establishing 25 new or replicated schools and expanding an additional 25 high-quality schools throughout the five-year project period (e34-e39). The applicant presents sound reasoning for setting the average award amount for subgrantees at [REDACTED] (e39-e40).

Weaknesses:

The application discusses a waiver request for supporting five existing subgrantees previously funded under a prior SE grant in the State, but the request is incomplete as it does not include the required waiver request application. Additionally, the applicant's dependency on future legislative action to enact the proposed number of subgrant awards introduces a significant risk, given the unpredictability of legislative processes.

Reader's Score: 17

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 an exhaustive and detailed subgrant solicitation and evaluation process aimed at maximizing the alignment of subgrantee projects with the State entity's objectives for enhancing the quality of charter schools and improving student educational outcomes (e38-e47). The applicant presents extensive information about how the applicant will publicize the availability of subgrants, the requirements, and the process. The applicant describes in detail how the subgrant process will support diverse charter models, as well as prioritize communities with high concentrations of schools that have high-need student populations in disproportionately large numbers (e8, e26, e59, e248). The application thoroughly examines how subgrant applications are evaluated, detailing the peer review procedures and criteria (e46-e47). Additionally, the scoring rubric, which outlines the weighting of factors related to the Project Narrative Components,

is clearly articulated, ensuring transparency and consistency in the evaluation process (e314). This structured approach increases the likelihood that selected subgrantees will effectively contribute to achieving the program's goals and improving educational outcomes across the State.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not discuss minimum qualification scores subgrant applicants must earn to be eligible for charter school subgrant awards. Additionally, the application lacks details on how the ongoing performance of subgrantees will be assessed post-award, lacks a clear definition of high-quality for replication schools, and does not specify a timeline for authorizing decisions.

Reader's Score: 11

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 presents a robust range of monitoring activities designed to ensure that all subgrantees are in compliance with the activities of their applications, meeting their project goals, and adhering to federal rules and regulations under the State entity program (e51-e52). The applicant demonstrates they have specific training programs to ensure their monitors have clear and aligned monitoring materials and/or rubrics (e51).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 presents a comprehensive proposal to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized chartering entities (e53-e54). The applicant will utilize information from reporting requirements already in its possession from authorizers, student, and employee data systems; as well as the timeline approved by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) and the State University of New York (SUNY) Charter Schools Institute for both application cycles (Table 3-e43-e44, e49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

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 a very comprehensive approach to providing technical assistance and support to eligible applicants receiving subgrants, that begins during the pre-award phase and extends throughout the project period (e54-e58). For example, during the pre-award phase, the NYSED will offer eligible subgrant applicants informational webinars and slideshow presentations for developers to review. They will also provide guidance on how schools can plan for initial costs in their CSP subgrant budgets and advise board members and leaders on structuring programs and using resources efficiently.

The applicant describes a plan that details several examples of collaboration between the applicant, subgrantees, outside experts, and key stakeholders to focus on capacity building of the authorizing community (e58-e60). For example, the NYSED and the SUNY Charter Schools Institute will collaborate with a quality service provider to improve their outreach efforts, ensuring that they consider the viewpoints of students, families, residents, school officials, local nonprofits, and elected or appointed officials effectively.

Weaknesses:

The application's lack of specificity regarding technical assistance for authorizer improvement raises concerns about the clarity and effectiveness of the proposed plans. It is unclear whether the technical assistance proposed in the application will enhance authorizer performance and oversight.

Reader's Score: 9

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 application provides a sound strategy for engaging parents and community stakeholders statewide, including those in areas without current charter school presence (e61). Central to this plan is the involvement of the New York State Charter Parent Council, and the use of survey data and focus group insights to enhance the establishment and operation of both existing and potential charter schools throughout the project's duration (e60-e62). The applicant outlines a structured timeline for ongoing parent and community engagement activities, demonstrating a commitment to continuous improvement (e62). This approach ensures that key constituencies' input is integrated into the project on a routine and ongoing basis.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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).

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant describes in detail how the State law established an administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering entity (e62-e64). This administrative relationship empowers charter schools to function as independent and autonomous public schools, where their boards of trustees hold ultimate authority over policy and operational decisions. The applicant will oversee charter schools in a manner that will ensure flexible operation and management, while allowing operators to use evident-based models as appropriate to their contexts. For example, the Boards have the responsibility to approve a school's annual budget, decide on resource allocation, and oversee the financial management of the school (e63).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 sufficiently describes the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time and within budget (e64-e66, e667-e668). Each of the major tasks have been ascribed timelines, milestones, and assigned responsible parties, which are summarized in a table within the application (e67-e69). The roles and responsibilities of key staff team members are clearly reflected in the application.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's management plan lacks due dates for required reports and events.

Reader's Score: 9

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

Strengths:

The application presents a robust feedback and continuous improvement strategy aligned with the proposed performance objectives (e26, e28-e30). The applicant will use evidence-based improvement cycles, leveraging comprehensive qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources (e70-e71). The Project Director will consolidate this feedback into NYSED's Annual Performance Report for the Department of Education.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 time commitments of the project director, fiscal oversight specialist, program research specialist, and other key personnel presented in the proposal are adequate and appropriate to accomplish the specific aim of oversight and administering federal grant programs (e46-e66, e71). The role of the principal investigator is not tied to a single position. Instead, these job duties and responsibilities are mainly divided between the Fiscal Oversight Specialist position, which will

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 effectively demonstrates that under the New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998, charter schools are authorized by either of two statewide public entities (1) the New York State Board of Regents through the New York State Education Department or (2) the State University of New York Board of Trustees through the SUNY Charter Schools Institute (e12, e14). Neither of these authorizing entities are LEAs.

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 cites New York State law regarding charter schools receiving per pupil funding that is equal to no less than the per pupil amount received by the school district in which the charter school is located (e14-e16). Districts are required to remit per-pupil payments in a timely manner. Additionally, a NYSED regulation mandates six nearly equal payments be made on the first business days of July, September, November, January, March, and May, based on the school's enrollment from the previous month (e15).

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:

The application presents compelling evidence that demonstrate applicant's location in a State that leverages best practices from charter schools to enhance struggling schools and LEAs (e13, e16-e18). For example, New York State Law requires that the Board of Regents "review and make available to school districts best educational practices employed by charter schools" (e16). One notable beneficial collaboration facilitated by the NYSED and the State University of New York (SUNY) Board of Trustees is the turnaround partnerships between successful charter schools serving over-age/under-credited students and schools struggling to serve those students effectively.

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:

The applicant clearly states that it is located in a State that provides charter schools with access to public facilities, funding for facilities, the ability to share in bonds, and assistance with facilities acquisition (e18-e20).

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 application emphasizes the applicant's commitment to providing charter schools with comprehensive supports for at-risk students, including English Language Learners, social-emotional development, dropout prevention, dropout recovery, and comprehensive career counseling services (e20-e23, e38, e154). These supports include prioritizing and approving schools that ensure access to essential support services and foster innovation, such as working with children in the child welfare system, immigrant youth, and supporting language acquisition and social-emotional development while providing innovative family support (e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/15/2024 01:29 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2024 02:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S282A240007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	31
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	11
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	31
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Sub Total	100	87

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

97

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - State Entities Panel - 4: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S282A240007)

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: 31

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a strong logic model that outlines the activities, outputs, and outcomes of the projects (e27). Furthermore, the applicant addresses the key priorities, including a clearly stated goal to support 25 new or replication schools and 25 expansions with a goal of 18,750 new seats (e26), a clear statewide system of support (e11-13), and strategies for collaboration with local districts through micro-grants, and professional development (e22-23). This logic model is backed up with research from the Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) at Stanford University, Peterson & Shakeel, and Cordes (e24).

Weaknesses:

The applicant mentions that charter schools are often located in "target Districts" with struggling schools (e25), but it is unclear what specific support strategies will be used for these schools. Similarly, the applicant provides no description of support for improving or turning around struggling schools.

Reader's Score: 4

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 includes a table of project goals with three performance measurements each (e28-30). These measurements include quantitative outcomes that have specific data sources for measuring success. The included goals are all specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely. The goals of objective 2 (Improve student academic outcomes in New York State charter schools, particularly for students who are at greatest risk of not meeting State academic standards, through high-quality charter authorizing and technical assistance) can be measured on an annual basis, while many of the other outcomes will be measured over the life of the grant.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Sub

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 ample evidence that the objectives for this project are ambitious. The additional 18,750 proposed seats would increase the number of charter school seats by more than 10% in the state (e30) and the proposed academic outcomes hinge on increasing charter school student performance in both assessments and graduation rates (e29). Additionally, the applicant also presents convincing data that the goals are attainable given the experience of administering six previous CSP grants (e30) and current data show that in all subcategories of English Language Arts (ELA) and Math, charter schools outperform their peer traditional districts (e31-32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 is proposing funding 25 new school or replication schools and 25 expansion schools over the next 5 years (e34), as well as one-time continuation subgrants to 5 schools that were awarded under a previous CSP State Entity competition. Each award has a base of [REDACTED], with an additional [REDACTED] available to schools that meet one or more key program design priorities. Given that all award recipients in the last CSP grant received the additional funding (e656), it is reasonable for the applicant to budget [REDACTED] per subgrant. The applicant also provides ample evidence of growth in the charter school sector, as well as new charter schools able to open after a legislative change allowed for closed schools to no longer count in the limits to the number of schools in New York City (e35).

Weaknesses:

The applicant lists an additional 5 continuation subgrants (e34) but does not provide a clear amount of funding that these subgrantees would be expected to receive through the CSP grant. In addition, the application relies on an assumption that additional advocacy will result in more schools being able to open in New York City,; however, that legislative change is not at all certain at this time (e34).

Reader's Score: 17

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 proposes a rigorous application process that combines the charter authorization and the CSP application into one process. The applicant provides a crosswalk that demonstrates the alignment to the CSP application requirements (e43-44) as well as a listing of key activities and processes. The subgrant process for expansion schools is also provided allows a current school to apply for a revision to increase the number of students allowed in their charter, that process is a critical component of the expansion CSP sub-grants (e46). Due to the integrated nature of the CSP with

the authorizer application process, information about the CSP subgrant process is provided to all schools that are applying for new schools, replications, or expansions. Information is also provided that describes the process for recruiting, training, and evaluating potential reviewers (e477-48). New York requires that a new or replicating school provide, " A description of how the eligible applicant will solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of each charter school that will receive funds under the State entity's program" (e44). The expansion proposal requires schools to provide a community analysis with the same information (e45).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides insufficient information on how the applicant will ensure that replicating schools are "high quality" prior to the authorization and awarding of the CSP subgrants. This process is documented in the verification of eligibility process for expansion schools (e36) but is not listed in the "NYS Charter School Authorizer Application Requirements" (e43). Additionally, while the application lists a clear deadline for authorization approval decisions, it does not provide a timeline for the applicants for authorization (and subsequent CSP subgrants). The application also does not list the minimum criteria for authorization and therefore the CSP subgrant relies heavily on the authorization decision (e43).

Reader's Score: 11

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 31

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a complete monitoring plan document (e428-436) that clearly articulates the monitoring process and timeline for subgrantees. It also provides a Charter School Evaluation Visit Guide for School Leaders (e437) that outlines a sound plan for the types of monitoring visits and checklists of what the monitors will be looking for. Additionally, the applicant includes a well-designed and comprehensive plan for monitoring subgrantee expenditures (e52), training monitors (e51), and how deficiencies will be corrected (e53).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 significant evidence that by combining the application and monitoring of the CSP subgrant with the Stat's system for authorization and oversight, the burden to the schools and authorizer are lessened considerably (e53).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 provides an exhaustive list of past technical assistance provided to the charter sector in New York, including support for recruitment, enrollment and retention (through the Home-to-School Connections trainings, e55), educationally disadvantaged students, and specialty support for new, expanding, and replication schools (e54).

The applicant provides information on the quality of the authorizing processes in the state and the history of adhering to national principles and standards for authorizing by the two authorizing entities in the state (e58). The state's authorizers have committed to building their capacity in community-based authorizing.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not present a plan for developing or presenting training specifically for reducing the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom. While the application states that the applicants are committed to continuous improvement, it does not include a comprehensive plan for improving authorizing in the state, nor for technical assistance that will be conducted to support the authorizers.

Reader's Score: 6

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 proposes a plan with a detailed timeline to partner with a service provider to conduct surveys during the CSP project period and to then work with a Charter Parent Council to develop recommendations for the applicant to make changes in the applicants processes for implementing and authorizing charter schools in the state (e61-62).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 provides a comprehensive overview of the flexibility offered by the state's charter school law and has developed technical assistance to help schools to understand how to maximize these autonomies (e63-64).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 presents a strong management plan with a clear timeline of events and milestones separated by quarter and by objective (e67-69). The plan also clearly delineates the staff, both of internal and external partner organizations, that will participate in the project. All key staff have qualifications to oversee the grant and all technical assistance (e64-67, e663-668). The budget contains appropriate resources for salary and benefits for each staff member, separated between technical assistance and administrative costs (e667-668). Contracted services are included in the budget and have detailed descriptions of the work that will be provided by the contractors (e670-674).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a description of how internal staff members will select or manage external partners that are proposed to work on multiple grant activities.

Reader's Score: 9

- 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 thorough plan for seeking out qualitative and quantitative data, including from subgrantee reports, family and community surveys, authorizer surveys, and performance data (e70). Additionally, the applicant plans to use this data to inform their work and revising their processes (e71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 applicant includes a detailed management plan that outlines how the goals and objectives will be accomplished within the timeframe of the project. The information is adequate to meet these goals, especially given the applicant's long history of administering CSP grants (e71). Additionally, the applicant provides a breakdown of each staff member's percentage of time dedicated to the grant as well as separating out that time into Technical Assistance and Administrative work (e663-667) that shows that the time commitments are sufficient for managing a grant of this size.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 demonstrates that there are two active non-LEA authorizers in the state (e14).

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 provides sufficient evidence that charter schools in New York are receiving equitable funding in comparison to the local school district. This includes funding directly from school districts and from the state. In addition, charter schools are LEAs and therefore directly receive special education funding and all other federal funding (e14-15).

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:

The applicant includes ample evidence that the state has developed multiple avenues for charter school practices to be adopted by struggling charter and district schools, including a requirement in law for the Board of Regents to conduct an annual review of educational practices, a requirement of charter school developers to identify schools to support, and a New York City District-Charter Collaborative (e16). Several examples of district and charter school collaboration are included that demonstrate charter schools training teachers and leaders in literacy instruction, college counseling support for Department of Education officials, and counseling services for co-located students.

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:

The applicant includes strong evidence that the state supports charter school facilities in multiple ways, including through a statutory right to facilities access that grants schools in New York City (access to public facilities), or rental assistance for private housing if space is not available (funding for facilities) (e18-19). State agencies and school districts are required to provide lists of vacant buildings and portions of buildings to charter schools (the right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings), the New York State Stimulus Fund provides discretionary grants to charter schools for costs associated with facilities, and charter schools have access to bond financing through local development agencies (e 19).

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 a comprehensive list schools the applicant has prioritized and approved that serve at-risk students, such as children in the child welfare system, migrant students, or over-age/under-credited students that are at risk of dropping out (e20-21). In addition, the applicant provides evidence that there are supports for these schools through the A-GAME program as well as the "Active Ingredients" project, which are authorizer-led initiatives. These programs are allowing the authorizers to continue to evaluate the success to schools beyond simply looking at state assessments (e22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2024 02:18 PM