

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2018 04:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (U282A180010)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	10
Objectives		
1. Objectives	20	18
Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	10
Parent and Community Involvement		
1. Involvement	10	8
Flexibility		
1. Flexibility	5	3
Sub Total	100	84
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Equitable Financing		
1. Equitable Financing	6	6
Sub Total	6	6
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Charter School Facilities		
1. Charter School Facilities	6	6
Sub Total	6	6
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Best Practices to Improve Struggling School/LEAs		
1. Struggling Schools	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
Serving At-Risk Students		

1. At-Risk Students	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing		
1. Best Practices	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	123	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel 4 - MI-DOE - 1: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (U282A180010)

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: 10

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale

Strengths:

The project design is based on a clear rationale. Even though the applicant has a robust system of charter public schools (44 authorizers, 297 charter districts, and 365 charter schools), e16, the applicant recognized a need to “revamp its system of support to serve students better.” e16. The applicant provided evidence that without the ability to support charter startup and implementation, the growth of new schools slowed significantly. e39. The project includes four goals and five objectives that build on each other e16. The central rationale is building the capacity of schools by “incorporating data and research in education decision-making,” e40. The applicant has already built the Public School Academies Efficiency Platform (PSAEP) and will broaden its use and impact through the proposed project, e25-26, The PSAEP enables schools to build a profile and compare their performance to that of schools with similar characteristics. E26. Upgrading this platform (Objective 3) will enable the applicant to provide more focused technical assistance to new schools and struggling existing schools (Objectives 2 and 4). The applicant also plans to enhance the PSAEP to build profiles of authorizer strengths (Objective 5). Together, those efforts will, according to the rationale, lead to an increase in the number of high-quality schools serving at-risk populations. e16. The rationale for the project is grounded in recent data and stakeholder conversations, e39, and specifically includes finding charter schools with upward performance trends to support and base further expansion on, e41. The applicant provided a basic logic model with inputs, actions, outputs, and outcomes. E63-64.

Weaknesses:

The rationale became less clear when evaluating the rationale narrative, e40-50, together with the objectives in the Quality Assurance System (QAS) Model, e65-66, and the state management plan, e67-69. The articulation of the rationale and its direct connection to the goals, objectives, and outcomes were unclear. The apparent attempt to contextualize the project design in the applicant’s QAS, a management plan, and a logic model made it difficult to clearly see the overall project design. The Quality Assurance System (QAS) Model, e65-66, has some measures, but the applicant only states one goal in those measures (20 new high-quality charter schools). The logic model conflates actions and outputs, and the logic model, QAS, and management plan do not clearly align. For example, the logic model lists providing technical assistance as both an action and an output, e63, and the QAS has technical assistance as a core activity, e65. The lack of alignment between these different tools used to map progress and plan activities creates ambiguity for the project rationale, e16.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 6

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly articulated objectives, based in the strength of academic performance at prior CSP subgrantees' schools. e53-54. The inclusion of raw performance data in ELA, Math, and Science was impressive. e54 because it provides correlation between the benefits of investing in charter school startups and academic outcomes for students. This supports the applicant's rationale that investing in startups, data collection, evaluation, and accompanying technical assistance for schools and authorizers can result in improved outcomes for students. The applicant clearly specifies how it plans to accomplish its objectives. E.g., the applicant explains how its use of the PSAEP to profile charter schools will inform the training and assistance to be provided through the project to each subgrantee. e54.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide clear measureable outcomes on some of the objectives. An example of this is e.g., upgrading the assistance platform (PSAEP). e51. The application would have been strengthened further if the applicant had set strong measurable goals around student performance (that support specific goals, objectives and outcomes for that measure (e.g., the CSP grantees score above 30% in ELA by 2019). e69.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Objectives

- 1. The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under this program.**

Note: In response to this criterion, an applicant may address (or cross reference) some or all of the components of application requirements (I)(A)-(G) in this notice, which require the applicant to provide a description of the State entity's objectives in running a quality charter school program and how the objectives of the program will be carried out.

Strengths:

The objectives are appropriately ambitious. The applicant recognizes a need to revamp its system, e16, and establishes objectives to ultimately provide more high-quality charter schools and authorizers, e51. These include the main objective of increasing the number of high-quality charter schools, providing technical assistance for programs serving educationally disadvantaged students, upgrading their data system and the means with which data is shared among charter schools, and using that same data system to profile effective authorizer practices across the state. e51. The applicant intends to upgrade its data system to support authorizer and school improvement. e51 which will strengthen accountability.

Weaknesses:

The feasibility of these objectives would be improved with supporting evidence that shows the applicant is aware of the particular investments made by prior CSP subgrantees that produced the increased academic results at schools receiving CSP subgrants compared to those that did not. e54. In other words, the applicant could make an even stronger connection between its proposed investment of grant funds will likely yield the sought-after improvement in student achievement. E.g., subgrantees that invested in curriculum design and technology had better student achievement results than those that spent funds on founding team member salaries in the planning year. The applicant noted that it can use the PSAEP to "show the relative contribution of various actions or variables . . . on student performance." E52. Some analysis of that data would enhance the application.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates that eligible applicants will meet project objectives because of the applicant's evident capacity to vet subgrant applicants and provide tailored support to subgrantees. The subgrant application evaluation rubric demonstrates how the applicant will ensure that subgrantees are ready to invest their grant funds in effective support of the grant objectives. e121-124. The applicant also has data in its PSAEP available to judge the likely impact of subgrant applicants' intended investments of subgrant funds. E52-53.

The applicant presents further evidence regarding the likelihood of subgrant applicants meeting the project objectives: data showing that overall student proficiency was better for prior subgrantees, e53-54, and the requirement that subgrantees have a quality assurance system when they open, enabling them to continually improve in support of student achievement, e55.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

1) Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;

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

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.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a convincing plan for monitoring subgrantees, including through their authorizers, and providing relevant technical assistance. The applicant provides subgrantees with fund release guidance, monthly status reports, draw-down monitoring, and end-of-stage progress report forms. e57-58.

The subgrant risk assessment rubric and plan, that includes peer review, demonstrates how the applicant will ensure that subgrantees are on track to meet project objectives. e152-159. To avoid duplication of effort on behalf of subgrantees, the applicant provides access to a mature grant management system. E56. Using this system will simplify reporting and compliance work and enable subgrantees to focus more time on serving students. e56. Similarly, the applicant's work with authorizers, which includes a coalition of authorizers and a focus on authorizer monitoring, demonstrates how the applicant will avoid duplication of effort. e34-36. The applicant will ensure that funds support as many schools as possible by reallocating those earmarked for any subgrantees that do not qualify for implementation grants. e60. The applicant provided evidence of this occurring in the past: regular audits of subgrantees prompted two subgrantees sharing a single building site to merge. E60. The applicant required the remaining subgrantee to repay a portion of CSP grant funds following the merger. E60.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 20

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: 10

Sub Question

- 1. (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**

Strengths:

The applicant's management plan is adequate to accomplish the project objectives. The plan is organized by objectives and includes performance targets at set time periods. E67-69. The plan ties actions to assigned personnel, provides a timeline, and notes which line of the budget will cover those actions. e67-69. The actions follow naturally from the objectives they are listed under, appropriate personnel are assigned to each action so there is clarity in work delegation, and specific time periods for each action are included. E67-69. For example, in providing quality technical assistance (Objective 2), one of the actions is to train boards of all new subgrantees prior to the subgrantee receiving implementation funds. That action is broken down into milestones of developing training and then providing training. E68.

Weaknesses:

The application is lacking distinct milestones for some elements of the management plan. An example of this is aligning the Authorizer 101 program to NACSA standards. E68. The management plan states that this should be completed "by year 3 of the grant." e68. However, aligning the program to national standards and outcomes "that can be associated with PSAEP tool for alignment and measurement" is an exhaustive project involving multiple teams inside the state department of education (working out the data warehouse setup for such alignment alone will require significant steps), and coordination with other stakeholders (charter school developers and authorizers). Because the plan does not break such a large action into milestones, the likelihood that it will be completed is unclear based on the information provided in the application.

Reader's Score: 7

- 2. (2) 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**

Strengths:

The plan clearly addresses the time commitments of each staff assigned to the grant, as outlined in the budget narrative. e161-164. The staff planned for the project have relevant experience: the manager has worked in the charter schools' office for the applicant for six years, following experience as a teacher and principal in other public

Sub Question

schools; the proposed consultant has nearly a decade of experience working with authorizers, boards, and subgrantees in addition to service as a superintendent and principal. e79-88.

Weaknesses:

The time commitments although addressed in the application, seem insufficient for all the proposed activities in the grant. Together, they only add up to 1.35 FTEs. e161. The grant manager is listed as spending 40% of time and effort on the project, e161, but is assigned a long list of responsibilities in the management plan (e.g., recruit new charter school developers, assist authorizers in closing low-performing schools, conducting site visits, providing technical assistance, and sponsoring the school improvement conference), e67-69.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Parent and Community Involvement**1. 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.****Strengths:**

The applicant has a well-developed parental involvement program for all public schools, and this program informs how the applicant incorporates parent and community involvement in public charter school operations. The applicant noted that the state built a parent dashboard as part of its Top 10 in 10 initiatives for parent and community involvement. E70. This parent dashboard enables parents the ability to compare schools for their children. E70. This demonstrates that the applicant will be able to support and gather input from parents with students in charter schools supported by subgrants. Monitoring of charter applicants and subgrant applicants also includes a review of evidence of community need. E70. Charter school boards are required by statute to include representation from the local community, resulting in established and empowered means of community input to charter implementation and operation. e70. Subgrantees are required to take professional development regarding community relations and stakeholder involvement, e108, and to show community need as part of the application, e115 and 117.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not demonstrate effectively how it would use parental input received through the dashboard. E70. The applicant also failed to cite examples of how charter schools and authorizers have used the significant discretion granted them to determine how to engage parents and community members as part of the charter application. e69.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Flexibility**1. 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.****Strengths:**

The applicant adequately explained the discretion provided for charter governing boards and schools, including in areas such as instructional design, e72, contracting for services, e72-73, offering benefit packages to staff, e73, and choosing authorizers, e73.

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to explain how it would specifically work to maximize this flexibility. Details on how the applicant would develop a plan to maximize the flexibility would have strengthened this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Equitable Financing

1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.

Strengths:

The applicant works to ensure that there are sources of equitable financing available to charter schools. This is demonstrated clearly by the state's equitable financing policies. The state provides equal or greater amounts of "foundation" allowance – the federal and state formula grant funds. e19. Charter schools may also access a portion of local millages, use the same enrollment count and timing for fund distribution as district-operated schools—with the ability to use an estimated count to stabilize state aid, and charter schools have access to short and long-term loan vehicles for facilities costs. e20-21. The state also takes special care to ensure that schools that are new or significantly expanding receive funds in a timely manner during the first year when operating funds are typically very limited. e21-22.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Charter School Facilities

1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located 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; or
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a complete and comprehensive overview of the extensive facilities options provided to charter schools through the state. They have developed numerous strategies to assist charter schools around facility needs. Charter schools have access to short and long-term loan vehicles for facilities costs. e20-21.

The applicant has a special unit within the department focused on connecting charter school developers with facilities guidance and support. e22. The unit partners with a state council of authorizers, a state association of charter school boards, and the national charter schools institute to inform school operators about facilities possibilities. e22.

Charter schools have access to bond levy funds and tax-exempt financing through a state facilities authority's bond and loan programs. And charter schools can access enhancement millage funds and are able to lease while exempt from school property tax. e22.

Any vacant buildings paid for by tax dollars cannot be withheld from public charter schools, pursuant to a recent state law. e23.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Best Practices to Improve Struggling School/LEAs

1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies.

Strengths:

The applicant has a sound plan for connecting charter schools and districts with struggling schools.

The applicant's state uses a partnership model that engages, gathers, and provides resources and technical assistance, and holds all public school operators accountable for improving struggling schools. e23-27.

Annual school improvement conferences are attended by district and charter school operators. e25.

A partnership team—with charter and district representation—reviews and approves proposed improvement plans. e24.

The state provides significant data and online resources – including Open Education Resources for use in the classrooms – to struggling schools. e27-28.

Weaknesses:

The applicant inadequately explains how best practices from charter schools will actually be leveraged in helping struggling schools and local education agencies. The application does not provide evidence that the state uses charter turnaround as a key method of improving struggling schools. Though the applicant notes that local education agencies participate as partners with charter schools, e24, and attend school improvement conferences, e25, there is no evidence that the State uses practices from charter schools to improve struggling district schools.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 5 - Serving At-Risk Students

1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which 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 documents exhaustive means available for supporting charter schools serving at-risk students.

The applicant state has “over a dozen statewide initiatives designed to support educationally disadvantaged students and eliminate gaps in achievement.” e30. Among these are several supports starting in early childhood (a website disseminating information on developmental milestones in preschoolers), some focused on behavioral support (restorative practices), and those that include career exploration and career counseling. E31-33. Charter schools have access to these diverse programs and guidance from the department on how to best utilize the ones they feel are most suitable for their students. e30-33.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it has taken steps to ensure that all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing.

Strengths:

The applicant documents extensive existing and planned efforts to ensure the implementation of quality authorizing practices. The applicant has worked with authorizers in the state to develop an authorizer accreditation process that focuses on quality. e34. Engaging with authorizers in this process will foster further collaboration between the applicant and other authorizers.

The commitment to best practices for charter school authorizing is shown by the data point of 95% of students in charter schools are in schools authorized by accredited authorizers. e34.

Authorizers are trained by the department, monitored once every three years, e35-36, and are required to utilize a two-phase charter application process. e36-37.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/12/2018 04:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2018 04:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (U282A180010)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	10
Objectives		
1. Objectives	20	20
Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	11
Parent and Community Involvement		
1. Involvement	10	9
Flexibility		
1. Flexibility	5	4
Sub Total	100	89
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Equitable Financing		
1. Equitable Financing	6	6
Sub Total	6	6
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Charter School Facilities		
1. Charter School Facilities	6	6
Sub Total	6	6
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Best Practices to Improve Struggling School/LEAs		
1. Struggling Schools	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
Serving At-Risk Students		

1. At-Risk Students	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing		
1. Best Practices	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	123	112

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel 4 - MI-DOE - 1: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (U282A180010)

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: 10

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale

Strengths:

The logic model provided clearly described three levels of outcomes. These outcomes are related to the components of the grant. Figure 1 provides evidence showing these components are consistent with the project (p. e63-64). Additionally the activities provided in the logic model are defined and aligned to the outcomes of the project (p. e63). A description of the current status of the state's charter schools, due to limited funding and school closures, is clearly stated. This also shows the need for more high quality charters (p.e39), which is one of the project's objectives. The applicant is proposing to enable PSAU (Public School Academic Unit) to develop a balanced approach to high quality that will focus on expanding existing high quality models, thereby increasing the number of seats (p.e40). This approach will also add quality sites and expand grade ranges (p.e40). The process presents a solid rationale which will establish schools that are in areas of underserved populations (p.e41).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant's logic model is clearly, there is little evidence regarding the measure of outcomes. (p. e. 63 -64). The rationale is not clearly linked to measurable objectives and outcomes.

Reader's Score: 7

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

The applicant proposed, PSAU (Public School Academies Unit) have the autonomy to strategize and identify schools with overall high performance, academically, operationally, and fiscally trending upward to highlight. These identified charters will provide the context for entities interested in expanding replication, and new charter schools (p.e41). A defined baseline for high quality has been established (p.e41). Continuous improvement measures have been put in place to address high quality schools and the quality and level of technical assistance (p. e65 -66).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

Although the objectives were clearly stated, they are not specifically measurable.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Objectives

- 1. The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under this program.**

Note: In response to this criterion, an applicant may address (or cross reference) some or all of the components of application requirements (I)(A)-(G) in this notice, which require the applicant to provide a description of the State entity's objectives in running a quality charter school program and how the objectives of the program will be carried out.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a well stated response that indicates ambition and sound objectives. The objectives were clearly stated and directly aligned to the project goals (p.e50-51). Based on the CSP program purpose, the objectives addressed, recruiting high quality charter schools, providing more secondary options and increase the number of schools to underserved populations. More specifically, objective 1 address ways to increase the number of high quality schools (p. e52) to provide more options to more areas of need (p. e65). In addition, objectives 3 and 5 address collecting data to build and strengthen authorizers to approve more high quality charter schools. The PSAU platform supports the ongoing process to build capacity to collect data to support schools. This data will inform progress toward reaching the project's goal (p.e52). Each year the defined baseline of high-quality schools is revisited based on outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

- 1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students.**

Strengths:

Based on the state's track record and the project objectives, the funding infrastructure in place to expand, replicate and create new charter schools. Since the last round of CPS grants in 2015, the PSAU platform is in place to enhance technical assistance, monitor the need for resources, and monitor the educational program. This platform is setup to monitor for CPS sub-grants and traditional charter schools (p. e52). Based on overall proficiency on the state assessment the students at CSP schools (20.33%) performed measurably better than (p e53) non CSP school (15.57%) students (p. e53).

The application process for all sub-grant applicants to ensure the quality was well developed. The onboarding process provided a risk assessment prior to grant submission that allowed ongoing training. This shows strong component to their support process (p. e54). Given the applicant's two phase process before submission, the applications are vetted and provided technical assistance to meet the authorized standards to improve quality (p. e 38). The project evaluation rubric clearly outlines the standard that can be used to rate subgrant applicants (p. e122).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

- 1) Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;**
- 2) Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies; and**
- 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant used the Grant Electronic Monitoring System (GEMS) of monitoring to manage the grants, maintain authorizer and charter contracts and all communication to sub-grantees p. e36. The applicant describes strong support services to ensure the success of subgrant applicants including : site visits, and provide grant and instructional support (pe.61). In addition, the PSAU team will provide technical assistance through onboarding for new development teams via leadership cohort meetings (p.e61 - 62) based on the applicant comprehensive process. This process assists applicants with less capacity and provided resources and training in curriculum alignment, data quality, and validation (p. e62). Avoiding duplication of efforts, the partnership model was created with stakeholders (charter partners) provides the opportunity for best practices to be shared to all charter schools (p. e61). The planned collaboration and partnership with multiple groups will provide a better quality of strategies which will be shared during TA sessions (p. e61).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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: 11

Sub Question

- 1. (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**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The description of the applicant's management plan is clearly aligned to project's goals and objective including the proposed budget and timeline to support the desired outcomes (p. e67 – 69). The QAS (quality assistance program) and the continuous improvement cycle is evidence, figures 2, 3, and 4, of this alignment (p. e 65 - 66). The roles and responsibilities outlined were directly linked to the project's objectives and the overall grant purpose (p. e67 – 69). Based on the expertise of the personnel provided in the plan the capacity to accomplish the desired outcome is feasible (p.e67- 69). More specifically, one of the purposes of the CSP grant is to increase the number of high quality schools which is indicated by the actions and assignments provided in the plan (objective 1) p. e67.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's description of the management plan showed little or no evidence of milestones to support its alignment to the objectives and timeline to progress the project's implementation (p. e67 – 69).

Reader's Score: 8

2. (2) 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

Strengths:

The applicant proposed management plan provides a clear description of the key personnel along with resumes to show their area(s) of expertise and experience to carry out the objectives (p. e 121).

Weaknesses:

Based on the project design, and the number of activities to be implemented, the amount of time allotted for key personnel (i.e. project director) is not sufficient and shows evidence of some objectives not met (p.e161).

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Parent and Community Involvement

1. 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.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes the importance of community in its efforts to address educational gaps, under performing schools, and innovative school design. Input is solicited through public forums, survey data, social media, advertisements in the paper, conducting learnings and parent forums (p.e69). The applicant plans to facilitate statewide parent and community input initiatives (p. e70). Another way the applicant is seeking to gather input is the creation of the parent dashboard which will enable the applicant to make informed decisions about the quality of education for their families and in their communities. In Michigan a promising practice is emerging allowing parents to serve on charter school boards, and to be part of process to evaluate the connection between development teams and the respective community (p.e70).

Weaknesses:

Based on the applicant's description there is a lack of evidence regarding data to be collected and how it will be used (p. e70).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Flexibility

1. **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.**

Strengths:

Since Michigan is a local control state, the statute and regulations clearly define opportunities for the applicant, local school board officials and other education agencies to be creative and innovative in their efforts toward accomplishing the goals of the project (p. e70). Based on the state law, the applicant has the autonomy/independence to execute its proposed plan without any budget restrictions (p. e73). For example, charter schools are willing able to pilot innovating ideas (i.e. grade configuration) (p.e72)

Weaknesses:

Given the autonomy of the applicant to implement innovative initiatives, planned activities to carry them out was missing and not evident to the reviewer (p. e70-73).

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Equitable Financing

1. **To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.**

Strengths:

Based on Michigan legislation charter schools are guaranteed to receive the foundation allowance greater than or equal to traditional schools (p.e19). Titles I-VI of the Every Student Succeeds Act are administered under the State's Office of Field Services (OFS) determines allocation amounts for charter and traditional schools to include homeless, students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Charter School Facilities

1. **To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located 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; or**

f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges.

Strengths:

The Michigan revised school code provides for equitable access to capital funding and facilities. In addition, school districts provide access to charter schools to bond levy funds for facilities based on their charter (p.e22). Other provisions made by the state for charter school include: access to tax exempt financing, school property tax exemption, low or now cost leasing privilege, and access to millage revenue (p.e22). The Senate Bill 249 granted charter schools the right to occupy vacant building paid for by tax dollars (p.e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Best Practices to Improve Struggling School/LEAs

- 1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies.**

Strengths:

The applicant established the partnership model to ensure best practices are provided to assist schools in need of support. This model aligns resources and technical expertise to drive improvement toward positive outcomes (p.e23). The model includes: local school board members, LEAS, parents education council, businesses, higher education, charter management, and foundations (p.e24). TA includes- other school site visits and statewide conference (p.e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 5 - Serving At-Risk Students

- 1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.**

Strengths:

The state's charter school institution to provide TA (technical assistance) is PSAU. They specifically focus on at-risk student population (i.e. homeless, adjudicated youth, ELL, and students with disabilities) (p.e30). Through PSAU schools are connected to various consultants and programs for assistance and includes ISDs and RESA (Regional Education Service Agency). PSAU guarantees equal access and promote inclusion for all students (p.e30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it has taken steps to ensure that all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing.

Strengths:

The applicant uses PSAU (Public School Academic Unit), a continuous improvement effort to collect best practices for charter schools at a system-wide level. Conference topics are proposed based on best practices to be shared both local and state wide via support visit (p.e25). PSAU provides a platform to identify early sign of student growth which is an ongoing process (p.e24).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2018 04:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2018 04:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (U282A180010)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	8
Objectives		
1. Objectives	20	18
Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	14
State Plan		
1. State Plan	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	10
Parent and Community Involvement		
1. Involvement	10	8
Flexibility		
1. Flexibility	5	4
Sub Total	100	81
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Equitable Financing		
1. Equitable Financing	6	6
Sub Total	6	6
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Charter School Facilities		
1. Charter School Facilities	6	6
Sub Total	6	6
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Best Practices to Improve Struggling School/LEAs		
1. Struggling Schools	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
Serving At-Risk Students		

1. At-Risk Students	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing		
1. Best Practices	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	123	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel 4 - MI-DOE - 1: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education (U282A180010)

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: 8

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale

Strengths:

The logic model is located on page e63 of the application. It provides a general framework for the inputs, actions and outcomes from the project objectives that are described in the application, and also covers the short and long term outcomes of the applicant. There is a link between some of the key components provided in the logic model; for example, "Authorizer 101 and 201" in the action section will likely lead to improvement in the Design and Maintenance of the PSA Efficiency platform in the outputs (e63).

Additionally, the strengths of the program and a comparative chart regarding the opening of both Non-CSP funded and CSP funded schools is provided on page e.39 as a strong example of the rationale

Weaknesses:

The information and rationale are not clearly presented and linked to the logic model. Goals and objectives found on pages e67-70 were not clearly defined and should be more consolidated. The relationship between some of the key components and outcomes is not described in detail and needs additional components to be successful. For example, monitoring and technical assistance actions may results in Improvement/Systems for CSP funded charter schools, but there is little detail to explain the processes, and provide performance measures that will create a link between actions and long term outputs (e63).

Additionally, it was difficult to link the separate component data (goals, objectives and measures) and develop an analysis of the whole picture. The information in the management plan was difficult to link to the measures and objectives, due to their lack of more detailed information (e63). The overall rationale could be supported by providing additional context within the logic model that supports the three main objectives.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Sub Question

Strengths:

The goals and objectives listed in the application on page e16 are clear and relevant to the project described in the application. The measures listed for opening and supporting new charter developers are in line with the application objectives (e67).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant generally provided support for the goals and performance measures, some of them were not clearly measurable. The application articulates measures like "Analyze annual school and student level data for CSP sub-grantees to determine if the plan is effective in improving student performance" and "Annual authorizer profile and reports to provide context grade level analysis versus all grades" on page e66. These are broad and the applicant did not provide enough information to ascertain if these could effectively be measured. Some measurable components, such as "Compare non-CSP awardee to CSP awardee and overall charter performance annually" are lacking sufficient detail (e69). Additional numerical component like projected growth or achievement would further support the application's measures.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Objectives

1. The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under this program.

Note: In response to this criterion, an applicant may address (or cross reference) some or all of the components of application requirements (I)(A)-(G) in this notice, which require the applicant to provide a description of the State entity's objectives in running a quality charter school program and how the objectives of the program will be carried out.

Strengths:

The applicant's objectives satisfy many of the application requirements laid out in the Notice Inviting Applications, in addition to the responsibilities and duties of the applicant's staff. For example, Objective 2 (e51) meets Application Requirement 1 (description of the State entity's objectives in running a quality charter school program and how the objectives of the program will be carried out) and 10 (Ensure that charter schools receiving funds under the State entity's program meet the educational needs of their students, including children with disabilities and English learners;)(see Notice Inviting applications). Another example involves Objective 2, which meets Application Requirements 7 and 8 (see Notice Inviting Applications). Objective 5 (e16), which meets Application Requirement 4 (Ensure that authorized public chartering agencies, in collaboration with surrounding LEAs where applicable, establish clear plans and procedures to assist students enrolled in a charter school that closes or loses its charter to attend other high-quality schools), , will be an important component for the applicant to measure effectively; being a local control state, it will be important for the applicant to work closely and collaboratively with the authorizers to ensure sustainable high quality charter schools are meeting expectations.

Weaknesses:

The applications' objectives are ambitious but some questions remain over their feasibility. In particular, objectives 2 and 4 regarding technical assistance need further detail in the application for measuring progress (e65-66). The application admits it is in "an ongoing process for building capacity to collect data that encompass(es) the objectives to ensure the capture of multiple data points, which can assist in supporting charter schools and inform progress" (e51), which implies that further steps should be taken if the applicants wants to put more thought into crafting effective objectives linked closely to the goals and measures listed.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students.

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a comprehensive online grant application system that has streamlined the process of applying and provides clear information on what next steps are for the purpose of applying for grant funds (e.102). Additionally, eligibility requirements in the sub-grant application on page e44-49 are robust and well developed in addition to the checklist being well designed and informative (e122). The data provided shows how the CSP funded grantees are faring compared to charter schools who have not received CSP funding assistance (e53-54), which helps to support the application. The applicant states they are developing a more unified vision to complete the authorizing process with higher efficiency and a more unified process to streamline the process (e55).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide enough supporting evidence regarding baseline data for student achievement prior to initiating the educational program. For example, more information and data on how charter schools are comparing to district schools in growth, retention, achievement, or other relevant examples would really benefit the credibility of the application's past success (e54).

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

1) Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;

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

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.

Strengths:

The applicant's Charter School Planning Grant Evaluation Rubric in Appendix C is well developed and helpful (e.121). Strong examples include on-site visits, desk reviews and the submission of annual reports to determine progress and growth of their portfolio. The applicant tracks grantee performance and achievements through its Grants Electric Monitoring System, where data and reports are uploaded to allow to better monitor the progress of its sub-grantees (e36).

Additionally, the applicant's oversight and monitoring protocol includes monthly academic and financial reports and enhanced monitoring for all planning sub-grantees (e57-58). The plan also involves random board meeting visits, official visits and special appointment requests, so the applicant demonstrates the importance of meeting with all sub-grantees and adequately monitor progress (e28-29). The applicant describes on page e61 the importance of developing collaborative partnerships with the multiple groups to provide technical assistance s in avoiding duplication. Finally, the authorizer and Risk Assessment checklist is comprehensive and helpful as a uniform document for all authorizers to use (e131).

Weaknesses:

The data provided to support how much better CSP funded schools are doing compared to Non-CSP funded schools is missing additional support data to indicate the depth to which CSP funded schools are growing in comparison to Non-CSP funded schools. More data on the impact of those partnerships between the applicant and external organizations to avoid

duplication of duties would help develop the applicant's overall contribution to the charter school sector.

Reader's Score: 19

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: 10

Sub Question

- 1. (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**

Strengths:

The management plan covers the objectives that are listed in the applications, and presents milestones and a timeline (e67). The trainings are realistic and are tied into the program and management plan and goals. It is organized by targets, who are overseeing which subproject, and what are the roles and responsibilities that are aligned by project objectives and goals (e.67-69). The objectives are aligned and consistent with the budget to carry out. Additionally, the management plan is linked to some of the objectives by tying CSP funding into the short and long-term outcomes (where the median outcome "increase effective implementation of best practices for charters in the areas of academics, finance, and operations" results in the long-term outcome of "all charter schools are high-quality options" (e64).

Weaknesses:

There are some measurable components to the management plan, but it is lacking measurability and context on how to proceed strategically, while the milestones and sub-measures for each section of the management plan need additional details to supplement the overall plan and tie both the logic model and the objectives into the overall goals of the project.

Reader's Score: 7

- 2. (2) 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**

Strengths:

The individuals associated with this grant include a supervisor, grant manager and three support staff, all who have or will have experience in their relevant areas (e78). The staff appears to spend a predominant amount of time in analytical roles, where data is collected by external agencies and then funneled to them through the online system to review, analyze and take action on. The Manager will spend a reasonable amount of time committed to the grant (e161-164).

Weaknesses:

The time commitments may not be reasonable enough as it is difficult to ascertain the percentage of time spent on the project, considering how much work and responsibilities have been laid out in the application (e161).

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Parent and Community Involvement

1. 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.

Strengths:

The applicant requires all school developers to submit an assessment of community need section to their application (e. 115), in addition to sections regarding recruitment and involvement. The applicant also works closely with the authorizers to understand the wants and needs of the communities in which charter schools hope to open, as indicated in the 2018-2023 CSP Risk Assessment Guidelines (e152). Additionally, the Charter school board provides community and parental support that sub-grantees are required to demonstrate the capacity to meet (e.70 and e108).

From the applicant side, a program called the "Top 10 in 10 initiative provides a statewide structure to improve parent and community involvement and provide information to parents." The Parent Dashboard gives parents around the state the opportunity to compare schools using multiple filters in order to select the school most appropriate to their needs (e70). The applicant describes how authorizers collaborate with school developers to determine the needs of the community, and that authorizers "survey communities once schools are operating to measure and evaluate parent and community engagement and satisfaction" (e71).

Weaknesses:

No explanation is provided regarding on how to use parental input from the application; very little information is provided regarding how the state will solicit input from the community or parents regarding their project.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Flexibility

1. 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.

Strengths:

The applicant indicates there is a high degree of flexibility within their law (e71) . As Michigan is a state under local control, then charter schools and other choice options have a strong degree of autonomy from the state. For example, MCL 380.501-MCL 380.507 provides a high degree of legal autonomy for charter schools to be overseen by their authorizer and not just the state (e71).

Additionally, the applicant's state law insists on charter schools being granted specific statutory authority to contract for the services of classroom instruction, which local districts are prohibited from doing (e72). For example, state statute MCL 380.507 allows schools to choose their authorizer based on their circumstances.

State law requires all teachers to possess a valid teaching certificate, however, Charter Schools may apply for a permit employing noncertified individuals in a teaching assignment. Teacher Certification Administrative Rules were given additional flexibility regarding permit issuing in 2017, following a review of the challenges employed by the previous statute (e74).

The applicant is in a local control state, where the authority of local board officials to operate their schools independently within the confines of statute and regulation to seek innovative ideas without the interference of the state. The applicant will benefit from the flexibility from state law by encouraging innovational practices by charter schools and further developing the Public School Academies Efficiency Platform, one of core objectives of this application (e72).

Weaknesses:

The application does not demonstrate how it will take advantage of the flexibility provided and what impact it will have on the charter schools. For example, the applicant fails to mention or provide data on waivers and the impact waiving specific state statute has on charter schools, if this is a requirement of sub-grantees to provide evidence of in the sub-grantee application (e114). While there are no plans proscribed by the applicant to maximize the flexibility other than through the development of the Public School Academies Efficiency Platform, there are flexibilities from state law in place.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Equitable Financing

- 1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.**

Strengths:

The application states that charter schools in the state have the same funding allowance and are on the same timeline as traditional schools (e1), and have access to a variety of other sources and loans, including State Aid Note Programs and Local Government Loan Programs (e2). The application also states that as of October 2017, charter schools received access to a portion of the revenue generated by enhancement millages and countywide millages, which are levied by intermediate school districts that provide additional revenue for the local districts within those districts (e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Charter School Facilities

- 1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located 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; or**
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges.**

Strengths:

The state's revised School Code (Public Act 22) includes provisions requiring equitable access to capital funding and facilities specifically for charter schools. Charter schools that are authorized by school districts can access bond levy funds for facilities as determined by their charter agreement, and are also eligible to access tax-exempt financing and assistance through the Michigan Public Educational Facilities Authority's bonding and loan programs (e22). Additionally, charter schools have access to specific guidance on locating, evaluating and comparing and developing facilities or opportunities through the Michigan Finance Authority.

Additionally, the application refers to Senate Bill 249, which limited the powers of local governmental bodies regarding the selling, transferring, leasing, or renting of property. Specifically, vacant buildings paid for and supported by tax dollars cannot be withheld from use by other educational entities, such as charter schools (e23).

The application also references how sub-grant applicants must submit in their application detailed information on facilities arrangements, including budget, renovation costs and how the steps being taken meet state requirements regarding facilities arrangements (e118).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Best Practices to Improve Struggling School/LEAs

- 1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies.**

Strengths:

For the last year, the applicant has been working on a partnership model to improve student achievement and assist struggling schools by identifying schools in need of additional support, whereby they are assigned a liaison and partnership agreement with the applicant and community partners to identify and fix any challenges. All schools identified as low performing receive support for improvements (e23).

The applicant is also a GoOpen state, where a community of traditional and charter school teachers and leaders access and contribute resources to a warehouse for Open Educational Resources (e28). Collaborative programs like this support the initiatives the state is taking to share best practices across struggling schools and local school districts.

The applicant delivers frequent technical assistance (TA) to any requests that are submitted, but also implemented assistance rooted in the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) (e56). These visits result in the collection and sharing of best practices and support the dissemination of best practices for charter schools seeking assistance. The applicant contracts with various Charter Support Organizations to visit and support charter schools as they seek assistance (e29).

The applicant has multiple programs to support schools, including Statewide Autism Resources and Training, Michigan Special Education Mediation Program, African American initiative, all designed to support schools in reaching out to various student groups in their school (e32-33).

Weaknesses:

Although turnaround best practices were covered as topics for technical assistance on page e23, it is not clear what findings or practices are being used to improve struggling, i.e. turnaround, schools and what the impact has been.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 5 - Serving At-Risk Students

- 1. To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.**

Strengths:

There are multiple initiatives that the applicant discusses in this section to help boost support and services for at-risk students, such as Dropout Recovery Program, Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative and Statewide Autism Resources and Training (e32).

The applicant describes how all public schools in the state receive a proportional amount of federal and state formula grant funds directly via the regular allocation formula. The applicant explains how they administer a variety of formula grants (Title, I, II, III, IV, V and VI of the now Every Student Succeeds Act) based on student count and are designed to enhance the capacity of both charter and traditional schools to serve at-risk students, which includes but is not limited to students with disabilities. Allocations are determined based on student count, which is processed through the applicant's online grants management system (e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

1. **To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it has taken steps to ensure that all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing.**

Strengths:

The applicant maintains a comprehensive website with numerous resources for authorizers, developers, school leaders and other stakeholders, and has a wide range of communication strategies that support promising practices that include social media, and conferences (e27). Recent topics include the newly revised School Improvement Framework, Turnaround Best Practices, Effective Early Childhood Programs, third-grade reading strategies, new legislation impacting charter schools, Culture and Climate in Beating the Odds Schools, and a rollout of the new accountability system. Practices are also shared at state conferences as well as charter specific topics such as closure, flexibility and curriculum.

To ensure new large and small authorizers, and newly hired employees of authorizers understand their responsibilities in developing a contract or improved oversight, the MDE's, PSAU created the Authorizer 101 program to ensure authorizers receive technical assistance, which is mostly for LEA's, whereas the state or national organizations may partner to provide the university authorizers training as previously mentioned in the technical assistance section (e35).

The Public School Academies Efficiency Platform will generate a data profile to determine the overall quality of charter schools in an authorizer's portfolio, including the location of schools, student growth and proficiency, which will be used to examine authorizer performance (e26). The applicant then provides context for the way the platform identifies and supports all public schools in Michigan; "The process begins with identifying the data set. The platform will develop an authorizer list based on areas of growth, a plan is developed for improvement, and the PSAU will provide TA or utilize a partner to address TA (e36).

Weaknesses:

The applicant appears to rely heavily on groups such as the National Charter Schools Institute and the Michigan Council of Charter Authorizers to conduct visits and collect data. If the latter organization represents the ten largest authorizers in Michigan that cover 85% of schools and 95% of students F(e34), the applicant may not have the ability to determine the quality of authorizing in the state on its own without potential bias.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2018 04:26 PM