

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2020 05:10 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A200007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	32
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CPP6	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CPP7	4	4
Sub Total	16	16
Total	116	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - CSP State Entities - 10: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A200007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. a. Quality of Project Design

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: 33

Sub

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

Strengths:

Beginning on e31, the applicant presented a very deliberate and comprehensive plan for their project design that is rational and provides clear foundational elements for operational objectives; each in alignment with over all goals of the project. The project design is also complementary to the State of California's top 10 priorities and the Local Control Funding Formula. Additional points that provided very good detail about the project included: Successful Evaluation Findings; Clear paths in addressing need for establishing relationship goals between state, authorizers, and subgrantees; and Innovative approaches in working with migrant students, and students that were impacted by the camp fires devastation.

The proposed project also details an evaluation structure that associates project performance measures in connection to data assessment. The program design features are also built upon the usage of a detailed logic model (e47) that is inclusive of each objective and frames the project in consideration of: Inputs; Activities; Outputs; and Outcomes. Additionally, there are secondary functions to include Assumptions and External Factors.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

2. (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; and

Strengths:

Beginning on e37 and e45, the applicant has presented a clear perspective for data collection and evaluation. The data collection process will yield both qualitative and quantitative data sets that will reflect local self-reported data such as: teacher qualifications; safe and clean buildings; textbooks; implementation of academic standards; access to broad course of study; school climate surveys; and parent involvement and engagement.

Sub

The six-overall project objectives are reflective of very intentional and innovative practices: provide financial assistance for up to 45 new and/or replication high-quality charter schools and the expansion of up to 15 high-quality charter schools over a 36-month time period (20 grant awards per year); annually increase the number of CA charter schools meeting high-quality standards by 10 percent over the term of the grant; annually increase academic achievement for all CA charter school students in ELA and mathematics by five percent for three consecutive years; provide technical assistance to at least 15 charter schools per year via three annual regional workshops; provide at least 90 percent of the subgrantees with technical assistance by way of webinars, on-site trainings, phone calls, and attendance at CDE conference presentations; and provide at least 50 percent of authorizers with technical assistance on best practices and new charter school legislation and conference presentations. The applicant has also taken into consideration the impact of Covid-19 regarding data collection.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

3. (3) The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entities program

Strengths:

Beginning on e21 (and supplemented in other parts of application), the applicant has detailed a plan for objectives that are ambitious in being able to reach the projects goals by way of the six outlined objectives. The objectives are also attainable given the proposed project elements: (1) including a broad range of involvement from each level; (2) including a system of accountability; (3) conducting needs assessment; (4) promoting transparency in communication; (5) providing for clear, sharing of best practices between and among stakeholders; and (6) implementing innovative programming at the high school level.

Weaknesses:

Objective number 6 in providing 50 percent of authorizers with technical assistance on best practices and new charter school legislation and conference presentations, would appear to be attainable, but not ambitious. As a result, it may be difficult to determine the true impact upon the outcomes related to the expected outcome of increasing consistent charter authorizer review of charter school petitions and standardization of oversight practices.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

1. b. Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

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

Strengths:

Beginning on e48, the applicant proposed a detailed and prescriptive plan that provides insight for how subgrantees under the program will meet objectives of providing high-quality charter school environments and improved educational results for the students to be served. Subgrantees are also awarded additional preference points to their application for effectively being able to provide evidence of the following: (1) a signed facility agreement; (2) a school site located in

targeted QOZs or rural community; (3) the establishment of a new charter high school; and (4) the establishment of a charter school within a district or county with less than 10 publicly funded charter schools. Other key elements of viable eligible subgrant applications include: Transportation Needs of Students; Support for Development of New Charter High Schools; and Diversity of Charter School Models. The applicant also offers a detailed synopsis of the application review process including geographic challenges, training, consensus process, and expectations of volunteers and peer reviewers.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. c. State Plan

The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 32

Sub

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

Strengths:

Beginning on e54, the applicant presented a compelling narrative that describes activities related to: effective monitoring; coordination of activity throughout the state; authorizer and subgrantee oversight; quality technical assistance; and stakeholder engagement in implementation. Key monitoring activities and functions that were noted include: fiscal monitoring; charter monitoring template; and annual, in-depth site and desk monitoring. In preparing for the closeout of a grantee award, the applicant requires a third-party external review that provides an evaluation of the school's program, academic achievements, governance structure, and fiscal vital signs.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

Beginning on e58, the applicant details an adequate operational plan, which represents a process that will avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies. The applicant proposes to increase engagement with charter authorizers through a standard set of activities, as well as targeted activities to ensure two-way communication with authorizers and schools. The applicant will also interface with support organizations on identifying nationally recognized standards for quality authorizing. Targeted elements of the plan

Sub

will include: (1) creation of triangular synergy between the applicant, authorizer, and subgrantee; (2) establishment of continuous improvement network for mid-to-large portfolio charter school authorizers; (3) peer to peer working groups on best practices; and (4) creation of case studies to increase efficiency across the system.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

3. (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:

Beginning on e59, the applicant outlines detailed and specific technical assistance that will be provided to subgrantees. Around the need for technical assistance, the applicant will continue to segment focus for training in two areas: Targeted and Universal. A series of technical assistance activities will be provided by the applicant over the course of the three-year award. Technical assistance will cover key programmatic elements that should prove to be of great value for subgrantee. The training will include the following modules: opening and operating new charter schools; replication and expansion; student recruitment, enrollment, and retention; reducing the overuse of discipline practices; access to federal funds; support for recruitment and enrollment practices; and support for students when a charter school closes.

Beginning on e64, the applicant provides a detailed narrative to address the efforts that will be put in place to ensure quality authorizing efforts in the State of California. Technical assistance that will be provided by the applicant for authorizing agencies will include best practices in the following areas: assessing annual performance data of authorized schools; financial review and assistance with audits; holding charter schools accountable to their performance agreements; reviewing processes related to renewal, non-renewal, or revocation; and establishing clear plans and procedures to assist students enrolled in a charter school that closes. Facilitation of trainings will be delivered through conferences, webinars, small group meetings, consultancy, workshop network(s), and usage of subject matter experts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

4. (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; and

Strengths:

Beginning on e65, the applicant details a formative plan of operation to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of a charter schools. Charter schools in California are required to have an active School Site Council that includes the representation of the principal or designee, school personnel, and two the parents and/or community group members. To aid in the facilitation of this requirement, subgrantees are required to have their charter school petition signed parent/guardian of at least one-

Sub

half the number of pupils that the charter school estimates will enroll for its first year of operation. The applicant seeks to have representative voices engaged in the charter school's operation that gives parents and communities the opportunity to have input on the following: (1) approving the Local Control and Accountability Plan; (2) recommending approvals to the local governing board; (3) monitoring of charter school operation and implementation of policies; and (4) evaluating the effectiveness of the related goals, actions, and services offered at charter schools. The charter school's parents and community members will also be interviewed periodically throughout the life of the grant to allow for feedback and to assess the level of engagement.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide clear and distinctive timeline for concrete benchmarks in being able to meet the objectives that are laid out. Additionally, it is not clear how applicant will use data in a formative manner.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Beginning on e65, the applicant provides detailed insight and explanation of 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. The EC Section 47601 of the California Charter Schools Act of 1992, consist of "mega-exemptions", which allow for charter schools to operate independently of many of the constraints that apply to non-charter public schools, but under the guise of their own governing board. Charter schools in California have flexibility to develop innovative ideas, to respond to the needs of smaller communities, to create their own programs, to determine educational curriculum to determine the grade levels to be served, to hire administrative staff and teachers, to maintain total control over contracting for services, to managing expenditures, and budgeting.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. d. Quality of the Management Plan

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. (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; and

Sub

Strengths:

Beginning on e68, the applicant provided a comprehensive management plan that lays out the overall objectives: reasonableness and achievability, improving response time to stakeholders, improving the quality of applicants, and improving the monitoring system for sub-grantees. The management plan is supported by tasks that are in alignment with project activities. Each of the tasks and activities are associated with a specific person or subgrantee, a frequency timetable and a feedback source. The applicant also provides a Management by Objective table that is clear and delineates roles, responsibilities, and a timetable associated with each task. Each of the project management protocols tie back to the programmatic logic model.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide enough detailed information on how it proposes to manage the activities and commitments of their external partners throughout the state.

Reader's Score: 9

2. (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project

Strengths:

Beginning on e69, the applicant offers detailed information for what the approach will be to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. Key elements of the applicant's management plan will focus on ensuring that data is collected, evaluated, analyzed, communicated, and acted upon. Specific data set collection will lend support to gain timely feedback and continuous improvement and consists of the following: anonymous paper survey; electronic surveys; email responses; quarterly reports; annual progress reports; formal letter responses; and in-person meetings.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

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.

Strengths:

Beginning on e70, the applicant provides a detailed assessment for staffing and time commitments. The applicant also provides detailed narrative that explains the time commitment and the roles and responsibilities of project personnel. The narrative appears to offer a reasonable assessment for adequacy of staffing. Specificity and detail are provided to explain the following staffing positions: Charter Schools Division Director, Project Director, Regional EPCs, and Fiscal Analyst. These positions consist of three full time personnel and an executive administrator. The time commitments, as well as the roles and responsibilities, appear to be appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Sub

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. CPP3 Competitive Preference Priority 3: Equitable Financing

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:

Beginning on e21, the applicant clearly demonstrates that the state has policies in place the address equitable financing between traditional public schools, and charter schools and students in a prompt manner. Through the state's Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), California has made great strides in being able to bring equitable financing to charter schools, with the aim of improving outcomes for high-need students. Key elements of the formula include: supplemental and concentration grants; economic recovery to restore pre-recession funding; guaranteed minimum amount of state aid; access to receive in-lieu property taxes from the school district in which they are located; ease in access to unrestricted funds from state for new charters; and charter eligibility to receive approximately 37 percent of their annual LCFF entitlement by the end of September.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. CPP4 Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities

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:

Beginning on e23, the applicant demonstrates a high level of support for charter schools throughout the State of California in their ability to secure access to facility space to start or expand a charter operation, giving equal access charter school students. Proposition 39, which was voted on by the residents of the state, directs that, "school districts make available, to all charter schools operating in their school district with projections of at least 80 units of ADA, space that will sufficiently accommodate all of the charter's in- district students in facilities that are 'reasonably equivalent' to other classrooms, buildings, or facilities in the district." Additionally, the applicant reports other supplemental support from the state in the area of charter school facilities: (1) assistance with fixed rate, long-term loans, and favorable terms that are established by the state verses capital markets; (2) bond proceeds available to charter schools for facilities construction or renovation; and (3) the Charter School Facility Program, which provides facility financing of 50 percent grant and 50

percent loan that may be used to finance construction of a new or permanent school facilities, rehabilitation of existing school district facility, or to rent school district facilities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. CPP5 Competitive Preference Priority 5: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies

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:

Beginning on e24, the applicant provided a comprehensive narrative to demonstrate how the state's operational activities will use best practices from exemplary efforts around the State of California to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies. The applicant cites seven good educational models of practice, as well as supportive opportunities that are designed to facilitate and ensure the effective transfer of knowledge and skills. The seven models include provisions related to the following: (1) charter school outreach to homeless youth with mobile classrooms; (2) credit recovery for charter schools that enroll students for intensive short-term interventions that enable high school graduation and/or return to public school; (3) charter schools built around specific career technical education pathways; (4) charter schools that have forged strong industry partnerships and that provide internships and mentoring opportunities to marginalized communities; (5) charter school models that support medically fragile students unable to participate in a classroom setting; (6) charter schools sharing best practices for full inclusion of students with moderate to severe disabilities; and (7) technology and project-based charter schools operating their own teacher training college to address the teacher shortage.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. CPP6 Competitive Preference Priority 6: Serving At-Risk Students

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:

Beginning on e27, the applicant has adequately demonstrated a significant level of commitment to serving at-risk students in the state of California. As part of the application process, the applicant requires that subgrantees address how the

charter school will attract, recruit, admit, enroll, serve, and retain educationally disadvantaged students by way of the provision of curriculum, services, and management operations. Additionally, the applicant's Local Control and Accountability Plan requires that all charter schools include within their petition, a description of how they will serve and meet the needs of (1) students who are academically low-achieving, (2) students with disabilities, and/or (3) students who are English learners. This requirement establishes high expectations for all subgrantees. Additional educational priorities for charter schools in their service to at-risk students include the following: (1) dropout prevention and recovery; (2) chronic absenteeism; (3) credit recovery; (4) student safety; (5) graduation rate; (6) career counseling services; and (7) support for English language learners and foster youth.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. CPP7 Competitive Preference Priority 7: Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

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:

Beginning on e29, the applicant provided a good plan that ensures all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing. Maintaining a partnership role with authorizers throughout the state, the applicant seeks to establish clear steps, to ensure that authorizers implement best practices, and that charter schools are in compliance with all required statutes and regulations. The applicant has also provided both general and specific methods to be able to meet defined goals related to charter school authorizing, which also includes a focused approach regarding Financial Management Standards.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2020 05:10 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2020 08:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A200007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	33
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CPP6	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CPP7	4	4
Sub Total	16	16
Total	116	111

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - CSP State Entities - 10: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A200007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. a. Quality of Project Design

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: 33

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents information to improve academic performance, best practices, and support systems for the proposed project. The applicant provides a rationale based on past successes, credible body of research, and successful evaluation findings that likely realize the proposed outcomes. The applicant presents specific activities to strengthen a cohesive statewide strategy of enrollment opportunities, collaboration, and best practices aligned with the logic model. The application presents specific data points to produce intended results. For example, the applicant explains a rationale of operational relationship between project goals, objectives, activities, and outcomes (e10, e31-e36, e47).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (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; and

Strengths:

The application proposal demonstrates achievable objective performance measures for each target objectives related to the intended project outcomes. The applicant presents data collection and analysis protocols for annual performance measures of qualitative and quantitative data. For example, the applicant presents performance indicators such as basic staffing and operations conditions, academic standards implementation, broad course of study access, school climate surveys, and parent engagement. The applicant presents measures of success with evaluation methods to support the expansion and replication of high-quality schools with all students, especially students of underserved communities (e37-e40; e45-e46).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

3. (3) The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entities program

Strengths:

The applicant presents attainable objectives that align with state-wide priorities. For example, the applicant provides project objectives and performance measures to evaluate grants management compliance, effective technical assistance, and increasing academic achievement for the duration of the grant. The applicant provides the framework for the proposed tasks, outcomes, and deliverables (e37-e40).

Weaknesses:

The application proposal would be stronger with clear details for objective 6 for the true impact of consecutive review performance and oversight practices to judge the objective as ambitious. The applicant would also benefit by including specific baseline data for each objective to make a clear determination of ambitious objectives (e37-e40).

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

1. b. Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a strong description of the likelihood of eligible subgrant applicants meeting proposed objectives. The applicant presents a clear subgrant program aligned with state and federal program requirements. The application proposal awards preference points to eligible subgrant applicants with planning activities, implementation, expansion, and replication of quality school choice to improve low performing schools. For example, the applicant presents an application checklist to support subgrant applicants application review, scoring criteria, peer review and approval process. The applicant lists subgrant application requirements, responsibilities, family engagement activities, charter school program flexibility, and funding expenditures (e48-e54).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. c. State Plan

The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents an adequate monitoring plan for eligible subgrant applicants. The applicant assesses subgrantees through an annual monitoring process to validate fiscal and programmatic conditions with charter school program implementation. For example, the applicant introduces a charter school monitoring instrument template to monitor charter school governance, operations, staffing, school improvement needs, student performance, and financial decisions. Additionally, the applicant describes grant application requirements to evaluate progress toward the performance goals of quality charter schools. The applicant describes special considerations of the monitoring plan to promote equal access to appropriate services and accountability (e54-e58).

Weaknesses:

The application proposal would be strengthened with a detailed explanation of how they will monitor for sustainability in subgrants beyond the grant period (e54-58).

Reader's Score: 9

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed plan to avoid the duplication of work for charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies. The application proposal demonstrates school contextual awareness of teaching and learning accountability to reduce administrative burden. The applicant proposes two-way communication and collaboration to coordinate monitoring visits and monitoring report documentation. The applicant provides a grants management system to streamline critical processes and required documentation for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies (e58-e59).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

3. (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 relevant technical assistance and support for eligible subgrant applicants. The applicant describes universal and targeted technical assistance to reach diverse stakeholders. For example, the applicant presents targeted technical assistance such as facilitation and capacity building activities addressing rural education conditions for charter authorizer network. The application proposal demonstrates clear technical assistance activities to address shifting standards and accountability systems. The applicant proposes a comprehensive plan to provide technical assistance and support for quality authorizing efforts state-wide. The applicant provides universal and targeted technical assistance of nationally recognized best practices for quality authorizing based on the State legal contextual framework. For example, the applicant describes quality authorizing practices of universal technical assistance such as communication and collaboration, best practices dissemination, charter school partnerships, and case studies. Additionally, the applicant provides authorizers with an evaluative rubric to determine how well a charter school program addresses underserved student communities and financial accountability (e59, e64-e66).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. (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; and

Strengths:

The applicant provides appropriate input solicitation and consideration from parents and other members of the community. The applicant works collaboratively with partners on traditional and innovative communication methods. Additionally, the applicant presents input strategies of parental and community involvement for interviews and stakeholder meetings. For example, the applicant provides a parent and community involvement schedule to serve on the charter school site councils. The applicant specifies required family and community input on the implementation, operations, and establishment of new charter schools (e65-e67).

Weaknesses:

The application proposal would have been strengthened with detailed specificity on data use in a formative way for fidelity of the implementation and operations of quality charter schools (e67).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant proposes significant flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law. The applicant presents acceptable flexibility for inclusion of state and federal funding formula grant application. For example, the applicant creates flexibility for autonomous programs, educational delivery format, and hiring practices. The applicant presents a funding structure based on academic and financial goals during entire grant award period. Additionally, the applicant maintains flexibility with exclusive control over its expenditures, personnel, contracting services, budgets, and instructional methods. The applicant maximizes flexibility of the State's charter school law in funding charter school facilities. For example, the charter schools act allows charter schools to access the facility revolving loan program for building rent and working with public schools for unused facility space (e67-e68).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. d. Quality of the Management Plan

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. (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; and**

Strengths:

The applicant presents an adequate management plan with objectives, implementation activities, responsible party, and a timeline for the proposed project. The applicant aligns budget with the management of the proposed project. The applicant provides resumes of project personnel and key staff with relevant charter school qualifications, experience, and training to contribute to accomplishing project tasks. The applicant provides sufficient resources for project tasks. Additionally, the applicant identifies an annual process of program monitoring reviews, data collection systems, and charter school accountability reports of the proposed project (e68-e77).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provided letters of support for commitment, the application proposal could be stronger with a specific process of managing the coordinated relationships of authorizers and external partners for accomplishing proposed project's tasks (e68-e77).

Sub

Reader's Score: 9

2. (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project

Strengths:

The applicant provides appropriate procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement for the proposed project. The applicant reports on programmatic and operations feedback from diverse stakeholders. For example, the applicant solicits feedback from subgrantee applicants, peer reviewers, authorizers, and contractors. The applicant describes procedures on monitoring processes, peer reviewer training, technical assistance, and information dissemination to guide continuous improvement. For example, the applicant examines progress and identifies strengths to continuously improve in the operations of the proposed project (e69-e70).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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.

Strengths:

The applicant presents appropriate time commitments of the project director and other key personnel. The applicant includes details on percentage of time dedicated to meet proposed objectives. The applicant reports time commitment for each key project personnel such as the project director, primary program analyst, and secondary program analyst. For example, the assigned project director and other key personnel dedicate 100% of their time to the proposed project (e71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. CPP3 Competitive Preference Priority 3: Equitable Financing

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 addresses clear guidance for the State to ensure equitable financing to equalize funding charter schools with supplemental and concentration grants to address high-need students. The applicant presents the maintenance of home-to-school transportation and targeted instructional improvement block grant funding as add-ons to the adjusted base grants. These funding mechanisms and the alternate systems ensure charter schools receive funding on par with traditional public schools to address the realities and need for timely funding that exist for opening and operating a new

school. For example, the funding model for both non-charter public schools and charter schools underwent a major change with the implementation of the local control funding formula. The equitable financing reduces longstanding disparities in funding and improves outcomes for high-need students (e21-e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. CPP4 Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities

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 presents a strong process for the State to provide charter school facility programs to assist charter schools. The applicant assists charter schools at a fixed rate, long-term loans with favorable terms. In addition, the applicant proposes funds to finance construction of new, permanent school facilities, rehabilitation of existing school district facilities for charter schools, or rent school district facilities through option of private facility funding options. For example, the applicant addresses all the needs to assist in charter school facilities such as facilities revolving loan program, provision property exemption, and charter school pro-rate share of the facilities costs which the school offsets with unrestricted general funding (e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. CPP5 Competitive Preference Priority 5: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies

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 proposes a strong plan for the State to provide best practices to improve struggling schools and local educational agencies with incubator approaches. The applicant evaluates charter school settings focusing on outreach to homeless youth with mobile classrooms that deliver curriculum, health care, and personal care supports directly to

students. The applicant leverages technology and project-based charter school operating structures to address teacher shortages across the state and internationally. The applicant identifies alternative educational models and opportunities to serve diverse families and students. The project diverse models include peer to peer dissemination of best practices and inquiry-based learning to improve academic performance of educationally disadvantaged students at charter schools (e24-e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. CPP6 Competitive Preference Priority 6: Serving At-Risk Students

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 addresses serving at-risk students in collaboration with communities and families. The applicant articulates educational priorities such as dropout prevention and recovery, chronic absenteeism, credit recovery, student safety, graduation rate, and career counseling services for English learners and foster youth. For example, the applicant presents supplemental funding to support instructional activities and services for at-risk students such as hiring additional counselors, classroom assistants, bilingual aides, or on after school tutoring. The applicant allocates funds to support rigorous and innovative instruction in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged students (e27-e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. CPP7 Competitive Preference Priority 7: Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

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 addresses best practices for charter school authorizing oversight. The applicant tracks petitions as well as provides reminders to the petitioner and authorizer about pending renewal dates. The authorizer encourages participation of the sub-grantees monitoring process. The applicant emphasizes collaboration with charter authorizing support organizations such as the Charter Accountability Resource & Support Network to elevate nationally recognized standards for quality authorizing. For example, the applicant shares best practices for quality authorizing and the dissemination of standards (e29-e30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2020 08:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2020 04:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A200007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	34
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CPP6	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CPP7	4	4
Sub Total	16	16
Total	116	113

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - CSP State Entities - 10: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: CA Department of Education for the State Board of Education (S282A200007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. a. Quality of Project Design

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: 33

Sub

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

Strengths:

The project design provides several elements that will be addressed by the project (e31-e37). In addition to increasing the number of high-quality charter schools, the applicant will conduct other activities. These include: 1) addressing issues caused by the recent pandemic; 2) ensuring strategies for effective collaboration; 3) assisting struggling schools; and 4) supporting local educational agencies with significant numbers of charter schools. The supporting activities support each of the six elements listed above. The research-based logic model supports the rationale for the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (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; and

Strengths:

The applicant's narrative provides high-quality methods of evaluation that include objective performance measures (e32-e33). Each performance measure is aligned with objectives and activities. For example, the applicant will increase the number of high-quality charter schools with an emphasis on those serving educationally disadvantaged students by assisting 45 charter schools. Each of the performance measures are measured quantitatively. Specifically, the applicant proposes to: (1) increase in the number of high-quality charter schools; (2) increase enrollment opportunities for all students to attend high-quality schools; (3) decrease in the number of schools eligible to receive continuous support; (4) increase access and support for disadvantaged student subgroups attending the state's charter school; (5) improve academic achievement statewide assessments in English/language arts(ELA) and mathematics; and (6) increase consistent charter authorizer review of charter school petitions and standardization of oversight practices. The applicant includes qualitative measures such as local assessments that include parent surveys and school climate surveys. Additionally, the applicant provides annual reports on each of

Sub

the objectives.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

3. (3) The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entities program

Strengths:

The narrative describes how each objective is attainable (e39-e44). For example, a goal of the program is to strengthen the quality of the "quality standards of charter school authorizers." These goals are supported by activities that make the goal attainable. These activities include the following: (1) conducting a needs assessment to identify areas for improvement and tailor technical assistance to those needs; (2) developing tools and resources aligned with identified areas for improvement and grounded state standards; (3) training sponsors on tools and resources through in-person and virtual training sessions; and (4) providing one-on-one consultation with sponsors. Objectives are tied to project activities and are proposed to ensure the success of the overall project.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear from the narrative how ambitious the goals are because no baseline data are given. For example, the goal of providing technical assistance to 50% of charter school authorizers is difficult to evaluate because we don't know: (1) how many charter school authorizers are in the state, or (2) what percentage of charter school authorizers may have received technical assistance in previous years.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

1. b. Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants

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

Strengths:

The plan is comprehensive to ensure that high-quality eligible subgrant applicants are selected (e48-e54). For example, the applicant supports diverse charter school models that are based upon a strong foundation of research or evidence and will meet the direct needs of the communities they will serve. In addition to using existing resources and community partnerships, the applicant presents an exhaustive plan for advertising and promotion to gather applications. Additionally, the applicant will hold technical assistance workshops prior to applications becoming due. The applicant will conduct these workshops in collaboration with its quality management organization to discuss the application and review processes and timeline. Applications will be evaluated and scored for eligibility using program criteria to examine management, budget, timelines for activities, and other critical factors. These criteria align with US Department of Education criteria for state applications.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. c. State Plan

The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 34

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant's plan is solid for monitoring eligible applicants that receive subgrants (e54-e58). Specifically, the plan includes program monitoring (desk and on-site) and fiscal monitoring through the quality management organization. For example, financial reports will be monitored to ensure funds are being spent in eligible cost categories to meet the educational needs of students. Additionally, the charter management organization will assist in the financial management responsibility of the grant by tracking the allocation of allowable expenses eligible for reimbursement and review of quarterly subgrantee reimbursement requests. The applicant intends to sustain its monitoring throughout the administration and awarding of subgrants. Monitoring is extensive to include such areas as review of governance structure and recruitment practices. Staff prepare a post-monitoring response to the school indicating any findings of non-compliance with statutory grant goals and objectives and payments are halted until findings are remedied. In this way, risks are identified quickly and promptly.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The narrative is solid for addressing this criterion (e58-e59). For example, the applicant will partner with regional systems to create efficiencies for charter school subgrantees participating in other programs. This includes contacting personnel in the areas where charter applications will be advertised so that there is no duplication of programs. This will be an ongoing activity to avoid duplication.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) Provide technical assistance and support for--

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

Sub

ii. **Quality authorizing efforts in the State;**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a high-quality plan for providing technical assistance and support to eligible applicants (e59-e64). Technical assistance is provided based on level of need and experience. For example, for entities exploring charters, a recorded webinar on best practices to start a charter school. A comprehensive list of technical assistance opportunities is provided in the narrative to include assistance to schools in danger of closure. Technical assistance is targeted to schools that use online platforms; charter schools that have expanded; and charter schools that are replicated.

The narrative is solid for demonstrating quality authorizing efforts in the state (e59-e64). Assistance can be universal or targeted, depending on the needs of the authorizer. For example, universal technical assistance includes trainings, information, guidance, and presentations. Targeted assistance includes contracting with subject matter experts and workshops. The applicant's plan serves all chartering agencies. For example, a technical assistance plan is targeted to strengthen the Rural Charter Authorizer Network.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. (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; and**

Strengths:

The narrative is provided to describe how the applicant will solicit input from stakeholders (e65-e67). For example, charters schools must have school site councils to include parent members. Additionally, parent signatures are required along with the charter school application to ensure support of the charter school opening. The applicant provides the frequency and schedule of parent meetings and activities.

Weaknesses:

The narrative would be strengthened by a discussion of how parent data would be used. Aside from gathering parent and stakeholder signatures, it is unclear how the information is used to influence the implementation and operation of charter schools.

Reader's Score: 4

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**

Strengths:

The narrative is of high quality and demonstrates that the state's charter school law provides flexibility to charter schools (e67-e68). For example, charter schools are generally operated by non-profit corporations or operate as single, stand-alone schools, with their own governing boards thus having their own oversight. Additionally, charter schools also maintain total control over contracting for services, managing expenditures, and budgeting. These examples of autonomy allow for flexibility in management.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. d. Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

- 1. (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; and**

Strengths:

The applicant describes a solid management plan to operate the project (e68-e78). The plan includes milestones, timelines, and persons responsible for each task. The project includes the positions and responsibilities. For example, the plan includes a division director, project director, regional supports, and a fiscal analyst. Within each position, specific responsibilities are outlined. Key project personnel have qualifications that support the project activities and ensure the project's success. For example, the fiscal analyst will prepare sub-grantee grant award and reimbursement payment packages; (2) verify and track DUNS number, System for Award Management accounts, and nonprofit status for all applicants and sub-grantees; (3) process approved quarterly claims for sub-grants and contractors; and (4) track claim and payment amounts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The narrative sufficiently describes a process for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement (page e69-e72). Specifically, the applicant describes continuous discussions among staff and stakeholders for the program. For example, sub-grantees, peer reviewers, authorizers, and contractors will be solicited for feedback on processes surrounding the following: (1) the implementation of the action plan, including site monitoring processes; (2) quality review processes; (3) peer reviewer training and scoring, delivery of technical assistance to sub-grantees; (4) best practices workshop delivery to charter schools and authorizers; and (5) the delivery of information to stakeholders.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

- 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes the responsibilities of the project director and other key personnel (e76-78). For example, the project director will (1) submit all required reports to the US Department of Education; (2) communicate current activity to the charter school division director; (3) review award and reimbursement payment packages prior to the Division Director approval; (4) track grant budget expenditures; and (5) participate in US Department of Education scheduled monitoring calls. Time commitments are provide and appear adequate to meet the goals and objectives of the grant. For example, the division director, the project director and the regional supports are 100% time commitments to the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. CPP3 Competitive Preference Priority 3: Equitable Financing

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's narrative clearly describes how state funding is allocated to the charter school systems (e21-e23). Specifically, the charter school receives a per pupil allocation similar to other public school along with other appropriations allocated by specific formulas. The locally controlled formula funding (LCFF) also provides a benefit to charter schools through unrestricted funding (e23). Additionally, funds are added to the base to account for other measures such as serving high percentages of disadvantaged students. Funds are allocated prior to September 30th of each year.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. CPP4 Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities

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 solid narrative for this indicator (e24-e27). Specifically, the applicant has state law that allows financial resources for funding sources for facilities. Specifically, state law requires that school districts make available to all charter schools operating in their school district with projections of at least 80 units of ADA, a space that is "reasonably equivalent" to other classrooms, buildings, or facilities in the district (e24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. CPP5 Competitive Preference Priority 5: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies

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 provides an expansive narrative to explain best practices to improve struggling schools and local educational agencies (e24-e27). Support is leveled through tiers with tier 1 receiving general assistance; tier 2 receiving differentiated assistance provided by specific organizations; and tier 3 receiving intense assistance. Additionally, the applicant provides support to schools by sharing of best practices. This includes peer to peer dissemination of best practices to charter schools and authorizers such as Inquiry Based Learning to improve academic performance in ELA and mathematics.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. CPP6 Competitive Preference Priority 6: Serving At-Risk Students

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 provides a solid explanation of how it will serve at-risk students (e27-e29). The applicant identifies how it will serve state priority groups to target dropout prevention and recovery, chronic absenteeism, credit recovery, student safety, graduation rate, career counseling services, and support for ELs, and foster youth. Additional funding is provided to support at-risk groups.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. CPP7 Competitive Preference Priority 7: Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

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 narrative is solid to describe a robust charter school authorizing system (e29-e30). The state system provides a system to ensure that charters and authorizers are informed of processes. For example, the applicant tracks petition start and end dates, providing reminders to the petitioner and authorizer about pending renewal dates. All authorizers are informed of charter schools awarded CSP grant funds. The authorizers are notified and encouraged to participate in the sub-grantees' monitoring process. These are best practices for charter school authorizing and will have impact on the program's success as the applicant will use funds to publish and disseminate quality authorizing standards that address critical areas such as performance contracting, renewal decisions, revocation application processes and decision making, and oversight monitoring (e78).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2020 04:53 PM

Technical Review Form

Reader: CSP Staff
Applicant: California Department of Education (S282A200007)

Total CPP1 and CPP2 Score **2**

Competitive Preference Priority 1: Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; and**
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

Note: In responding to this priority, an applicant is encouraged to explain how it will encourage prospective subgrantees to open, replicate, or expand one or more charter schools in a Qualified Opportunity Zone and how that might align to the application requirement response for (I)(C)(i).

Strengths:

No strengths found.

Weaknesses:

Although, the applicant plans to target technical assistance to low performing charter schools in areas that include Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZs) and plans to focus on opening new charter schools in QOZs. (e20) The applicant did not provide the census tracts of the QOZs in which it plans to provide services and therefore does not meet part [a] of this competitive preference priority. Both [a] and [b] must be met to receive points under this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 2: One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a LEA, or an Appeals Process

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

- a) Provides for one authorized public chartering agency that is not an LEA, such as a State chartering board, for each individual or entity seeking to operate a charter school pursuant to State law; or
- b) In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, allows for 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 appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Strengths:

The applicant meets [b] as there is an appeals process if the applicant is denied or non-renewed by the local school district to appeal to the county board of education. If denied by the county board of education the applicant may appeal to the State Board of Education. (e21)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2