

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2022 02:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Holla School (S282B220006)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	29
Sub Total	40	29
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	20	15
Sub Total	20	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	30
Sub Total	40	39
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Developers New Panel - 3: 84.282B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Holla School (S282B220006)

Questions

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 29

Sub

1. (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The school will be open (epage 10), and the management plan will carry the work of the school forward over the next three years. The responsibilities of the key personnel are discussed and provided. (p.9-12)

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not provide the necessary clarity on how the school will develop over the three years. While the work for Grade 3 academics is noted (p 353) there is not reference to the work to prepare for Grade 4, which would be in the context of the timeline for this CSP grant, nor for Grade 5, which would be outside the timeline of this grant. The milestones for accomplishing projects tasks are unclear and not listed on a chart or table with any specificity behind the plan provided for the pre-operational year (p165-171` of the charter application). The information provided in the actual charter submissions to Reynolds was helpful in understanding the CSP application, there was not enough updated information in the submitted management plan to understand what updates and other changes the school may have made based on their work during the pre-operational year. While Rockford School District will provide special education services (p.122 of charter application) the extent and specificity of those services is lacking.

Reader's Score: 6

2. (ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(f)(2)(iv))

Strengths:

The costs outlined in the budget narrative (epage 353-355) are clear and specific. The budget narrative provides the necessary details. 46.1 percent of the funds are directed at direct services to students through personnel (Personnel, part of Contractual, the Social Worker, and the Healthcare Worker.) 37.8 percent are directed toward clearly needed and appropriate start-up costs (i.e., facility research and improvements, and equipment and supplies) that will benefit students both in the short and long-term. This represents almost 84 percent of the funds requested for this CSP proposal. The funding will ensure the students will have what they need when school opens this fall.

Sub

Given that the Executive Director has previously served for an extended period of time on another charter school board in Oregon (epage 76), as well as the benefit of the partnership with Charter School Capital (epage 253-255), provide significant confidence that the school’s budget and the costs outlined in the CSP grant will be reasonable and conservative as it relates to the execution of the grant.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear whether the time allocation for the School Administrator/Educational Consultant, the Program Director, and the Instructional Climate Coach will be enough allow them to execute on the objectives under the CSP grant, as well as carry out the other, significant management tasks they will be responsible for in managing and leading the new school. Also, the plans for staff growth over time is potentially too thin (i.e., not enough adults to support students as the school grows). Lastly, no costs seem to be planned for to ensure professional development for the board and leadership team.

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))**

Strengths:

Based on the budget narrative (epage 353-355) the Program Director will be dedicating 6 hours a week to the project management of the CSP grant. In addition, the Program Director’s work will be supplemented by a “Charter School Specialist” who will assist with the grant project and reporting. Lastly, the grant includes funding to support an evaluation of the school’s work. All of this should be more than adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

The amount of time and funding dedicated to support the work of the Program Director and the Charter School Specialist in this area may be too high when those funds and dedicated personnel would be better targeted at serving students. Also, there was no timeline for getting all of the staff through the professional development training, particularly related to the new curriculum, which is so core to the school’s work.

Reader's Score: 3

- 4. (iv) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))**

Strengths:

The school’s application is particularly strong in this area. The overall team has deep experience in education, and deep expertise in building the type of academic program designed to significantly improve the academic outcomes for BIPOC students in a low-income community like Rockwood. The Executive Director’s work at HOLLA provides important experience around serving students in need. In addition, his extensive service on a charter school board will provide important insights into how a high-quality charter public school should be managed. The bios (p.76-79) and resumes (epages 375-382) for the rest of the team speak to a long-standing commitment to serving low-income students of color. In addition, the diversity of experiences in education (i.e., teaching and management, developing programs, special education, etc.) demonstrate the depth of knowledge and expertise the team will bring to this work.

Sub

Weaknesses:

The school's application lays out clearly the challenge around literacy for the students in Rockwood. The application spends considerable time focused on how the school will go about improving literacy outcomes for students. Additional and explicitly stated expertise among the key personnel in K-2 reading and an explicit track record of improving literacy at those grade levels is missing. In addition, none of the key personnel have had experience in managing a previous CSP grant. Lastly, there was a lack of clarity on who would actually execute the financial/operations work for the school, who would be the school's lead on special education (although the district will be providing services), and who would be the school's lead to operationalize the ELL systems for ELL students given the language diversity in this geographic area.

Reader's Score: 3

5. (v) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds is more than adequate. The partnership with Charter School Capital (epages 253-255) will provide important assistance to the school in managing their overall budget, including the funding from the CSP program. In addition, the Executive Director's track record as a CEO of HOLLA and his experience in managing other grants from that organization (epage 76) provide assurances that the CSP grant funds will be managed well.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

6. (vi) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Given the strength of the education team, the leadership of the Executive Director with the pre-existing organization, and the additional partnerships and personnel that will support the grant, The applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions is more than adequate. There is a clear statement from the district about the autonomy of the school. (epage 321) and that application notes that it is an independent charter (p.45).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

7. (vii) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to administer or supervise the administration of the grant, including maintaining management and oversight responsibilities over the grant (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

The grant will be well managed and will received proper oversight based on the budget narrative (epage 353-355) the Project Director will be dedicating 6 hours a week to the project management of the CSP grant. In addition, the Project Director's work will be supplemented by the Charter School Specialist, who will assist with the grant project and reporting. The grant's inclusion of funding for an evaluation report at the end of the grant further demonstrates the commitment to accountability by the applicant.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No one on the current team has previously managed a federal grant. The accounting and financial systems plans as outlined in the application are not as clear as is needed. For example the school references that it “may” use Quickbooks (epage 241), but leaves the system issue unresolved. The Risk Management section (epage 242) needed to be more encompassing of the financial, legal and other risks that the school may face. The application does not provide clarity as to who will serve as the key operations person for the school. There is no indication who will manage the school’s basic financial work (i.e., payroll, reporting, audit, etc.) or if these processes will be outsourced and to whom.

Reader's Score: 3

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The five year budget presented in the charter petition seems reasonable and thoughtful. Here again the support by Charter School Capital (epage 253-255) provides confidence in the budget projections and the ability of the school to continue its work beyond the three years of the CSP grant. The deep connections with community groups (epage 250-267) will certainly provide support as the school continues to operate beyond the scope of this CSP grant. Despite the overall decline in the number of K-12 students that is happening across the country and particularly in our cities like Portland, HOLLA has found an area where they will be able to attract students particularly for the type of new option they are providing for parents. (epage 15-17)

Weaknesses:

In this case, there wasn’t much evidence given for why the number of kindergarteners would double in the 2025-2026 school year (p.38 of grant application). In addition, there was no plan regarding seeking out additional philanthropic or other funds after the grant is completed. Assuming the applicant will want to continue some of the services listed in the budget narrative (i.e., social worker, healthcare worker, etc.) there is no clear plan on how those services will continue. Lastly, it is unclear if the Executive Director will have to balance raising funds for the original HOLLA organization and the new HOLLA public charter school. Lastly, this is a relatively small school at 160 students. It is unclear if that small number of students will allow the school to be sustainable over the longer term (i.e., beyond the scope of the requested CSP grant.)

Reader's Score: 15

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))

Strengths:

A key project component/objective the establishment of this new charter public school is to have a culturally responsive and sustaining pedagogy and school culture for BIPOC students that includes ensuring all the school's personnel, but especially the teachers, receive the necessary culturally responsive professional development. The charter application attached to this grant application provides an incredibly in-depth description of HOLLA's educational philosophy and model (p.45-51) In addition, the charter application includes a very detailed set of academic references both in the document as well as at the end (p.147-151). It is clear that the key curricular and academic components of the school are informed by recent research on interventions that will better serve BIPOC students and help improve the academic and life outcomes for BIPOC students. The proposed project demonstrates a clear rationale.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The logic model (p.50) provides a clear outline of key goals, objectives and outcomes that the school is hoping to accomplish generally with the help of the CSP grant funding. In addition, the charter application in Exhibit B (epages 349-351) provides a clear Student Performance Plan for the 2022-2023 school year. Both of these documents indicate that the school has chosen detailed metrics for success for their students. The metrics are clear and measurable (assuming that Oregon's state assessment system remains in place).

Weaknesses:

There are some gaps related to the measurability of the metrics for the CSP grant. There were not enough specifics about both the program evaluation and the website buildout, to items called for in the budget narrative (epages 353-355). In addition, while most of the other objectives and outcomes outlined in the budget narrative are relatively measurable, they are not specific enough. The fund balance at year 5 (epage 294) is lower than should be expected after five years of operation.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(i))

Sub

Strengths:

The magnitude and severity of the challenge that HOLLA is taking on is enormous and compelling. The student academic achievement data on page 11-12 of the CSP proposal and p 18-19 of the charter submission are appalling. In particular, if the data for Black students is correct, there is a clear and compelling need for new, much higher academic and educational options for parents and students. The application also provides compelling data on student discipline and retention (p.41-42) that also makes the case for the need for a new option in this community.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

The application provides a compelling case for a need for new high quality school option(epage 22-24) such as HOLLA. Based on the evidence provide, the applicant makes a strong case that their curriculum, the additional mentoring for students, and the additional social, health, and other supports combined in a new, innovative way will provide the families in Rockford with a new, effective educational option for parents.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Promoting High-Quality Educator and Community-Centered Charter Schools to Support Underserved Students. (Up to 5 points).

1.Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators (0 or 1 point); and

2.Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development of the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties. (Up to 2 points).

In its application, an applicant must provide a high-quality plan that demonstrates how its proposed project would meet the requirements in paragraph (a) of this priority, accompanied by a timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school. (Up to 2 points).

Strengths:

The HOLLA school is a new charter public school that will begin serving students this month in the geography east of Portland, OR. The school was launched out of a successful, pre-existing, community-based education services nonprofit (HOLLA) designed to provide mentoring and other services to students. Their deep connection to the community deeply

informed the development of this new school.(p.1) The organization is moving into the charter sector because of the feedback they received from the community.(p.2) The organization conducted a wide array of activities (e.g., BBQs, focus groups, surveys, etc.) to gauge community interest in the new charter public school.(p. 4-5) They also involved a number of other individuals, organizations, and businesses in the development and support of the new school.(p.6 and see p.383-390 of letters of support and Appendix B in charter petition). The founders include two teachers coming from the Portland Public Schools (p.1 and see pages 376 and 378 for resumes of founders).

The founders of the new school have performed a strong analysis of the geographic area where the school has been founded in Rockwood. Because of their pre-existing connections to the community and the clear support for community, school district and state organizations (p.383-390 of letters of support in charter petition), it seems clear that the school will continue to access those community supports and can be expected to grow them over time. The explicit inclusion of a Family Advisory Council (p.6-7) demonstrates the inclusive approach the school's leaders intend to use in approaching their work with students and the community. The proposal outlines the ongoing connections with Mudbone Grown, Warner Pacific University, and Summerworks (p21-22). The support from the Reynolds School District #7, which has experience in working with other charter schools, demonstrates the new school's connection to the larger education community.

The application provides significant evidence about the need for a new charter public school that will provide higher quality education opportunities for low-income students and students of color. (p.23-24 and p.17-20 of the charter petition). The Pre-Operational Plan is provided on p.164-171 of the charter petition. Assuming the school is on track to open this fall with 71 students, the school would seemingly have executed against "the timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school."

Weaknesses:

No recognized weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/24/2022 02:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/23/2022 04:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Holla School (S282B220006)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	29
Sub Total	40	29
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	20	15
Sub Total	20	15
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	30
Sub Total	40	39
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Developers New Panel - 3: 84.282B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Holla School (S282B220006)

Questions

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 29

Sub

1. (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The application presents an overall coherent and comprehensive plan for the management of the project, and a robust timeline of planned activities including responsible parties.

Weaknesses:

The special education programmatic planning and staffing model for the school is underdeveloped in the application and lacks clarity regarding key responsibilities and outcomes (e.g., no indication that any school personnel will hold training or certification in special education) (pp. 53, 190-191)

Reader's Score: 7

2. (ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(f)(2)(iv))

Strengths:

The overall grant budget is robust, and articulates reasonable expenses aligned to the elements of the application and the school's overall plan.

Weaknesses:

Within grant budget, not all requested/budgeted supplies (e.g. and especially consumables) have supporting rationale – these appear to be reasonable but are difficult to fully assess based on the limited information provided in the application . (pp. 353-364)

Reader's Score: 3

3. (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))

Sub

Strengths:

The application provides both a staffing plan for the school, and specific to the application for funds.

Weaknesses:

Assertions are made in the application regarding the adequacy of staffing and clarity of role delineation between CSP Project Manager, Consultants, and Administrators, but a detailed assessment of this plan cannot be made based on the materials as presented (pp. 19-21)

Reader's Score: 3

4. (iv) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210€(3)(ii))

Strengths:

The application presents an overall strong school management team, though it is unclear based on the presented information whether any individual named in the application has prior experience with receiving and managing federal grants.

Weaknesses:

Additional clarity regarding partnership with Charter School Capital, including supports in establishing financial policies and operational procedures, would be beneficial in assessing adequacy of the overall and grant-specific financial management plan. (pp. 241)

Reader's Score: 3

5. (v) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Core elements of a strong financial management plan with respect to prospective CSP funds are articulated in the application materials, with processes and timelines identified for completion. Grant funds will remain under the control of the applicant – no evidence of any district or other third party interference. (pp. 34-36)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

6. (vi) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

The application (pp. 57-60) and the included charter school contract agreement both articulate a relationship between the district authorizer and the school that conforms to the definition of charter school established under ESEA and other applicable federal/state laws.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

7. (vii) The adequacy of the applicant’s plan to administer or supervise the administration of the grant, including maintaining management and oversight responsibilities over the grant (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

The application presents a robust budget and plan for use of funds, which provides a sufficient and solid foundation for management and administration of funds.

Weaknesses:

Significant portions of the school’s financial controls & risk mitigation policies are not yet in place, or are not presented within the applicant’s submission; materials indicate that these policies will be adopted at various times, including during the grant performance period. (pp. 240-241)

Heavy reliance on the Board of Trustees, and in particular the Board Treasurer, to play a significant role in developing and managing the financial aspects of the school (budget, audits, policy development and execution) (pp. 241-242)

As noted earlier, the application as presented is unclear with respect to the delineation of roles and responsibilities with respect to staff level oversight of school finances, including grant funding.

Reader's Score: 3

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant’s application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

- The application demonstrates a through, deep, and thoughtful alignment of mission, community and stakeholder feedback, and school model design (pp. 43-49)
- A strong leadership team for the school is in place, both with deep commitment to the school’s mission and significant demonstrated expertise that would support the effective operations of the school, and further development of the school’s design. (pp. 76-78)

Weaknesses:

- Risk management plan (pp. 242) focuses solely on insurance coverages, and insufficiently discusses other potential forms of risk to the school, and how these risks may be mitigated or otherwise addressed.
- Long term enrollment projections (p. 300, e.g. and especially in Y5 of the initial charter contract term) presented in the application may not align with budget and staff headcount/FTE model developed elsewhere in the application materials
 - o The scale/growth model of the proposed school is not clear. Specifically, the budget narrative assumptions include addition of 6th grade, while references in the application to remaining in start-up phase until completion of growth to 5th grade [p.27]).
 - o Separately, the application is unclear the extent to which the school’s enrollment plans align with student population trends in the targeted communities (e.g., birth rates, student mobility, etc) (pp. 12-16)
- Key budgetary assumptions (FTE/headcount + salary growth, p. 298) may not be reasonably developed or aligned with planned school growth model. Rationale for budgetary assumptions is insufficient to assess the degree to which these are reasonable and based on prudent financial planning, vs tied to projections of available resources (i.e.,

costs appear to have been scaled down to avoid showing a projected deficit during the project period)

- - o Specifically, concerns exist regarding the adequacy of planned growth in staff salaries/benefits (2.5% annual growth in salary, which is sub-inflationary and unlikely to keep pace with teacher labor market trends), as well as the staffing plan (+1 additional teacher FTE per year, with no planned increases in staffing levels for non-instructional components of the school) (pp. 287 – 300)
- Uncertainty/lack of firm long-term school facility (pp. 227-230) – The school has a one-year secured lease, and has identified prospects and team engaged on longer-term location needs (as appropriate), but nothing is presented as secured or finalized beyond Y1 of operation.

Reader's Score: 15

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 the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))**

Strengths:

Rigorous and appropriate performance objectives and outcomes are identified, both for the overall school and specific to the CSP proposal (pp. 353 – 363)– there is a clear connection developed between the proposed activities and grant outcomes.

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))**

Strengths:

The school's proposed academic and instructional goals (pp. 182-185) are clearly articulated, ambitious, and would represent substantial progress when compared to the presented data on current student outcomes among the school's targeted community and student population (pp. 23-24).

Weaknesses:

The school's proposed financial goals and outcomes may not be sufficient to sustain operations, in particular the 5% contingency/fund balance reserve (pp. 30, 291), given the low annual operating budget margins (p. 294).

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The applicant presented robust and well-articulated perspective on the educational challenges faced by Black, Indigenous, and other People Of Color (BIPOC) students in East Multnomah County/Portland (pp. 15-17)

The application demonstrates strong alignment across all aspects of the school's design model, to the identified target community and the priorities identified through engagement with community stakeholders (pp. 96-103)

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

- The applicant presents a strong, evidence-informed instructional model, tailored to address the unique and diverse educational circumstances of the school's targeted student population, and with broad applicability to meet the needs of all students. (pp. 42-49)
- The application includes targeted and articulated statement of the school's mission, vision, aligned to a robust assessment of the challenges faced in the targeted communities of interest (both geographic and with respect to BIPOC identity) (pp. 23-24, 182-185)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Promoting High-Quality Educator and Community-Centered Charter Schools to Support Underserved Students. (Up to 5 points).

1. Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators (0 or 1 point); and

2. Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development of the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties. (Up to 2 points).

In its application, an applicant must provide a high-quality plan that demonstrates how its proposed project would meet the requirements in paragraph (a) of this priority, accompanied by a timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school. (Up to 2 points).

Strengths:

- The applicant provided evidence of extensive and robust engagement of educators and community members demonstrated in the application, with a particular focus on BIPOC and other targeted student/family demographic groups in the local community. (pp. 13-19)
- The applicant clearly articulated how input from the community groups directly informed all aspects of the charter school's programmatic model and instructional design. (pp. 13-19)
- The applicant provides information current and prospective partnerships with community-based organizations articulated throughout the proposal (pp. 33-34)
- The application clearly and directly connects input from community assets and stakeholders, with core elements of the school design (pp. 72-75, 96-103), and incorporates robust structures for ongoing maintenance of strong community ties and voice in all facets of the school's operations (pp. 223-225)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/23/2022 04:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2022 08:05 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Holla School (S282B220006)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	34
Sub Total	40	34
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	20	17
Sub Total	20	17
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	30
Sub Total	40	39
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Developers New Panel - 3: 84.282B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Holla School (S282B220006)

Questions

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 34

Sub

1. (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The school included in incredibly thorough timeline of tasks (subpage 165-171), in clear alignment with budget (unnumbered PDF page 288-300) and mission. The school also included roles for partner organizations, the district, and the board as well (p 21).

Weaknesses:

The timeline of tasks (subpage 165-171) could include more specific role responsibility assignments aligned to project team members, though roles are identified elsewhere with less specificity. I am most curious, for example, about who will be participating in the professional development and curriculum development experiences.

Reader's Score: 8

2. (ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(f)(2)(iv))

Strengths:

The provided budget (unnumbered subpage 288-300) is reasonable, identifying all necessary activities of a high quality school.

Weaknesses:

Budget could include clear professional development allotment for board, authorizer, and leader as well as staff (unnumbered subpage 288-300).

Reader's Score: 4

3. (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))

Sub

Strengths:

The budget identifies costs around the project manager's time and work (unnumbered PDF page 353-354), and the narrative outlines work to be completed in alignment with school's mission.

Weaknesses:

My concern is that the plan (subpages 165-171) may not include enough time for professional development of all staff prior to the school's opening, given the vast amount of learning around the rich research and curriculum the school will be using (as outlined on subpages 45-111).

Reader's Score: 4

4. (iv) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210€(3)(ii))

Strengths:

The qualifications meet and exceed the needed experience (p 1 and PDF page 375-382), and include a diverse team of skillsets, including non-teaching, community-connected mentors.

Weaknesses:

The concern would be just generally that schools need to have a strong succession plan for onboarding new leaders as the founders will eventually step down. The staffing chart does not explicitly include an articulation of SPED and ELL teachers (subpages 140-142).

Reader's Score: 4

5. (v) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant includes robust authorizer accountability over funds and implementation of design (p 22-24) as well as a statement of assurances over CSP controls (p 8). They also include an audit expectation for themselves (p 23 and elsewhere).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

6. (vi) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Contract with authorizer is included in the application and includes statement of autonomy (PDF unnumbered page 320-347) (specifically page 321).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

7. (vii) The adequacy of the applicant’s plan to administer or supervise the administration of the grant, including maintaining management and oversight responsibilities over the grant (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Administrative work is satisfactorily outlined in the budget of the project manager (unnumbered PDF page 353-356).

Weaknesses:

The school alludes to a financial management system but did not clearly describe who would manage it, which system, and the policies it would follow.

Reader's Score: 4

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant’s application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The school has a very strong foundation with clear mission and pillars of practice (pages 17-20). School also has strong support from the authorizing district (pages 22-24). Both considerations are assets to set up schools for long term success and support. The community partnerships and connection to an existing organization are also huge assets to its continuation and sustainability in the community (page 8).

Weaknesses:

School does not seem to have articulated a strong succession plan for when founding leaders step away. The 5-year budget (p 288-300) would be stronger if it factored in ongoing professional development allocations for leaders and teachers (factoring in new staff, turnover, additional grade-level sections, ongoing needs, etc.). Addition of additional kindergarten section in enrollment chart (p. 37-38) alludes to future growth planning, but it is not clear.

Reader's Score: 17

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 the following factors:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))

Sub

Strengths:

The project identifies an abundance of rationale (p. 27) including local data (subpage 18), community data (subpage 29-32), curricular resources available (subpage 40-42), academic research (subpage 45-111, specifically 50-51) -- all of which point very directly to the school's design. The research and practices which are rooted in need are very intentionally aligned.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The school presents a strong logic model (subpage 50), and academic performance measures (subpage 117-119). The overall goal of the school is very clearly rooted in its philosophy and carries clearly into the actions the school will take.

Weaknesses:

The goal stating "financial growth" on subpage 50 could be more clearly articulated. I also wonder what long term story-telling tools your school will implement to track your social change - such as graduation, employment, entrepreneurs, college graduation, etc. (subpage 117-119).

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The applicant clearly defines the local demographics, the changes in student and community make-up and an articulation of unique student group needs (subpage 16-20). The proposal defined the relevant research (subpage 30-37) and how they plan to include the findings of the research in their implementation. The applicant also outlines the historical need for this school design (subpage 9-13).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

The school presented strong articulation of need for their services in the community and with the targeted population (p 14-16). The charter school is a strong and logical next step to build on the strong community supports and district need.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Promoting High-Quality Educator and Community-Centered Charter Schools to Support Underserved Students. (Up to 5 points).

1. Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators (0 or 1 point); and

2. Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development of the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties. (Up to 2 points).

In its application, an applicant must provide a high-quality plan that demonstrates how its proposed project would meet the requirements in paragraph (a) of this priority, accompanied by a timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school. (Up to 2 points).

Strengths:

The school identified engagement with their local district and educators from their community (p1-5), for whom they provided resumes as well (p375-382). The school also articulated their role in the community through engagement events and stakeholders (p 26-27). The school has a strong component of FUBU (for us by us) for their BIPOC community. The school also has a clear timeline of activities (subpage 165-171).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/24/2022 08:05 AM

