

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2022 07:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lawndale Educational And Regional Network Charter School (S282E220001)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	18
Sub Total	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	35
Sub Total	35	35
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	9
Sub Total	10	9
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	8
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	33
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Developers Replication Panel - 1: 84.282E

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Lawndale Educational And Regional Network Charter School (S282E220001)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

(i) LEARN reports outpacing the national rates of college attainment with the vast majority of its students coming from low-income background, which suggests even greater impact they are having, p. e24. The application demonstrates greater success with students across several educationally disadvantaged subgroups as compared with the state and their comparable district as evidenced by the table on p. e27.

Weaknesses:

(i) One gap is noted in comparing LEARN with the state and their comparable district: LEARN has a lower percentage of students with IEPs and is not demonstrating success with said students at the same rate other subgroups of students are performing, p. e28.

Reader's Score: 3

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

There are no material deficiencies presented in charter regulatory compliance, p. e30.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for this subfactor.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

There are no material financial, operational management, or student safety deficiencies, p. e30.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for this subfactor.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (iv) The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The organization reports significant success on the state 5Essentials and has earned "an above average rating on four of the five essentials," p. e32

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for this subfactor.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

1. (i) 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: 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 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Sub

Strengths:

LEARN has sufficient infrastructure in place to support this proposed 39.5% growth in student population at LEARN 9 as evidenced by the size of the organization, positions staffed, and successful years of operation, p. e34.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

Reader's Score: 5

- 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 of [REDACTED] per pupil per year is reasonable considering the various expenditures associated with running a school. The application successfully demonstrates that and how those funds are to be allocated, p. e37.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

Reader's Score: 5

- 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:

The budgeted amount of time committed to the expansions is well disbursed across network and school staff to ensure feasibility of meeting growth objectives, p. e38. The applicant allocates between 10-20% of key personnel time to the grant depending on their role.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

Reader's Score: 5

- 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 application shows strengths in that key personnel resumes indicate significant and relevant experience, with quantifiable positive results, across several team members, p. e39.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The application is successful in demonstrating its ability to maintain control over all CSP grant funds. LEARN reports successful experience with managing prior CSP grants and, given their infrastructure, has provided evidence that they are able to meet criteria v-vii of this section., p. e42.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

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 this application concerning an expansion, the applicant's demonstrated history of success with the school program already at LEARN 9 is sufficient evidence of the plan to make all programmatic decisions. The applicant notes that "many of the programmatic decisions have already been made," p. e42.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

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 applicant adequately describes their plan to administer the grant. Applicant has successful experience in doing so with 2010 and 2015 CSP as well as other federal grants, p. e43.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

Reader's Score: 5

Quality of the Continuation Plan - 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 percentage and pace of student growth and expenses is low enough for the LEARN network to easily absolve costs and operational realities in their existing infrastructure once the grant funds are no longer available. LEARN also has a solid S&P rating to give further support to this assertion, p. e45.

Weaknesses:

The noted area of improvement in this section is that LEARN reports maintain "at least 3 months of cash on hand," which is the lower end of generally accepted financial principles, p. e45.

Reader's Score: 9

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: 8

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:

The applicant successfully describes some rationale for this project and demonstrates that it “substantially outperforms demographically similar students in (their comparable school district),” p. e47.

Weaknesses:

The application could be better supported by citing the research it is referencing to develop and design this project, p. e47. Expanding seats has the potential to decrease feasibility of achieving these ambitious college attainment goals. LEARN already outpaces the national average of college attainment and significantly outpaces that rate for minority students. Additional widening of that gap is extremely ambitious, even if necessary to ensure more students have stronger outcomes.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

Goals are sufficiently specific and measurable, beginning on p. e48. Goals are feasibly attainable with the strategic effort outlined throughout the application. Goals serve the overall intent and target population of the grant. For example, the applicant aims for a 19% increase in college attainment by 2035. The self-identified short- and mid-term outcomes are highly attainable and serve a key need, p. 56

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this subfactor.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Need for the Project

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) 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: (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:

LEARN adequately demonstrates with data the critical community need for additional high-quality seats for low-income and minority students. The application asserts that there are "limited high quality school options" in their city, p. e59.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

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 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

The project successfully addresses a large portion of the need given that "246 K-8th grade students have applied that cannot be accommodated," p. e60 This expansion aims to add 170 seats equating to more than half of the gap present.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this factor.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

- (1) The application shows strength in attempting ongoing engagement with current teachers. It specifies “annual anonymous staff surveys to monitor staff satisfaction,” p. e18.
- (2) The application’s key strength is in the community-centered approach. It is robust and specific. It ties together various elements that directly impact the expansion proposed in this application and is responsive to community needs (i.e., expansion location, traffic flow, learning models), p. e20.
- (3) LEARN adequately demonstrates how the project would meet requirements and includes a timeline and project plan that begins on p. e22. It is also clear which staff would be involved and the activities and frequency provided in the table suggest a strong implementation plan.

Weaknesses:

- (1) The plan for meaningful engagement with current or former teachers and other educators is not as robust as the community-centered approach. The applicant addresses staff surveys, but this is not explicitly for the purpose of expansion, p. e18. This section lacks specificity and a clear tie to the proposed expansion. It is a minimum good-faith effort at educator engagement.
- (2) No weakness noted for this subfactor.
- (3) No weakness noted for this subfactor.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/22/2022 07:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2022 01:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lawndale Educational And Regional Network Charter School (S282E220001)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	17
Sub Total	20	17
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	33
Sub Total	35	33
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	4
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	29
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Developers Replication Panel - 1: 84.282E

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Lawndale Educational And Regional Network Charter School (S282E220001)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 17

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

i. The applicant clearly documented academic achievement results for the 2019 and 2021 school years compared to the state and other school districts to demonstrate that all grades in Learn 9 were performing below the state for reading (Learn 9 19.1% vs 30.2% state in 2021) and mathematics (Learn 9 25.2% vs 11.8% state in 2021). The applicant explained on the new Illinois exam was not available in 2022 due to COVID-19 (p.e26). The applicant showed that Learn 9 outperformed Waukegan CUSD 60 in reading (11.8% vs. 19.1%) and math (7.7% vs 11.8%) in 2019 and 2021 (p.e26). Disaggregated data of minority students including Black and Hispanic students, who qualified for free and reduced lunch, English Language learner (ELL) and had an IEP was reported to evidence the characteristics of the population compared to the state and the district (p.e25). For example, 11.1% meet/exceeds the state reading assessment scores for Black students in 2021 compared to 7.6% at the state level and 15.8% at Learn 9. For Hispanic students, 18.2% meet/exceeds the state reading assessment scores in 2021 compared to 7.6% at the state level and 19.9% at Learn 9. For Black students, 5.5% meet/exceeds the state math assessment scores in 2021 compared to 7.7% at the state level and 7.9% at Learn 9. For Hispanic students, 12.0% meet/exceeds the state reading assessment scores in 2021 compared to 7.9% at the state level and 11.5% at Learn 9 (p.e27). Low-income information for 2019 and 2021 included 28.4% and 19.3% of LEARN 9 students scored at meets or exceeds in ELA at a higher rate compared to district schools at 16.5% and 9.6% (2019 and 2021 respectively) and 19.5% and 11.1% in math as compared to the local district at 13.6% and 6.5% (2019 and 2021 respectively) (p.e27-e28). Attendance information was also reported with LEARN 9 students attending at a higher rate (96.5% in 2021) than both school district (81.2% in 2021) and state (92.5% in 2021) in 2019, 2020, and 2021. Student mobility rate information was provided with LEARN 9 students attending at a lower rate (1.4% in 2021) than both school district (6.9% in 2021) and state (6.1% in 2021) in 2019, 2020, and 2021 (p.e30).

Sub

Weaknesses:

i. The applicant did not outperform the state in mathematics and reading. For example, the state reported that 31.8% of students meet or exceed the state assessment in 2019 compared to 19.5% reported by Learn 9 and 25.2% (state) in 2021 compared to 11.8% (Learn 9). The trend continues for reading state reported 37.8% and Learn 9 reported 28.5% in 2019 and state reported 30.28% and Learn 9 reported 19.1% in 2021 (p.e26). The applicant did not clearly connect either the mobility data provided or the percentage of learning loss recovery to academic achievement.

Reader's Score: 3

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

ii. The applicant clearly indicated that none of the Learn schools have been at risk or are at risk of closing at this time (p.e30).

Weaknesses:

ii. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

iii. The applicant clearly stated that none of LEARN schools have ever had an issue in the area of financial or operational management, and student safety or have experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance (p.e30). The applicant also indicated that an independent consultant is in place to implement audit procedures to ensure that financial issues are addressed adequately (p.e192).

Weaknesses:

iii. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (iv) The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

iv. The applicant clearly explained that the state-mandated Illinois 5Essentials Survey was utilized to assess non-academic outcomes (p.e31-e33). The applicant presented positive (an above average) reports in the areas of Effective Leaders, Collaborative Teachers, and Involved Families in 2021. For the other two areas (Supportive Environment and Ambitious Instruction), the applicant indicated that not enough responses were received in 2021 to report results (pe31).

Sub

Weaknesses:

iv. The applicant did not report information on Ambitious Instruction which is part of the 5Essentials Survey in 2019 and 2021. In addition, it was not clear why some constructs of the survey were reported, and others were not provided (p.e31-e33).

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

1. (i) **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: 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 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

Strengths:

i. The applicant clearly presented a management plan including tasks, milestones, timeline (January 2023-Sept. 2025), and the person responsible aligned with the two objectives (Objective 1: Expand enrollment at LEARN 9 from 430 to 600 by fall 2024 to serve more disadvantaged students and Objective 2: Substantially raise the percentage of LEARN 9's disadvantaged students who meet or exceed standards on state exams in English language arts and math) to be achieved by the proposed project (p.e34-e37). For example, professional development for teachers would be delivered from July – February, and school instruction coacher monitoring would be performed daily by the Chief Schools Officer and School Principal (p.e36). The applicant clearly provided information about the management of the proposed project to meet the desired objectives on time and within budget (p.e34-e37; p.e185-e195).

Weaknesses:

i. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

ii. The applicant clearly indicated a request of [REDACTED] serve additional 170 students with a cost rate of [REDACTED] per pupil over the three years of the grant or [REDACTED] pupil per year (p.e37-e38). The cost is reasonable for the activities proposed for the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

ii. It is unclear whether the cost of custodians (2) in the budget impacts the desired objectives. The applicant did not clearly articulate or justify this expense (p.e48; p.e185-e195).

Sub

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))

Strengths:

iii. The time commitment of the project director and the key personnel is adequate for the proposed activities. For example, the project director would spend 10% of the time overseeing and managing the implementation of the proposed project (p.e38). Other key personnel would use 10% of their FTE to implement activities such as student and staff recruitment and 20% of the time on professional development and coaching for new 10 new LEARN 9 teachers, a social worker, and a paraprofessional (p.e38-e39 and p.e186-e188).

Weaknesses:

iii. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

iv. The applicant clearly described the qualifications of the personnel implementing the proposed project, which is adequate to address the desired objectives. For example, the President and CEO have investment, entrepreneurial, and finance experience; the Chief Schools Officer has experience with supervision and coaching principals of K-12 schools in predominantly low-income communities; Chief Talent Officer has experience with human resources; the principal has expertise in school leadership and teaching roles; Director of Operations has experience in team management and overseeing operations; Assistant Director of Marketing and Communications served as interim director of marketing at IDEA Public Schools, Inc., a charter school network in Texas; and Development Associate as the project director is skilled in data analysis, project management, and grants management. The applicant also provided CVs to support the skills and expertise of the key personnel (p.e39-e42; p.e74-e93).

Weaknesses:

iv. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

v. The applicant clearly described their ability to responsibly managed grant funds due to prior experience with two federal Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools grants awarded in 2010 and 2015 which helped expand our network to 11 schools. The applicant provided information about the financial controls to monitor funding. For example, the applicant indicated that the Board of Directors oversees spending and financial controls are in place (p.e42).

Weaknesses:

v. No weakness noted.

Sub

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:

vi. The applicant clearly stated the programmatic decisions. The principal would have the responsibility for the expansion process. Thus, the programmatic decisions such as enrichment classes, professional development, and teachers/staff allocation reside with the principal. The principal would be supported by the Teaching and Learning department in the CMO with professional development, curriculum, and quality instructional practices including network-level staff training (p.e42-e43).

Weaknesses:

vi. No weakness noted.

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:

vii. The applicant clearly demonstrated an adequate plan to administer and supervise the implementation of the proposed project. For example, the CEO would be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the proposed project. The principal and the Teaching and Learning department would implement the PD and curriculum. The principal would oversee the daily implementation activities and communicate with the leadership about the implementation progress (p.e43-e44).

Weaknesses:

vii. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Quality of the Continuation Plan - 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 applicant clearly explained that various public and private funding streams including individual, foundation, corporate, and public funds would be sought by the Development Team led by the chief development officer to raise funds to sustain the proposed project. The applicant in the 2020 Strategic Plan Campaign raised [REDACTED] to date toward their [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to support core system improvements, which includes funding for LEARN 9's capital project as evidence of their ability to support the proposed project (p.e45-e46).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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: 4

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:

- i. The applicant provided a logic model (p.e155) including professional development and training, quality programming for English Language Learners (ELLs); and social-emotional learning (SEL) supports. The applicant indicated differentiated instruction to improve student outcomes and foster academic gains over time (p.e47). The applicant provided minimal information about the rationale of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

- i. The applicant provided a vague explanation about differentiated instruction to improve student outcomes. The applicant did not provide research or evaluation findings to support the key components of the logic model. The lack of information about how the logic model was informed by research or evaluation findings to improve relevant outcomes did not allow for a clear assessment of the applicant demonstrating a rationale for the proposed project. The applicant did not clearly address differentiation in instruction, how SEL would be implemented to meet the needs of the students and students' families, SEL supports for the students and families, and the specific curriculum for ELLs.

Reader's Score: 2

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:

- ii. The applicant specified two objectives (Objective 1: Expand enrollment at LEARN 9 from 430 students to 600 students, kindergarten through 8th grade, to serve more disadvantaged students, and Objective 2: Substantially raise the percentage of LEARN 9's disadvantaged students who meet or exceed standards on state exams in English language arts and math) of the proposed project. Objective 1 is measurable. The applicant indicated that the ultimate goal of the proposed project is to increase the 4-year college attainment rates for its scholars from 31% to 50% by 2035 (p.e47-e58).

Weaknesses:

- ii. The applicant did not clearly quantify "substantially" as the target for objective 2. The short-term outcomes for the subgroups did not indicate targets or identified the growth (p.e56). It is unclear the connection between the about 4-year college attainment rates and the proposed project since the proposed project is serving grades K-8. Thus, it seems inappropriate for the goal presented in the narrative (p.e47-e58).

Sub

Reader's Score: 2

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Need for the Project

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) **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: (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:

i. The applicant clearly demonstrated the need to improve students' academic outcomes in the proposed project. The applicant explained that Waukegan CUSD 60 students have performed worse than most comparable districts serving populations of similar student demographics according to the 2020 Waukegan Case Study. The applicant also stated that increased suburbanization exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic has worsened the racial and economic inequalities in disadvantaged neighborhoods. The issues of suburbanization and SEL needs have increased the needs of low-income families and students. The proposed project aims to address the needs of families through the proposed activities (p.e59).

Weaknesses:

i. No weakness 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 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))**

Strengths:

ii. The applicant clearly presented students' outcomes disparities between Learn 9, district, and state in reading and mathematics. The subgroup information presented also indicated that Learn 9 is performing higher compared to the school district. The proposed activities would address the need of the students in Learn 9 to increase their educational outcomes (p.e60-e61).

Weaknesses:

ii. No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

- i. The applicant indicated that the proposed project would expand enrollment from 430 students to 600 students for K-8 grade levels at Learn 9 (p.e14). The applicant partially explained that current and former teachers provided their input to improve students learning through surveys assessing teacher’s satisfaction and school concerns about professional development, Illinois 5Essentials Survey, and mandated state surveys (p.e18-23; p.e48).The applicant provided detailed information about the expansion of a high-quality charter school including the engagement of current and former teachers to develop the proposed project.
- ii. The applicant clearly indicated that in 2013 a needs analysis of the Chicago area was conducted to identify predominantly minority, low-income, suburban communities where disadvantaged and underserved students were achieving significantly below the state average for their subgroups (p.e19). As a response to their needs, Learn 9 opened in 2015. The applicant engaged the community to identify the community assets as part of the planning of the proposed project. For example, the meeting included sessions with local officials with the Mayor, state representatives, and senator (p.e20); bilingual parents (p.e20-e21); and families and community (p.e21). The applicant also proposed conducting a Community Assets Assessment during the initial planning year of the grant (p.e21). The proposed project clearly demonstrated a community-centered approach to understanding the community’s assets and needs by creating and maintaining strong community ties.
- iii. The applicant clearly provided an implementation plan including a list of activities, frequency, purpose, and stakeholders (p.e22-e23). For example, professional development will last for 6 years, and teachers would provide input about their training needs.

Weaknesses:

- i. The process of collecting information from teachers about the expansion of Learn 9 was ambiguous. It is also unclear if current and former teachers’ feedback were included in the development of the proposed project (p.e18-23; p.e48)..
- ii. No weakness noted.
- iii. The applicant did not clearly provide key milestones connected to the planning, development, and implementation of the charter school to inform the connections of the proposed activities of the charter school (p.e22-e23).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2022 01:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2022 06:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Lawndale Educational And Regional Network Charter School (S282E220001)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	18
Sub Total	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	32
Sub Total	35	32
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	5
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	30
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Developers Replication Panel - 1: 84.282E

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Lawndale Educational And Regional Network Charter School (S282E220001)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant provides appropriate evidence of demonstrated academic achievement results and other indicators of success comparable to the local district and compared to the state for the 2019 and 2021 school years; 2020 was not reported as per COVID-19; 2022 data was unavailable at the time of submission. Economically disadvantaged was defined as students who identified as Black, Hispanic, qualified for free and reduced lunch, identified as an English Language learner (ELL) and had an IEP. For instance, students enrolled at LEARN 9 scored higher on state ELA assessments the past two year at a rate above the local district. As an example, in 2019, 28.4% of LEARN 9 students scored proficiency (meets or exceeds) in ELA at a higher rate compared to district schools at 19.3% and 19.5% in math as compared to the local district at 7.7%. For 2021, the trend continued with LEARN 9 students scoring at 19.1% in ELA versus the local district at 16% in ELA and in math, a similar trend was reported: 11.8% as compared to the district at 7.7%. As a further specific example, LEARN 9 Black students outperformed both district and state averages in ELA in both 2019 and 2020; LEARN 9 Black students scored 36.4% in 2019 and 15.8% in 2021 as compared to the district, which was 12.5% and 7.6% respectively and the state which was 18.3% and 11.1% respectively. Similarly, Hispanic students at LEARN 9 outperformed both district and state counterparts in state ELA assessments in both 2019 and 2021 scoring 27.4% in 2019 and 19.9% in 2021 as compared to the district at 19.5% and 7.6% respectively in the same years and the state at 26.3% and 18.2% respectively. Attendance was also reported with LEARN 9 students attending at a higher rate than both local district and overall state in 2019, 2020 and 2021; LEARN 9 was reported by the applicant at 95% in 2019, 97% in 2020 and 96.5% in 2021. The district reported for the same years, 91.1%, 94.3%, and 82.1% respectively, while the state reported 94%, 95.4%, and 92.5% respectively for the same years. Finally, mobility was also reported; LEARN 9 had a 2.5% rate in 2019, a 1.7% rate in 2020, and a 1.4% rate in 2021 as compared to the local district reporting 11.8%, 10.8%, and 6.9% and the state reporting 7.1%, 6.2%, and 6.1% respectively for the same years. (e24-29)

Sub

Weaknesses:

As provided by the applicant, LEARN 9 students did not perform comparably or outperform state averages in math in 2019 and 2021. For instance, in 2019, the state reported 31.8% of students scored an average of meeting or exceeding state standards and 25.2% in 2021 while LEARN 9 students' math averages were 19.5% in 2019 and 11.8% in 2021, clearly indicating that LEARN 9 students underperformed in math as compared to students from across the state of Illinois. While data regarding learning loss was reported year-by-year among LEARN 9 students for 2019, 2021, and 2022 and indicated a rebound from the pandemic with 90.1% reported for ELA across those years and 113.2% in math from the same years, no comparable data was presented at both the district and state, thus; no true comparison could be reported. Mobility rates simply indicate movement; however, unless that movement is qualified, such rates can be misleading. For example, if a family moves as an upwardly mobile move such as purchasing a home versus renting, why that movement occurs is important information. Given that a pandemic occurred, mobility is less reliable as a school performance factor. (e24-29)

Reader's Score: 3

2. (ii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

The CMO, LEARN, states in the application that no network schools have been closed. At the time of application, no schools were reported as at risk for closing due to academic issues that resulted in revocation. This is sufficient. (e30)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

The CMO, LEARN, provides in the application that no network schools have experienced any financial, safety, or operational irregularities. At the time of application, no schools were reported as at risk for financial irregularities, had reported any safety concerns or issues, nor had any LEARN schools been cited for any operational compliance issues. An independent 3rd party audit procedure is in place to safeguard against any financial issues. This is appropriate. (e30)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (iv) **The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant adequately provides that via the results of the state mandated Illinois 5Essentials Survey, the applicant demonstrated strong outcomes. As indicated in the application, strong results were achieved on three indicators: effective leaders, collaborative teachers, and involved families which resulted in a rating for LEARN 9 of well-organized. In academic years 2019 and 2021, 'more' and 'most' ratings were achieved for the areas of supportive environment and involved families. (e31-33)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan

Reader's Score: 32

Sub

- 1. (i) 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: 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 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately provides for managing objectives on time and within budget. For example, two objectives are provided. Objective 1 facilitate the growth of student from 430 to 600 K-8, an enrollment growth of 170 students overall. Objective 2 is to raise the percentages of LEARN 9 students identified as disadvantaged who meet or exceed ELA and math standards as evidenced by state assessments. A timeline is provided as part of the proposed activities and strategies from January 2023 through September 2025 which indicated these activities can be accomplished on time. For instance, activities included PD, analysis of student data, improvements that spring for analysis, and walk-throughs. Responsible personnel and date ranges by month were provided. As an example, the Chief school Officer and the LEARN 9 principal will create action plans for improvement and monitor in Sept., Jan., and June for each year. Based on the budget, it appears that these activities can be accomplished within budget. (e34-37; 185-195; budget pages)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

- 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))**

Sub

Strengths:

Cost appear to be mostly reasonable. A projected enrollment of 170 additional students warrants additional instructional staff to meet the needs of incoming students and accommodate growth (objective 1). For example, an instructional coach will likely influence student outcomes (objective 2) as well six additional teachers, two special education teachers, a science teacher, an enrichment teacher, and a social worker. Costs per student per year of the grant are estimated at [REDACTED]0. (e37-38; e48)

Weaknesses:

The cost for two additional custodians was not adequately justified. It is unclear how these two positions will impact the two stated goals of growth of enrollment and student outcomes. No discussion or detail was provided. (e48; 185-195)

Reader's Score: 2

- 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:

Time commitments appear to be reasonable, adequate, and appropriate in terms of the percentage of time dedicated to the grant, and the grant objectives, and the scope of responsibilities. For instance, the LEARN 9 principal will dedicate 10% of her yearly time in years 1, 2, and 3 to the proposed project; this equated to approximately 10% of her annual salary in years 1, 2 and 3. The individual's duties include hiring, managerial aspects of being a principal, and acquiring new community partnerships as proposed. (e38-39; 185-195)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 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 qualifications of key personnel appeared to be appropriate and sufficient in terms of addressing both stated objectives. As an example, day-to-day operations, onboarding of proposed new faculty, and management of logistics related to the grant such as new equipment, furniture, and supplies. Similarly, other personnel's scope of duties and primary responsibilities appear to directly support objectives 1 and 2 – expansion of enrollment and increased student outcomes on state assessments. As further examples of the appropriateness and sufficiency of key personnel, descriptions provided adequate detail in terms of skills and experience as well as community connections. The CVs supplied attest to skill sets and expertise as per each faculty member and staff who will directly support students, teachers, and achievement of the objectives. (e39-42; 74-93)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Fiscal responsibility and financial controls are adequately addressed as part of the applicant's proposed plan. For example, the CMO has network financial controls in place, and a controller, clerks, and director of finance to support each site, including LEARN 9. The CMO also has a Board of Directors that oversee spending. Finally, the CMO has received two federal grants, further indications of fiduciary responsibility and fiscal expertise. (e42)

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:

2.6 In regard to programmatic decision-making, the LEARN 9 principal has many sole responsibilities such as deciding on where expansion (grade levels) will occur. This individual has discretion regarding on-site programmatic decisions and school-wide decisions such as what enrichment classes will be offered, school-level PD topics, and how faculty will be allocated. The Teaching and Learning unit of the CMO supports the principal in significant ways such as with PD for new faculty (onboarding) and curricular choices. This is comprehensive. (e42-43)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

2.7 Clearly, the applicant's overall plan to administer the grant is sufficient. In tandem, supervising management and oversight is adequately addressed. For instance, the CMO CEO oversees the entire grant at the macro level. Internal controls and supports are evidenced throughout the application such as PD, curriculum, and financials. The project director will provide leadership and coordination and serve as grant liaison. For instance, the project director will create and disseminate all correspondence regarding the grant to all stakeholders, will provide programmatic support, and will assist in data coordination for grant activities. (e43-44)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Quality of the Continuation Plan - 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 applicant provided past experience in managing 11 schools over a 20-year history as being adequately prepared to operate this expansion grant at LEARN 9. Once expansion has occurred (Sept 2025) based on the CMO's sound financial controls, successful past fundraising, and future commitments, it is likely, sustainability of LEARN 9's expansion will occur. As evidence a total of \$ [REDACTED] has been raised toward a projected [REDACTED] goal. In addition, a grow-your-own program addresses internal growth of human capital, especially hard to recruit/retain special education teachers, bilingual teachers, and ESL teachers. (45-46)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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: 5

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:

The applicant partially addressed a rationale for the project. For example, the logic model provided one example of a sound rationale. Bilingual instruction and ESL instruction was described in adequate detail. Addressing the needs of the whole child was broadly described. For instance, in terms of social emotional learning (SEL), SEL screeners are used to identify students with needs and subsequent small group counseling is provided. Differentiated instruction was referenced broadly and generally. (e47-58; 66; 155)

Weaknesses:

The applicant stated that research supports the efficacy of quality education for disadvantaged students, however, no specific research is cited that supports quality education. Given the percentages of students who are identified as Black, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, who speak English as a second language, and who qualify for special education service through an IEP and the abundance of available research to support such populations, it was difficult to ascertain the appropriateness of the rationale for the project. As an example, universal supports are referenced which failed to adequately address differentiation. As well, the only actual differentiated strategies mentioned were small group skill instruction. In addition, it was unclear how the many commercial curricula could be differentiated for individual student needs. As the applicant stressed the importance of meeting the needs of each child, and given that children also belong to complex family systems, if SEL needs are to be met, this would also include family supports. Finally, it was unclear if phonemic awareness and phonics instruction would be targeted to specific grade levels as K8 was referenced in the application. (e47-58)

Reader's Score: 3

Sub

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:

Project goals and objectives are clearly stated and are measurable. For example, the overall CMO, network-wide goal is to increase the 4-year college attainment rates for its scholars from 31% to 50% by 2035. Objective 1 is proposed as a baseline of 430 students currently, expanding to 515 in year 1, and 600 in year 2. Objective 2 is to raise achievement outcomes substantially. In the logic model 5% increases are stated as both short term and mid-term goals for YOY; as well, the application provided that 80% of LEARN 9 alumni matriculate to college and 50% of LEARN 9 alumni earn a 4-year college degree. (e47-58; 66; 155)

Weaknesses:

Baselines for college matriculation and persistence to a four-year degree were not provided in the application. Thus, while increases are provided, without a baseline, it is difficult to determine the degree to which increases can be measured accurately. (e47-58; 66; 155)

Reader's Score: 2

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Need for the Project

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) 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: (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:

Clearly, the applicant has sufficiently established that a need for instruction that improves student outcomes exists in the Waukegan local district. Overall subgroup demographics are provided, and student outcomes as measured by state achievement test results is also provided. The applicant also provided an increase in students identified as ELL. Suburbanization was listed as an issue in general fashion. Both increases in students identified as ESL and suburbanization contribute to need for expansion of LEARN 9. (59)

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 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Sub

Strengths:

Given the subgroup performance disparities between LEARN 9, the district, and state in ELA and the district and Learn 9 in math, additional seats at LEARN 9 are warranted. LEARN 9 subgroup performance is superior to the local district. Thus, past performance indicated that services provided will increase educational achievement. (e60-61)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

1. The applicant proposes to expand LEARN 9, an existing K-8 site in Waukegan, from an existing 430 enrollment to a projected 600 enrollment. The applicant provides that some input is received from current teachers via anonymous staff surveys that monitor satisfaction and concerns, from professional development (PD) questionnaires, and via a mandated state survey, the Illinois 5Essentials Survey. (e18-21; 48)

2. The applicant's proposed plan provides that a viable plan to solicit community input is considered. For instance, the application states that several community input sessions were held which included local public officials (Mayor, Alderman) and that on May 9, 2021, a bilingual parent meeting was held to solicit input from families regarding expansion but also concerns such as increasing the number of seats, adding a gym, and increased teacher planning and space issues. In addition, during the planning year of the proposed grant, a Community Asset Assessment will be conducted by a consultant. An adequate implementation plan and timeline is included which specifies activities, purpose, frequency. Targeted stakeholders as also included such as staff, teachers, parents, and students. (e19-21)

3. A basic timeline is provided. In this timeline, it is clear what activities will be schedule, the frequency of those activities as well as the purpose and the target audience. For instance, a post PD questionnaire is schedule for 6 times per year targeted to teachers, and for the purpose of soliciting feedback on staff needs. (e22-23)

Weaknesses:

1. Input was sought regarding PD, staff satisfaction, and concerns from current staff; however, it is unclear how input was sought specifically regarding expansion of LEARN 9 from current staff. Input from former staff is not articulated

clearly. (e18-21; 48)

2. No weaknesses noted. (e19-21)

3. No milestones were provided. Lack of milestones within the limited timeline lacks clarity within the applicant's proposed plan. (e22-23)

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2022 06:25 PM