

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/08/2022 11:44 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Charter Authorizing Professionals (S282T220002)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	30	28
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	38
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Sub Total	100	91
Total	100	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - National Dissemination Panel - 3: 84.282T

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: California Charter Authorizing Professionals (S282T220002)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

1. The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The coalition formed by the applicants is already several years old and has a history of success around problems of national significance as demonstrated by a past CSP grant (p. e24-25). The proposed project builds on previous success to dig deeper into problems of national significance around charter authorizing practices.

The application justifies the national significance of the proposed project with statistics from a recent report around charter authorizers (p. e26). Evidence is presented that a large percentage of authorizers are districts--many of which are small district authorizers lacking resources and capacity--thereby needing substantial technical assistance, along with evidence-based tools that can be modified for their local contexts (p. e26-27). The proposed project aims to improve district-led authorizing practices to create systemic change.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

Strengths:

All three primary state partners forming the coalition for this application have clearly demonstrated how they built their own local capacity to provide and improve charter services as part of their previous CSP project (p. e28).

Incubating partners from at least five additional states have been receiving mentoring and technical assistance support from the coalition, through which they will build capacity to create a state authorizing association or form their own state-based initiative (p. e31).

The applicant demonstrates a commitment, through a well-developed plan, to support incubating states with project deliverables that help implement high-quality authorizing, while allowing flexibility to address specific local and emerging needs (p. e32).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant mentions at least three other states exploring the project for local use (p. e18). It is not clear how these additional states will be onboarded to join incubating states, and how the primary state partners will work to build capacity in these new areas without adequate expertise in their local contexts.

Reader's Score: 13

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: 38

Sub

- 1. The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

The applicant has a proven framework to address national best practices in charter authorizing, as well as a strong theory of change that centers state/local needs to catalyze positive changes in district policy/practice (p. e34-35).

The applicant documented, in detail, challenges and opportunities of district-led authorizing based on past field experience and research, and aims to build on and expand previous strategies that leverage implementation of best national and local district authorizing practices and peer networking to improve all authorizers, specifically small and rural ones (p. e36).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The three project goals are clearly established and are strongly aligned with all parts of the Absolute Priority 3 as the project narrative describes with great detail how applicant will create and disseminate national best practices through cross-agency, multi-state partnerships in underserved communities, while meeting family well-being needs (p. e45-52).

Objectives and performance measures are articulated for each goal, and these are all measurable and attainable, with annual targets unfolding the impact of the project appropriately (p. e47-53).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

3. The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

The applicant has an innovative approach to the selected absolute priority and lists a myriad of valid reasons to make this point (p. e53-54). The strong cross-agency collaboration across eight states with previously established networks, a focused solution to supporting district-led authorizing, a unique approach to supporting small and rural area authorizers, providing evidence-based national best practices, while allowing flexibility to address local issues, an extensive focus on community-based authorizing, and addressing family and parent engagement, to name a few.

Weaknesses:

The narrative provides limited information on how the applicant's approach will target recruitment of rural districts and authorizers in the most pressing areas (p. e54). It is also not clear how the applicant will support the formation of State Authorizing Agencies (SAAs) or similar state-based initiative.

Reader's Score: 9

4. The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant is uniquely positioned to disseminate findings broadly due to its established networks and partners in both primary states and incubating states, as well as nationally, by leveraging their long-standing relationships with other agencies, state entities, and the National Charter Resource Center (p. e55).

Project tools and materials will be disseminated through multiple avenues, such as partner websites, newsletters, professional development forums, conferences, PLCs, and via technical assistance-- both locally and nationally (p. e55).

Weaknesses:

While there is a comprehensive mechanism to disseminate information in three primary and five incubation state partners where the work is being conducted, it is not clear how the tools and materials created will be replicable to other states beyond those eight states.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 16

Sub

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Sub

Strengths:

A joint application agreement is formed between the primary state agencies that delineates roles and responsibilities in regards to project implementation, support, and oversight (p. e56-57).

The applicant will appoint a national coordination team that works with a state director at each of the primary state partners (p. e57).

The applicant provides a thorough timeline for each year of the proposed project that includes project milestones and key activities, how they align to project goals, as well as the respective agencies that will own each of these activities (p. e58-61).

The applicant commits to hiring an external project evaluator to provide actionable feedback to all project partners for continuous improvement and stay on track with project deliverables (p. e61).

Weaknesses:

It is not clear how the part-time contracted facilitators for each of the incubating state partners will be recruited, selected, and trained to execute project activities. The narrative lacks sufficient detail around the quality and effectiveness of such contractors.

Reader's Score: 9

2. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The costs related to the personnel, fringe, travel, equipment, and supplies budget line items are all reasonable and justified, as detailed in the budget narrative (p. e129-132).

Weaknesses:

It is not clear how contractual expenses are calculated. While there are estimated cost ranges for various possible activities and specific costs related to project evaluation and Incubating State Partner (ISP) contractual support for part-time facilitators, the budget narrative is missing details for the rest of the totals distributed among primary agencies and national coordination office, and how those totals are justified (p. e133). Cost estimates for contractual staff members (project directors, state directors, etc.) and their FTEs dedicated to this project are missing from the narrative, which makes it difficult to assess if the associated costs are reasonable in relation to the proposed project.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons

Sub

who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

Strengths:

Each primary agent has a strategic plan to show their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (p. e63), which positions the applicant to have -at a minimum- an adequately developed guide to encourage more diverse talent recruitment for the project.

The applicant provided data that “40% of the current staff associated with Primary State Partners (PSPs) are people of color.” (p. e63), which adds strength to their diversity and equity efforts on employment.

Weaknesses:

While there is evidence of recruitment among underrepresented groups based on race/color, no other evidence is presented in other areas of underrepresentation (e.g. national origin, gender, etc.).

Although it is mentioned that each member has a strategic plan that addresses their commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion, no examples of strategies are provided from any of those plans.

Reader's Score: 2

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

Strengths:

A project director is already named and his qualifications and expertise in the field relevant to the work outlined in this proposed project are considerable (p. e63).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 4

3. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The key project personnel listed from each member organization bring a wealth of expertise in charter school law, charter management, operational effectiveness, school performance, and school board governance; as evidenced by their past expertise and training (p. e64-65).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/08/2022 11:44 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/08/2022 10:44 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Charter Authorizing Professionals (S282T220002)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	30	28
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Sub Total	100	87
Total	100	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - National Dissemination Panel - 3: 84.282T

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: California Charter Authorizing Professionals (S282T220002)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

1. The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant fully demonstrated that its proposed NN4DA Collaboration Initiative was of nationwide relevance, as districts in nearly every state have the option to authorize charter schools and more than 70 percent of authorizing districts have limited capacity. The applicant proposes to directly involve eight states that represent 66 percent of the nation's authorizers and 42 percent of all charter school students in the country. The applicant also cited strides made under its current National Dissemination (ND) grant in the three primary states and in outreach to 20 other states. [e18, e25, e117]

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

Strengths:

The applicant largely demonstrated the likelihood that its project would build local capacity. The applicant provided state-level context about its three primary state partners (PSPs) and its five incubating state partners (ISPs). The applicant also provided a detailed example of how its collaborative efforts within Colorado under the current ND grant led to improved authorizer monitoring practices that dissuaded charter schools from collecting student disability status data prior to an enrollment offer. [e28-e32]

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not sufficiently address how its approach to the project would be sustainable for ISPs to provide, improve or expand services, given that many authorizers in the ISPs fit the profile the applicant discussed, where building local authorizer capacity is most challenging--namely among the 70 percent of districts that oversee only one or two charter schools and are understaffed. [e32-33, e36-e39]

Sub

Reader's Score: 13

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: 35

Sub

- 1. The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

The project design demonstrated a theory of change that the creation of model materials, combined with technical assistance and professional development, as well as the promotion of best practices, would result in positive changes in district policy and practice with students--especially underserved students--being the ultimate beneficiaries. The applicant specifically cited the creation of State Authorizing Associations (SAAs) as a way to adapt tools and resources from one state for use in another state--at a lower cost and investment of time and effort. Furthermore, when districts own and control the organizations and initiatives, they are more likely to adopt recommended practices than they were previously--when national groups recommended similar changes. [e35-36]

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The project design included three goals each, with a variety of specifically measurable objectives. [e42-e55]

Weaknesses:

While the logic model identified short-term and long-term outcomes, the project design could have been improved by quantifying these outcomes. [e42-44]

Reader's Score: 8

- 3. The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.**

Strengths:

The applicant largely demonstrated that its approach is exceptional, including the ground work laid in its current ND grant; three levels of cross-agency partnerships (the collaboration of PSPs and ISPs, SAAs, and between districts and the charter schools they authorize); the model includes both national and state-level components; a build-up of trust because its SAAs are by and for district authorizers; a customized approach to each state's context; delivery of tangible resources, such as model contracts, evaluation checklists, closure tools, Year Zero and annual performance reports guidance; existing relationships at the local and national-level (e.g., NACSA, A-Game, and the Center for Learner Equity); and the expertise of the project director and supporting project personnel. [e53-55]

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant made references to supporting small and rural district authorizers that no other entity is currently addressing but could have more clearly addressed how it intends to specifically target this subsegment within ISPs with differentiated support appropriate for the acute needs of small and rural districts. The plan also lacked sufficient details on how the applicant intends to ensure the new SAAs being developed for ISPs would be, as the applicant noted, state-level sustainable continuous-improvement loops of best practice resources. [e54-55]

Reader's Score: 8

4. The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant largely articulated the mechanisms it would use to broadly disseminate information on its proposed project through each PSP, the NN4DA free online resource library, national-level professional development forums (e.g., NACSA), professional learning communities, conferences, and via technical assistance provided to ISPs, and through many relationships (e.g., National Charter Resource Center). [e55-56]

Weaknesses:

The applicant needed to more clearly convey how its dissemination of tools and materials would address its stated need to be adaptable in order to best support further development or replication beyond its initial eight states.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 16

Sub

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The proposed management plan set out timelines, milestones, and identified in general which entities were responsible for accomplishing which project tasks. The application included relevant evidence in the form of a joint agreement and letters of commitment from the PSPs and ISPs with responsibilities for implementing the proposed project. [e56-65, e94-114]

Weaknesses:

The proposed management plan was lacking in setting out the responsibilities of the part-time facilitators whom the applicant would seek to hire to perform the bulk of the work in the ISPs. [e56-e65, e110-114]

Sub

Reader's Score: 8

- 2. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant mostly demonstrated the reasonableness of its proposed budget. The applicant said it relied on its current ND grant experience in projecting the costs of managing the research, production, and implementation of similar work as well as the level of travel reimbursement support needed to convene successful PSP events. [e62, e128-e135]

Weaknesses:

More detail is necessary to demonstrate the reasonableness of how the contractual costs were calculated, including the percentage of FTE support provided by each PSP and the NN4DA. [e133-134]

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

- 1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided limited information from which to show the extent to which its joint applicants have each developed strategic plans that outline their commitments to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). The applicant also cited 40 percent of the current staff associated with the PSPs were people of color. [e63]

Weaknesses:

While inferred from its reference to DEI, the applicant did not specifically list what underrepresented groups, except color, that it would encourage for employment. Also the application neglected to reference any specific approaches the joint applicants would undertake to encourage DEI. While noting the current staff for PSPs were comprised of 40 percent people of color, the application did not indicate their levels of employment and the extent to which such representation extended to their governing boards, senior leaders, director, or managers. [e63]

Reader's Score: 1

- 2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.**

Strengths:

The designated Project Director possesses the relevant training and experience, including leading the existing ND grant, as well as 30 years of experience in the charter school sector, including overseeing national efforts with the Education Commission of the States, the U.S. Department of Education's CSP office, NACSA, and directing the

Sub

National Charter School Resource Center. The individual has also helped more than 20 states craft and revise charter school laws and policies that collectively shaped the charter movement and developed accountability for charter school authorizers. [e63, e80-81]

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

3. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The seven proposed key project personnel each have 20-30 years of relevant experience often working in several capacities in public education, including authorizing for a decade or more. The resumes of the personnel also highlighted prior experience related to the specific project tasks to be undertaken, such as creating model tools, or facilitating professional learning. [e63-65, e68-93]

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/08/2022 10:44 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/09/2022 01:08 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Charter Authorizing Professionals (S282T220002)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	30	30
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Sub Total	100	93
Total	100	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - National Dissemination Panel - 3: 84.282T

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: California Charter Authorizing Professionals (S282T220002)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant comprehensively illustrated how the proposed project, which is a joint partnership with the National Network for District Authorizing (NN4DA), the Colorado Association of Charter School Authorizers (CACSA), and the Florida Association of Charter School Authorizers (FACSA), aims to create systemic change by expanding their network of state-based initiatives that will support cross-agency collaborations in each partner state and give district authorizers evidence-based and locally-relevant best-practice tools to strengthen their authorizing. The overall vision is to increase the number of authorizers nationwide who are operating from an effective conceptual framework and are using best practices. (pgs. e8-10)

The partnership will increase to eight states involved in the project. The partnership will disseminate best-practice tools to strengthen authorizing in the area of community-oriented authorizing and community impact to ensure that parent and family engagement are appropriately incorporated in the tools and resources, professional development, and technical assistance disseminated by the project. (pgs.e10-14) The applicant indicated that the evidence-based derivatives disseminated by the project has the potential to ultimately lead to improved success rates of new charters and improved renewal rates of successful charters, improved charter school quality, nationwide adoption of best practice authorizing by districts, and more states with universally-strong authorizing. Most importantly, the project has the potential for national significance because, the participating states represent 66% of the nation's authorizers (72% of district authorizers) and 42% of all charter school students in the country. (pgs. e10-14)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project is likely to build capacity and improve services that addresses the needs of charter authorizers. For example, the applicant is building upon similar work through a previous CSP grant. (pg. e14) The applicant indicated that previous project has had substantial impact on district authorizers in California, Colorado, and Florida. One of the most significant pieces of evidence that was derived from the previous project was the common principles that support high-quality district authorizing as well as the impact of state variation. Thus, the applicant indicated that the proposed project will incorporate factors that will help district authorizers across the country implement high-quality authorizing, while simultaneously allowing flexibility based on state-specific data, emerging needs, and allowing states determine their priorities. (pgs. e14-17) The applicant has successfully demonstrated that continuing this work will significantly institutionalize processes, increase strategies, and dissemination, thereby creating continuous improvement loops of developing and updating resources that reflect the latest in authorizer best practices that are relevant in a state-by-state context. (pgs. e14-17)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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: 35

Sub

- 1. The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrated that the proposed project is aligned with evidence-based research that is applicable to the rationale. The applicant cited numerous studies, research, and evaluation findings that outlined primary design principles and standards for high-quality and effective charter authorizing oversight, thus building a case for developing common practices nationwide that can create a framework and strong foundation for shared authorizing practices. (pgs. e19-27) For example, the applicant successfully demonstrated how the proposed project has been woven into a theory of change based on the knowledge and experience regarding charter school operations and charter school authorizing from various organizations and the works from their current program efforts. As demonstrated in the logic model, (pg. e28) the applicant innovatively rationalizes how collaboration to create model materials, provide technical assistance and professional development, facilitate professional learning communities, and promote best practices, will result in positive changes in policies and practices. Overall, the applicant provided a strong foundation for the rationale and how the rationale will be woven into all trainings, as well as all disseminated materials. (pgs. e 19-27)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided three specific goals that are clearly measurable with performance measures and targets. For example, the three goals are: (1) to create, evolve, and disseminate best practices for district-led charter-school authorizing to address emerging issues nationally and in each participating state, (2) to catalyze and support cross-agency collaboration to serve underserved students, and (3) to expand NN4DA's impact nationwide by incubating new State Authorizing Associations or similar initiatives, as well as helping more district authorizers in all participating states to implement updated best practices in charter school authorizing. (pgs. e 32-39) The goals provided in the application are relevant and related to the model that the applicant is proposing to implement and establish in eight states--and that could be replicated nationwide. For example, the main goal for the project is develop an Incubating State Partners (ISP) model that will establish cross-state partnerships and build an infrastructure for cross-agency collaboration in each state to create systemic change for improving district charter school authorizing.(pgs. e32-39)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

3. The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a reasonable discussion to ascertain why the proposed project is an exceptional approach. For example, the project's use of leveraging cross-agency partnerships is an effective measure for incorporating cohesive appeal and best practices of peers from across the field. States can save significant time by adapting each other's proven tools and resources instead of always starting from scratch. (pg. e 40) The model can be adaptable to all districts, regardless of size and demographic makeup. The project will create state-level sustainable continuous-improvement loops of best practice resources for district authorizing, so that tools always reflect the latest thinking, emerging priorities, and changing contexts. The proposed project deliverables will provide a tangible and actionable model of resources for district's to utilize, such as checklists to help districts evaluate applications for new charter schools or requests for renewals, technical tools to help districts navigate if, when, and how to go about closures and renewals, as well as toolkits to help districts conduct annual performance reports. (pgs. e40-43)

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicated throughout the narrative that the project will focus on supporting district authorizers. However, the applicant does not account for how the project's deliverables will effectively address those states in which the state is the authorizer. The processes and procedures for evaluating applications, renewals, and closures are totally different, thus leaving a gap for state authorizers in the creation of the deliverables, such as toolkits and technical assistance.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

4. **The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project has mechanisms in place for dissemination that will reach national audiences. The applicant indicated that the project will potentially reach 66% of all authorizers in the nation, and 72% of districts serving as authorizers. (pgs. e 41-42) For example, the applicant indicated that all of the tools/resources created by PSPs and ISPs will be available on the National Network for District Authorizing (NN4DA) free online resource library and through each Primary State Partners (PSP) or Incubating State Partners (ISP) website. The project will also disseminate through national-level professional development forums (like the NACSA conference), professional learning communities, conferences, newsletters and via technical assistance provided to ISPs. (pgs. e41-42) The National Charter Resource Center will also create pathways for partners to distribute and disseminate resources. The applicant will offer technical assistance while presenting at state and national conferences. Materials developed will be available to all for replication. (pgs. e 41-42)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed and comprehensive management plan that aligns the tasks and activities that will occur to ensure the project will meet the program goals and objectives. The NN4DA Collaboration Initiative represents a joint application agreement between NN4DA, CCAP, CACSA, and FACSA, as well as a signed joint application agreement that has been included in Attachment C. As per the agreement, CCAP is the lead applicant and fiscal agent. (pgs. e17-21) Under the agreement, NN4DA will employ the Project Director and coordinate programmatic support for the project. In the project timeline, the applicant included activities/milestones, and responsibilities for each year of the grant, as well the timeline is aligned each goal and activity. For example, the three key activities will take place during October 2022-December 2022, such as: hire a director, develop relationships with partnering states and hold a launch meeting in each partnering state. (pgs. e 44-47) By project year three, the applicant will conclude July-September dissemination activities, such as a National Conference and sustainability plans. Overall, the management plan--if implemented as presented-- has the potential for serving as a blueprint for meeting goals on time and within budget. (pgs. e44-47)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed itemized budget and budget narrative that appears to be reasonable based on the goals of the project and the inclusion of eight state partners. The applicant is requesting a first year total funding of \$ [REDACTED] and total award amount of \$ [REDACTED]. The budget includes personnel costs for a part-time Finance Consultant employee of CCAP who will administer CCAP's role as the fiscal agent for the project. (Budget Attachment 1-8) Since the project will include working with several states, \$ [REDACTED] has been allocated for travel for annual national gatherings and for NN4DA outreach and support to the ISPs; as well as organizational planning meetings and outreach/support for authorizers. An amount of \$ [REDACTED] has been allocated to contractual expenses for the group members, an external consultant to help develop the resources and professional development opportunities under the project, as well as to support ISPs in developing their state initiatives. (Budget Attachment 1-8)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

Strengths:

The applicant indicated that the proposed project partners have developed strategic plans that outline their commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The project will also partner with NACSA on a national campaign to promote diversity in the charter school authorizing field. Currently, 40% of the current staff associated within the PSPs are people of color. (pg. e 47)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide any examples from their strategic plans as to how they will encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented. The examples would have provided some evidence that these strategies will be effective in reaching targeted and intentional audiences of potential employees.

Sub

Reader's Score: 1

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

Strengths:

The applicant has successfully identified a person as the designated Project Director with relevant training and experience, who will guide the implementation of the project's goals and direction. (pgs. e49) The person identified is currently the Executive Director of CACSA and the Chair of the NN4DA Governing Council. He has more than 30 years of experience in the charter school sector, leading national efforts with the Education Commission of the States, the U.S. Department of Education's CSP office, at NACSA as a board member and leader of state and federal policy initiatives, as well as chairing the board of the Colorado Charter School Institute, directing the National Charter School Resource Center, and serving as the National Coordinator of the Tri-State Alliance. The director helped found and chaired the board of the Center for Learner Equity and has helped more than 20 states and the federal government craft and revise charter school laws and policies that collectively shaped the charter movement and developed professional expectations and accountability for charter school authorizers. (pgs. e49-50)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

3. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the qualifications, relevant training, and experiences of the key project personnel are relevant for leading and guiding the project's direction and implementation. There are four key personnel staff members, and all have been involved in the implementation of the previous CSP project. (pg. e50) Each have over 30 years of experience working with various charter movements. For example, the CCAP Board Chair has over three decades of experience creating, managing, and helping others develop high-performing schools in California and nationally. He is a founding member of the CCAP board and Director of the Charter Authorizers Regional Support Network. In addition, the Executive Director of FACSA and has more than twenty years of experience in public education in both charter and traditional district schools. She previously served on the FACSA Board of Directors and was the Director of Charter Schools for Polk County Public Schools, where she oversaw 29 charter schools serving more than 15,000 students. (pgs. e50-52)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/09/2022 01:08 AM

