

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2022 02:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Institute for Excellence in Education (S282T220003)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	30	25
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
Sub Total	100	85
Total	100	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - National Dissemination Panel - 1: 84.282T

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Institute for Excellence in Education (S282T220003)

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: 25

Sub

1. The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a project that intends to build systems for charter authorizers to (1) create context-curated early warning systems and, (2) for schools identified as distressed, to monitor improvements using a tailored set of responsive goals. (Pg. e27-e28). In conceiving this project, the applicant identifies a disconnect between—on the one hand—traditional charter authorizer evaluation systems based heavily on compliance, state assessments, and graduation rates, and—on the other hand—effective measurement and support of charter schools. (Pg. e21). As such, the applicant has internalized and directly addressed Absolute Priority 1a and 1c in a manner that, if successful, would be nationally significant and improve systems and practices of charter authorizers across the nation.

Weaknesses:

Many authorizers rely on lagging data and schools self-reporting data that are not related to high stakes assessments. With its system for early warning and responsive goal setting, the applicant makes a conclusory assumption that authorizers can identify, measure, and target areas of concern in a timely way to successfully support an intervention. The applicant provided a specific example regarding declining enrollment, which is already measured in real time (i.e., charter schools are often funded based on enrollment, and authorizers receive immediate data regarding enrollment). However, due to a lack of specifics regarding early warning systems or context-curated responsive goals, it is unclear what additional metrics might be uncovered, and thus puts the feasibility, scalability, and practicality of the proposal into question.

Reader's Score: 13

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's proposal is designed with the express intent to build capacity, provide, improve, and expand authorizing capability that is responsive to local school and community need. The applicant provided specific examples about how both their early warning system and their responsive goal setting process can be tailored to local contexts that reflect the values both of the schools and their communities and families served—noting a rural CTE program that was a major draw and factor to school success but caused many students to take 5 years of high

Sub

school to graduate. (Pg. e29-e31). The proposal is meant to provide a system and process for local authorizers, to provide tools, templates, and resources for them, that push authorizers to build their own goals and warning systems that apply to their local context. (Pg. e32).

Weaknesses:

While designing a proposal tailored to building individual authorizer capacity responsive to local school and community need, the applicant has not addressed how labor intensive its early warning and responsive goal setting may be, and therefore the initiative's sustainability is called into question. While the applicant has set out systems to build these processes, the processes themselves appear to ultimately be unsystematic, and would require local authorizers to create differentiated assessments, goals, and supports for each of the schools they authorize. While laudable and perhaps even ideal from a school and student perspective, authorizer capacity may not be able to meet the demand required, and may not be able to implement the proposal with fidelity.

Reader's Score: 12

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's theory of action is that if an authorizer identifies schools in distress using customized and context-curated early warning systems, and provides tailored supports and local partnerships to address school issues earlier than done in traditional compliance-based authorizing systems, schools and students will benefit more than from through a traditional, lagging model of charter authorizing. (Pg. e38). This theory is based on the research and evaluation completed both through practical work resulting from A-GAME adopters and through publications from Dr. Aimee Evan. (Pg. e23, e32-33).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

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 goals and objectives are mostly outlined clearly and include measurable performance outcomes. Some examples are: (1) Outcome 1.1.a. measures scaling and disseminating the idea by doubling from 15 to 30 the number of authorizers implementing responsive goals. (Pg. e36); and (2) Outcome 2.1.a. identifies a measurable goal of causing six authorizers each in Year 1 and Year 2 to create early warnings systems and use them with schools they authorize, which would achieve the goal of shifting charter school authorizers' improvement strategies to be more proactive. (Pg. e37).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Objective 3.2's development of "plug and play" resources for authorizers will not necessarily achieve the goal to build local capacity at authorizers to implement the applicant's systems, because any context-curated system will necessarily have to develop a deep and time-intensive, multi-faceted community engagement strategy. This deliverable is not contemplated or internalized by the applicant's plan. (Pg. e37). In addition, Objective 1.1.b is not clear, as it sets a goal to increase schools adopting A-GAME to 9, which is less than the number of schools currently using A-GAME. (Pg. 36).

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 proposal contemplates flexible authorizing tools that enable authorizers to tailor their evaluations and interventions based on local context. In so doing, the proposal aligns authorizing best practices with local needs and community voice to support school success and student outcomes – and in this way, is exceptional. (Pg. e38-e39).

Weaknesses:

As the implementation tools are not yet built, and systems not yet in place, it is hard to fathom exactly how "working intimately with authorizers to change their academic frameworks and charter academic goals" to create context-curated systems will be implemented across different authorizers with fidelity, when each is a case-by-case implementation. (Pg. e39). The proposal assumes this ambitious, but perhaps unattainable goal as a given and does not address the time- and labor-intensive nature of such broad and varied change management. Even though the proposal identifies efforts related to socialization, collaboration, and continuous improvement activities (Pg. e40-e45), it is not clear that the proposal has addressed the labor and sustainability obstacles that authorizers will face during implementation.

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

This project will be disseminated through numerous virtual and in-person conferences, a network of authorizer users, a website resource portal, and through WestEd's Communications Department who works with researchers, technical assistance providers, and members of the Department of Education. (Pg. e46-e47). As a result, the information generated from this project is likely to support further development and replication.

Weaknesses:

None identified.

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: 18

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 management plan and adequacy of resources for the proposed project are excellent. The applicant provides a timeline with specific, detailed, and measurable milestones, that show both overall goals and incremental achievements throughout the span of the proposal. (Pg. e50-e53). The management plan identifies the data that will become available and when for further improvement, replication, and development, and the plan contemplates the growing scale of the project. (Pg. e52-e53).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

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 budget narrative details the cost breakdown very clearly for the Institute, including for subscriptions and equipment. The travel expenses reasonably accommodate one member from each of the collaborating teams (The Institute, Momentum Strategy & Research, and WestEd) to attend two in-person events per year. (Pg. e110-e116). The budgeted amounts for contracting with Momentum and with WestEd, given the standards for working with national education nonprofit organizations, is reasonable. (Pg. e111-e112, e117-e120).

Weaknesses:

While the overall amounts and narrative related to spending concerning Momentum and WestEd appear reasonable, a breakdown of salaries consistent with the Institute's narrative would be helpful to better understand precisely how the funding would be allocated. (Pg. e111-e112, e117-e120).

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: 7

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.**

Sub

Strengths:

No strengths found.

Weaknesses:

Applicant has not addressed encouraging applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented in its proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

The project director is a national leader in charter school accountability and has successfully completed a project related to charter authorizer approaches that began from a Charter School Program National Dissemination Grant. (P. e67).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Key project personnel have training and experience that make them well-qualified to execute on the proposed project. The Project Researcher has substantial experience across the nation developing accountability frameworks, selecting measures and assessments aligned to specific school missions and student populations, and has been a lead researcher on several U.S. Department of Education grant projects. (Pg. e56-e57, e71-e74). The School Improvement Consultant has demonstrated experience working with charter authorizers building policy and evaluation best practices, as well as providing technical assistance across local, district, state, and national levels. (Pg. e58-e59, e75-e77). The Finance Director and Systems Improvement Consultant similarly have experience and qualifications for their roles in this project. (Pg. e55, e59). In addition, WestEd is providing key support to assist with communications. (Pg. e46).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2022 02:29 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2022 02:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Institute for Excellence in Education (S282T220003)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	30	26
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	33
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
Sub Total	100	85
Total	100	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - National Dissemination Panel - 1: 84.282T

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Institute for Excellence in Education (S282T220003)

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: 26

Sub

1. The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The proposal provides a well-developed argument for the national significance of the project, in light of the COVID-10 pandemic. Moreover, e27 flags how strengthened relationships between authorizer and schools can influence the sector and students beyond the duration of the pandemic and has importance across geographies and for the national context.

Weaknesses:

The applicant lacks specifics around the connection between annual operational metrics (e.g. teacher turnover and governance) and formative academic and social emotional data (pg. e28). This makes it challenging to effectively determine scaling and feasibility efforts.

Reader's Score: 14

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 proposal documents current success with authorizers and small schools. E31 provides a clear example of how one rural, high-poverty school was able to facilitate an inclusive process that embedded career certification into accountability. The applicant notes, that this allowed the authorizer to avoid "identifying the school as failing, due to low 4-year cohort graduation rates, these Responsive Goals honor the needs and priorities of the community" (e31)

Weaknesses:

At the conclusion of the engagements, it appears as though teams will have products built to use for the work. It is unclear whether local communities will be able to generate similar work in the future. E31 notes that "plug and play" material will be provided, but materials alone are insufficient to execute the work independently. As written, there appears a consistent need for a third-party vendor for it to be applicable. This creates challenges should future funding priorities shift or when there is leadership turnover.

Sub

Reader's Score: 12

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: 33

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant's rationale is clear, cogent, and practically aligned to authorizers' examples. In particular, e33 provides two examples of how, "the authorizer's approach has shifted from compliance-driven to student-centered and the students become the focus of all decisions" This process can strengthen collaboration and targeted student work over time between authorizer and school.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant provided a logic model (e35) that has a completion of process activities, it is unclear how these activities will build the expected capacity.

Reader's Score: 9

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

Strengths:

The objectives represent a comprehensive and clear approach to expanding the initiative and building on current success. For example, outcome 1.1a on e36 notes current program work and projected completion for the work.

Weaknesses:

The creation and availability of tools does not necessarily lead to adoption or fidelity. Goal 3 on e37 clearly flags dissemination efforts of the program, but it is unclear how those translate to increased capacity over time. Baseline data are inconsistently used, for example outcome 2.1a and 2.2a on e37 do not have current baseline information to determine if the work is feasible.

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

The proposed approaches and resources provided to the sector are high-quality, especially for smaller and rural authorizers (e31) There are a range of activities that allow for authorizers to learn from the approach, even without full adoption. Most importantly, there presents a unique opportunity to influence the sector towards deeper engagement between authorizers around improvement and support, not just accountability.

Sub

Weaknesses:

E41 provides an optimistic view of collaboration between parties with different political agendas, and there is no grappling with the pre-work needed to bring different groups to the bargaining table. The proposal did not describe the targeted work done with the “nine charter schools (whose authorizer has not yet adopted the Responsive Goals philosophy) and their boards of directors to develop Responsive Goals for use in school improvement.” (pg. e43)

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

The proposal provides a variety of mechanisms (e46), like presentations and publications to share the research and specific goals on when to share the information (e37). They have identified partners, like Momentum Strategy Research (e56) and WestEd (e57), with demonstrated success in the field.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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: 19

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 plan contains adequate information around time, personnel, and budget to signal the ability to complete the proposed objectives. For example, FTE allocations are provided for Institute staff (pg. e110) and for consultants (pg. e119), creating a clear picture of roles and responsibilities for partner organizations and how the teams will collaborate effectively to complete milestones.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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.**

Sub

Strengths:

Overall costs appear in line with industry standards around salary, benefits, technology and travel (e109-e115). The project has the potential for evolved thinking on accountability for authorizers, which could significantly impact the overall sector and seems like a worthwhile investment.

Weaknesses:

There is no cost justification of annual stipend for coalition members (e115).

Reader's Score: 9

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: 7

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:

No strengths noted

Weaknesses:

It is unclear from the application 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.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

The project director brings a depth of experience to the role and formal academic qualifications, notably experience serving as a charter school board authorizer and governance for a local charter (pg. e55).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

Strengths:

The team is drawn from leaders with significant experience and academic credentials across the state and local context. Project members have experience as authorizers, board members, and practitioners. For example, the project director is a governance board chair (e55) and a partner is a former state superintendent of instruction (e83). There is a balance of previous experience teaching (e69) and operations in/out of education (e85).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/12/2022 02:29 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2022 02:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Institute for Excellence in Education (S282T220003)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	30	28
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	32
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
Sub Total	100	86
Total	100	86

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - National Dissemination Panel - 1: 84.282T

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Institute for Excellence in Education (S282T220003)

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 provided a clear, structured discussion of the national significance of the proposed project. For example, the residual impact of 2 years of pandemic schooling yielded an increase in low-income and minority and student absenteeism. Metrics that provided formative and summative feedback quickly became less useful because they were either very limited or not available. The need for new structures that address the current landscape of learning and student engagement was adequately justified. The applicant effectively demonstrated that responsive goals embedded in the proposed A-GAME strategy integrate both the suggested approach to school goal-setting and has already established a national presence given its National Association of Charter School Authorizers endorsement (p6). A strength of the proposal is that assertions made regarding schooling status were supported by recent research (p2-3). Another strength of the application was the intent to raise authorizer awareness that measures of short-term academic improvement, student engagement, and social-emotional development should be added to performance benchmarks.

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 clearly demonstrates that A-TEAM and early warning systems will build capacity at the local level and improve services given that both structures yield customized goals, activities and resources based on local context. A strength of the proposal is the immediate access to vetted, structured tools to guide local discussions regarding school performance. Authorizers and schools can immediately begin the work of establishing a local early warning system and responsive goals specific to their local schools (p9). Another strength of the proposal is that the proposed tools allow users flexibility in identifying areas of need and utilizing the resources and processes without an external facilitator (p9).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The asset/resource mapping component of the early warning system process assumes that needed resources are available or affordable within the local context. It also assumes that once a problem is identified through the process it is capable of being addressed (i.e., teacher vacancies) and this might not be the case (p17, 22).

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: 32

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates some components of its rationale for the project. For example, proposed early warning system alerts will allow authorizers to identify and address struggling schools in a timely manner (p13). The inclusion of mid-term and longer term outcomes in the logic model further highlight areas the project intends to impact, including academic growth, social-emotional development, attendance and completion rates. Adding school-based interim assessments to metrics reviewed by the authorizer helps inform if broader supports are needed.

Weaknesses:

Regarding the actual logic model graphic, the graphic does not include the activities that will inform the degree to which the applicant meets the outcomes. The arrows in the graphic also infer that one input feeds into the other, but the narrative does not suggest a sequential progression (p15).

Reader's Score: 8

- 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 presents several goals, objectives, and outcomes that are clear and measurable. For example, in proposed project years 1, 2, and 3, the A-GAME Coalition of Early Adopters and the A-GAME facilitators present at 15 state (local) and national conferences, convenings, and events (p17). The objective represents a strength of the application because it states an assessment time frame that reflects the incremental monitoring practice suggested for schools. Objective 1.1.a also sets a baseline of 14 authorizers and a performance target of 30 authorizers (p5, 16).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly state outcomes 1.1b and 2.2a. Outcome 1.1b seeks to increase performance but does not establish a performance baseline. For example, the goal to increase the number of schools that adopt A-GAME Responsive Goals for school improvement, with or without limited Authorizer participation, to 9 over the next three years (Outcome 1.1b) does not state the current level meeting the criteria to establish a baseline. Also, this goal

Sub

cannot be fully assessed until year 3 of the proposed grant and there are no interim benchmarks which would be needed to accurately complete annual reporting. Outcome 2.2a does not establish the number of asset maps authorizers will create therefore it is unclear how to assess the outcome. Several other goals also have extended assessment period that will not yield incremental monitoring suggested for the participating schools (e.g., Outcomes 1.2a, 1.4b, 3.1b, 3.2d) (p16-18). Also regarding 1.2a, the applicant did not clearly justify if it could scale to 100 authorizers, given 35 current subscribing charter school authorizers (p16, 20). The concern regarding goal attainability is also applicable for objective 3 outcomes.

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a somewhat novel approach to school oversight. The intent to create a different perspective on customizing early warning systems and creating a database of resource maps will likely provide some degree of systemic support and intervention. For example, the dissemination of learning modules and accompanying process document for early warning system development may be useful in varied local contexts (p18). A strength of the project is that templates and learning modules will be available for national dissemination.

Weaknesses:

The approach to include formative assessments in performance frameworks also assumes that progress monitoring/formative data is an effective metric for high stakes decision making (p12). Changing the way formative data is used may establish another layer of interim assessment at the school level given the formative data would essentially become a summative assessment measure because it would be integrated in the performance framework. Also, the intent to create a single dashboard with national data (e.g., absenteeism, dropout rates) is not novel, given national data is already readily available from varied national and state databases (p30). Additionally, A-GAME access will be available to National Association of Charter School Authorizer members in FY23, which assumes broad dissemination of 50% of the project (p21). The applicant also does not clearly discuss local capacity building related to change management, local training and local buy-in within each participating school/network required to fully execute or sustain the goal-setting and early warning components proposed. Adoption could be short-lived if downstream impacts are not embedded in the project.

Reader's Score: 7

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 proposes structured dissemination strategies. The creation of templates, samples and learning modules are appropriate given they can be utilized in a variety of contexts. The number of proposed conferences also increases the likelihood that a broad audience will be exposed to the project. A strength of the project is the availability of these resources through WestEd and A-GAME websites and social media channels, and a resource portal (p26).

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: 19

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 presents a structured management plan. Vetted communication and facilitation support from established partners increases the likelihood that activities and support will occur on-time and as noted (p29). Weekly management meetings with project and partner staff also will benefit the ability of the project to be executed on-time. The management plan will likely support on-time delivery given contact persons are listed and activities are clearly stated (p30-33).

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's overall budget is reasonable. For example, the personnel line items include descriptions of job duties and references to funding type (e.g., FTE, stipend). Each expenditure category includes a description of activities requested for funding (p e109-e123). A strength of the budget is that line items reflect proposed grant activities and fund each component to the degree it is utilized in the project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly discuss how it determined the \$ [REDACTED] /presentation stipend awarded to members of the Coalition of Early Adopters. Given travel costs are covered by the proposed project and registration fees for presenters are usually waived, the applicant does not adequately justify for fee for preparation time and logistics costs (budget p7). The applicant also does not clearly justify the project director's salary (\$ [REDACTED] for a .56FTE. Providing the average salary for the project director may have provided clarity regarding how the salary amount was determined.

Reader's Score: 9

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: 7

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the extent to which it will encourage 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.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

The project director is well-qualified to guide the project. She is experienced with authorizer, school governance and academic oversight. She has experience at the authorizer level and at the local charter school level. Her experience in the classroom will benefit the project in regards to available formative assessment and data use (p35). The project director also has experience with the proposed interventions and the intended finance director has experience managing federal grants.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Key project personnel are experienced to serve in assigned roles. For example, the finance director has experience in grant financial management and (p35) has specific experience with the former A-GAME grant which yielded clear audits. Primary partners are equally qualified in their respective fields.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2022 02:29 PM