

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2023 09:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oklahoma Public School Resource Center Inc (S282A230013)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	30
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	12
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	27
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	11
Sub Total	100	80

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1

Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. CPP1	1	1
Sub Total	1	1

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. CPP2	2	1
Sub Total	2	1

Competitive Preference Priority 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. CPP3	2	1
Sub Total	2	1

Competitive Preference Priority 4

Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. CPP4	2	2
Sub Total	2	2

Competitive Preference Priority 5

Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. CPP5	3	1
Sub Total	3	1

Total

110

86

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - State Entities - 11: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Oklahoma Public School Resource Center Inc (S282A230013)

Questions

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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided a logic model based on the research used by the National Charter School Resource Center for its paper "Starting Strong: Best Practices in Starting a Charter School" and its own experience as a charter-support organization that new schools and replicating/expanding schools require the same support (pg. e30). The paper outlines the challenges faced by start-up charter schools and provides best practices to assist new charter school with a successful start-up period (pgs. e29-e30). The logic model contains multiple key project elements, including but not limited to technical assistance, professional development, and sharing of best practices (pgs. e97, e39).

The applicant proposes to support the opening of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools through activities such as the School Design Center, consulting teams, cohort groups, etc. prior to application, during planning and implementation years, and throughout the subgrant period (pgs. e12, e31, e37, e39, e97). At least 5 new or expanding or replicated schools will open each year of the grant.

The applicant describes two main activities that will develop or strengthen a cohesive statewide system that supports the opening of new, replicating, or expanding high-quality charter schools: (1) meetings with the National Network for District Authorizing and (2) tools for authorizers developed based on results from a survey of authorizer needs (pg. e32).

The applicant is an organization that promotes collaboration between and among charter schools and school districts, including sharing charter school best practices at the state School Innovation Summit (pg. e33, e36, e69).

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicates it will support charter schools with a significant number of sites identified by the state for comprehensive support and improvement by offering technical support and model frameworks (pg. e34). It is not clear, however, if the technical support is mandatory or only provided if the struggling school requests assistance.

The applicant indicates it will use charter schools to improve/turn around struggling schools by offering technical support (pg. e35). Although it is noted that the applicant provided 191 hours of technical assistance to Collegiate Hall, and although the neighborhood comparison chart shows high performance by the school receiving the technical assistance, it is not clear how the applicant actively supports the use of charter schools to improve

Sub

struggling schools or for takeover of a traditional public school (pg. e35).

Reader's Score: 4

2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and

Strengths:

The applicant presented performance measures that are loosely related to the intended outcomes of the project. The applicant suggests six performance measures for project objective two, which is to “strengthen the quality of Oklahoma’s charter school operation and authorization” (pgs. e38-e39). The performance measures include determining the percentage new charter schools who participate in startup cohorts, determining the percentage of expanding/replicating charter schools who develop a strategic expansion plan, presenting a set number of charter school best practices, increasing student English Language Arts and Mathematics performance, determining the percentage of state authorizers who participate in NN4DA’s cohorts and attend meetings, and determining the percentage of state authorizers using best-practice tools. Five of the six performance measures focus solely on participation or use and do not align with determining if the operation and authorization of charter schools has improved.

Weaknesses:

The applicant suggests four performance measures for project objective one, which is to “Increase the number of high-quality charter schools in the state with an emphasis on those serving educationally disadvantaged students” (pgs. e37-e38). The performance measures include the number of sub-grants awarded, a population with a higher percentage of educationally disadvantaged students compared to the state average, the number of subgrants awarded in total throughout the grant period, and ensuring all subgrant funding is spent by the end of the grant period. None of the performance measures align with the objective of increasing the number of high-quality charter schools.

The application would be strengthened with performance measures clearly related to measuring the (1) quality of charter schools, (2) increase of serving educationally disadvantaged student populations, (3) quality of authorizing practices, and (4) quality of charter school operation. Examples of robust and aligned performance measures could include the increase of English Language Arts and Mathematics proficiency (or growth, if measured in the state) disaggregated by school and student subgroup to ensure charter schools are of high-quality and the target population’s education gap is reduced; the percentage of educationally disadvantaged students being served by charter schools as compared to the geographic region in which the school is located (rather than compared to the state); the improvement of charter school operation using objective performance in the recently developed model academic and financial performance framework, measured over time and comparing subgrant recipients receiving additional assistance to charter schools not receiving the additional assistance; the improvement of charter school authorizers using the NACSA Best Practices compared to those not using this framework, measured over time and comparing authorizers of charter schools receiving subgrants to those that did not receive subgrants; etc.

In addition, providing data for all years of the grant period rather than selecting only the most previous one or two years, and disaggregating performance data and other data by student subgroups, would strengthen the arguments of the amount of improvement for subgrant recipients (pgs. e17-e18).

Reader's Score: 3

3. The ambitiousness of the State entity’s objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entity program

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant's objective to open 25 new or expanding/replicating charter schools during the grant period is ambitious, as it would increase the total number of charter schools in the state by 39% (pg. e39).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's objective to serve a higher percentage of educationally disadvantaged students is easily attainable as it proposes to compare the enrollment demographic of all subgrantees (as a group) to the state (pg. e39). This allows a small number of charter schools serving a high percentage of educationally disadvantaged students to skew the data. The objective to strengthen the quality of the state's charter school operation and authorization is not ambitious as all performance measures look at increasing participation rate or attendance at meetings, training, or activities (pg. e40). There is no measure of the outcome of participating in these meetings, trainings, or activities making it unclear whether meeting these objectives would ensure the success of the overall project.

Reader's Score: 3

4. The extent to which the projected number of subgrant awards for each grant project year is supported by evidence of demand and need, and the extent to which the proposed average subgrant award amount is supported by evidence of the need of applicants

Strengths:

The applicant provided convincing evidence it can continue to open at least five new, replicating, or expanding schools each year during the grant period (pgs. e16, e42).

The proposed subgrant award is [REDACTED] would provide financial means for a subgrant recipient during its planning period and first two years of operation (pg. e43). This funding would be the only funding provided to a new, expanding, or replicating school other than state aid, which is based in prior year enrollment for expanding and replicating schools and current year enrollment for new schools. Multiple examples of financial challenges new, expanding, and replicating charter schools have faced during the process of opening or drastically changing demographics was provided by the applicant, providing a compelling reason for subgrant funding (pgs. e43-e46).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program and improve education results for students.

Strengths:

The applicant intends to publicize the availability of subgrants through existing avenues, such as the applicant's website, email newsletters, press releases, social media, and regional public community meetings (pg. e46). In addition, it will update its subgrant application process in 2024 to meet the requirements of the 2023 CSP grant (pg. e50). A detailed description of the changes to the RFA was provided (pgs. e50-e56). The peer review process was described in detail and includes a description of who will review the subgrant applications, which is mainly the applicant's staff and individuals with experience in charter schools (pgs. e47-e48).

The applicant identifies competitive priority preference for subgrantees serving educational disadvantaged students (pg. e57) and providing a high-quality plan with key milestones in the planning, development, and implementation of the charter school specific to membership of the governing board and a community-centered approach (pg. e57).

The applicant provided student proficiency data for school years 2021 and 2022 comparing all charter schools to charter schools receiving subgrants (pg. e17). The percent increase for subgrantees is higher than the increase for all charter schools.

Weaknesses:

There was no detail provided regarding how the subgrant process would support diverse charter school models, including models that serve rural communities as well as prioritize the opening of high schools (pgs. e47-e58). In addition, only two years of academic proficiency data was provided (i.e., 2021 and 2022). It is unclear if the applicant has continually improved education results for students over time or if education was improved in 2022 only. With no disaggregation of data, it is also unclear if the applicant improved education results for educationally disadvantaged students, the focus of the applicant's first objective (pgs. e37). The applicant does not discuss how the new subgrantees will improve educational results for children other than through one performance measure (i.e., Objective 2 P.M. 4), which states charter schools will increase English Language Arts and Mathematics performance by 5% by the end of the grant period (pg. e38).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant indicates it will conduct regular monitoring of subgrantees to assess if they are successfully implementing the approved grant project and according to federal and state requirements (pg. e58). Monitors will not duplicate efforts and will be trained by working alongside the state department of education's federal program officer to ensure consistency in monitoring processes (pg. e62).

Weaknesses:

The subgrantee monitoring process includes seven areas identified by name, but not all seven are included in the table of subgrantee requirements and required documentation (pgs. e59-e60). For example, there is no monitoring to determine if the subgrantee adheres to the definition and status of a high-quality charter school, and no monitoring for risk mitigation for charter schools operated by a management system, although both are identified as areas covered by the monitoring process (pgs. e58-e59).

The monitoring timeline indicates its first non-financial related review (a desktop monitoring activity) is in October-November of the planning year, which is eight to nine months after receiving a subgrant award and the next monitoring review is not until the school opens (18 months after receiving funds) (pg. e60). This timeline does not provide for an early identification of risk, but rather only identifies risk through evaluation of the charter school's year budget and yearly state accreditation reports provided by the state department of education (pg. e61). It is not clear what type(s) of risk would be identified by these two evaluations. The applicant also does not provide a timeframe by which identified deficiencies must be remedied (pgs. e60-e62).

Sub

Reader's Score: 6

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

Strengths:

The applicant's strategies to avoid duplication of work for the charter school subgrantees are clear and include using a single system to provide important information to the grantor, authorizer, accreditation office, technical assistance team, and others to access the same data (pgs. e62-e63). This also makes it easier for the authorized public chartering agencies and state agency to have access to information without having to collect it separately.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. Provide technical assistance and support for--

- i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
- ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State;**

Strengths:

The applicant's plan to provide technical assistance to support subgrantees in opening and operating new, expansion, and replicating charter schools is well-developed and includes one-on-one, customized technical assistance; large group, in-person training; website resources; and the ongoing School Design Center (pgs. e19-e20, e63-e64). The variety of technical assistance topics the applicant provides is a comprehensive list, including but not limited to accessing federal funding and programs, student recruitment and retention, engaging and supporting educationally disadvantaged students, and reducing the overuse of discipline with students with a disability (pgs. e64-e65).

The applicant's plan to provide technical assistance to improve quality authorizing efforts in the state is currently limited to quarterly meetings, with the rest of the plan depending on the results of surveys of authorizer needs and charter school perception of authorizer performance (pg. e65).

Weaknesses:

The applicant will create its authorizer technical assistance based on survey results of authorizer needs and charter school perception of authorizer performance and may not address all the areas identified in the grant application (pg. e65). No information was provided on how authorizers will be invited to participate or how non-attending authorizers will be able to access the technical assistance to improve their efforts. In addition, both performance measures related to authorizer performance (Objective 2 P.M. 5 and P.M. 6) are limited to participation rate and use, and it is not clear if the technical assistance will improve performance or perception of performance (pgs. e39, e65).

Reader's Score: 8

4. The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State; and

Strengths:

The applicant will assist all charter schools accessing the School Design Center with performing a community needs-assessment, which will inform the subgrantee of the educational factors and considerations that are the most

Sub

important to the community (pg. e66). The data collected will be completed prior to the planning year, which ensures that school design teams use community feedback as a foundational building block for the charter school design process (pg. e66).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide any details regarding how the School Design Center will engage the community, or a timeline of activities beyond data collection prior to the school’s planning year, or how the data will be collected and shared (pgs. e66-e67). The applicant also does not provide any details of how schools not accessing the School Design Center will collect and use community input through the design and implementation process of the school other than they can use subgrant funds for a consultant to help them (pg. e66). In addition, the applicant did not indicate a mechanism for soliciting feedback from parents or members of the community speaking languages other than English as their primary language.

Reader's Score: 3

5. The degree of flexibility afforded by the State’s charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates the flexibility for charter schools, including that charter schools are exempt from all statutes and rules relating to schools, boards of education, and school districts, except those found in the Oklahoma Charter Schools Act and the school’s charter agreement (pg. e67). Flexibilities are provided in the five critical areas of personnel, budgeting, curriculum and instruction, scheduling/attendance, and governance (pg. e67). The applicant provides and will continue to provide technical assistance to association members and subgrantees regarding advise on state statute and best practices of charter school operations (pg. e69).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 11

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’s management plan is realistic and appropriate for the objectives of the grant (pgs. e37-e39, e69-e71). The timeline is clear, as are responsible parties for each activity. Key project personnel have demonstrated adequate qualifications to contribute to the project’s success (pgs. e81 – e94).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The plan for managing external partners is minimal and does not include the level of detail needed to be considered well-developed (pg. e72). There could be additional milestones and responsibilities outlined in the management plan that align directly with the performance measures described for the grant project. For example, there is no clear milestone or activity in the management plan discussing when academic performance information will be obtained, how or when it will be analyzed, who will perform the analysis, how the analysis may be used for subgrant monitoring or risk assessment, etc. (Objective 2, P.M. 4) (pgs. e38, e69-e71).

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The applicant indicated it used feedback from its previous CSP grant to design this 2023 grant application (pg. e73).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides little information about its plan to collect, analyze, and use feedback for continuous improvement to their proposed project. The applicant identifies participating in a community of practice for CSP subgrantees through the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools and conducting subgrantee surveys at the end of the subgrant period but does not provide details regarding who (specifically) will provide the feedback, how it will receive the feedback, the type of data and feedback collected, and how the project personnel will use the feedback to make improvements in subsequent years (pgs. e72-e73).

Reader's Score: 1

3. The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant presents detailed information on the time commitments of the project director and other key personnel, including the percentage of time each staff member plans to spend on the project. The time dedicated to the project are appropriate and adequate to meet the goals and objectives of the grant (pgs. e37-e39, e69-e71, e73-e75).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

a. Allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State ; or

b. In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, the State has an appeals process for

the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing the appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Please specify whether they meet (a) or (b) and clearly explain why in the strengths.

(0 or 1 points)

Strengths:

In May 2023, the Oklahoma Charter Schools Act was expanded to include some higher education institutions, Native American Tribes, and a newly formed State Charter School Board as potential authorizers of charter schools if an application was denied a charter by the local school district (pgs. e24-e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The Oklahoma Charter Schools Act mandates that a charter school receive the full state aid allocation made available to students statewide (pg. e25). This funding is distributed at the same time as state aid is distributed to school districts (pg. e25). The applicant also indicated charter schools are identified as Local Education Agencies (LEAs), so they can receive federal funding, for which the LEA is eligible, directly from the state (pgs. e25-e26).

Weaknesses:

The applicant identified the Redbud School Finding act as the mechanism for providing funding to LEAs that receive less than the state average of ad-valorem tax (in lieu of local funding). However, it is not clear (1) if the funding received through Redbud is equitable to the local district of residence for the charter school, (2) when this funding is distributed to an eligible charter school, or (3) if this funding can be used for anything other than facility needs (pgs. e25, e27).

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant disseminates charter school best practices via templates on its website, presentations at an annual school innovation summit, and through a learning community that is committed to exploring new ideas and redesigning learning for their communities (pg. e26).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a description of how the best practices were determined to be best practices, only a list of topics included in the best practice materials and presentations. Other than making these best practices available, the applicant did not provide any evidence that any struggling school (district or charter) uses any of these best practices from charter schools (pg. e26). There was no evidence provided that the applicant targeted its best practices specifically for struggling schools' needs.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) **Funding for facilities**
- b) **Assistance with facilities acquisition**
- c) **Access to public facilities**
- d) **The ability to share in bonds or mill levies**
- e) **The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings**
- f) **Low- or no-cost leasing privileges**

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant described several efforts the State provides to assist charter schools with facilities access, including the Redbud School Funding Act, which provides funding for facilities to charter schools that do not receive significant property taxes (pg. e27); access to public facilities and low-cost leasing privileges (i.e., government rates) (pg. e27); and the opportunity to participate in bonds or mill levies (pg. e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 5 - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.

(up to 3 points)

Strengths:

The applicant indicated it would support schools serving at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services in the future if they ever had this need (pg. e28).

Weaknesses:

Given the information provided in the background section, such as the high number of educationally disadvantaged students across the state (pg. e16), and disparity between student proficiency scores in multiple student demographic subgroups (pgs. e17-e18), there is likely a current need for supporting existing and new charter schools that serve at-risk students with dropout prevention, dropout recovery, and college or career counseling needs.

Because the applicant does not provide any educational data pertaining to current state or charter school dropout demographics, or college or career counseling needs (e.g., college acceptance rates, college completion, career placement, etc.) it is not clear if the applicant is aware of this data for the schools it supports (pgs. e27). Although the applicant indicated it would support schools in the future if they ever had this need but did not provide any examples of the specific activities or types of activities it would provide (pg. e28).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 06/28/2023 09:51 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2023 10:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oklahoma Public School Resource Center Inc (S282A230013)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	30
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	12
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	29
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	11
Sub Total	100	82
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP2	2	1
Sub Total	2	1
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	2	1
Sub Total	2	1
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	3	1
Sub Total	3	1

Total

110

88

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - State Entities - 11: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Oklahoma Public School Resource Center Inc (S282A230013)

Questions

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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes a comprehensive plan of the design and intent of its project. The logic model included in this section clearly delineates the detail and thoroughness that the OPSRC has taken to determine its objectives throughout the project and its outcomes (pages e30-e31). Much of the design planning described in this application is demonstrated by prior experience in managing a CSP grant and their work with external organizations, such as National Charter School Resource Center and the National Charter School Institute. Furthermore, the OPSRC provides a clear explanation of its School Design Center and demonstrates the gains provided to its first cohort (pages e31-e32).

Weaknesses:

The applicant clearly states that it will support charter schools in LEAs identified for comprehensive support and improvement "by continuing to offer our complete array of technical support, model frameworks, etc.." (Page e34) However, the applicant's narrative lacked an explanation of how they would provide those supports. Additionally, the applicant is clear that "OPSRC supports a cohesive statewide strategy to encourage collaboration and share best practices between charter schools and other public schools/LEAs" (Page e36), however it does not provide information on how the applicant will support the use of charter schools to improve struggling schools or to turn around struggling schools (both charter and other public schools).

Reader's Score: 4

2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and

Strengths:

The applicant has included performance measures for both of its objectives through the creation of measures that are focused on increasing the number of high-quality charter schools and strengthening the quality of charter school operation and authorization. As a whole, the performance measures include both quantitative and qualitative outcomes. For example, in objective 2, page e38, the applicant has set a high percentage for participation in its School Design Center (SDC) and for developing strategic expansion plans. For example, P.M.1 requires that at least 90% of the new charter schools participate in SDC Startup Cohorts by FY28 and P.M.2 also has a 90% goal in

Sub

which expanding/replicating charter schools develop strategic expansion plans (page e38).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's performance measures for Objective 1 were adequate, however 3 out of the four performance measures within Objective 1 did not address the latter part of the objective which states, "...with an emphasis on serving educationally disadvantaged students." For example, P.M. 3 states, "Award 25 sub-grants by the end of the grant period." (Page e37) However, the method of evaluation only reviews the "number of sub-grants awarded according to executed sub-grant agreements" and it is not clear how this performance measure also meets the objective to serve educationally disadvantaged students.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides an explanation of how it will attain its objectives through prior experience through the CSP grant received in 2017 (Table on page e42) and the School Design Center (page e39-e40). Additionally, in their second objective, although they intend to have a number of staff working with sub grantees, the applicant will incorporate other consultants to work with schools in creating the strategic plans. The narrative for this section takes every performance measure and provides the personnel that will assist in attaining those measures (page e69-e71).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's narrative section for the second objective is not clear whether meeting the objective would ensure success of the overall project and limited data for the objective was provided.

Reader's Score: 3

4. The extent to which the projected number of subgrant awards for each grant project year is supported by evidence of demand and need, and the extent to which the proposed average subgrant award amount is supported by evidence of the need of applicants

Strengths:

The applicant provides extensive evidence on the demand and need for the projected number of subgrant awards. The applicant has experience with setting the number of subgrants per year from 2018 through 2023 and it is shown visibly with the chart provided on page e42. Their intentional planning for the 2017 CSP grant project design has informed this new proposed project. On page e43, the applicant explains how 12 teams from the first cohort of SDC are planning to open schools in the near future and five teams are set up to join the second SDC cohort. This demonstrates both the demand and need, as well as the importance of the SDC to the applicants and subgrantees. Additionally, the applicant provides evidence of the amount that is appropriate to allocate for startup costs based on the breakdown of student enrollment and per pupil expenditure of two schools (page e45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program and improve education results for students.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a thorough knowledge of each requirement it asks of the eligible applicants. This section clearly details each area associated with this project and includes the who, what and when for each area. For example, pages e47-e50, it provides a clear explanation of the review process and includes the diverse panel of reviewers recruited for the prior applications. Furthermore, the applicant provides detailed information for each section of the RFA the potential applicants are required to provide. These requirements expand through academic plans, financial funding and support, and complete operations of a school.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's narrative does not provide sufficient context on how the subgrant process supports diverse charter models, including models serving rural communities.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - State Plan**1. The State entity's plan to--**

Reader's Score: 29

Sub**1. Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;****Strengths:**

The applicant clearly delineates the action steps and what to look for when monitoring eligible applicants. The applicant provides a two charts (pages e59-e61) that visibly outline sub-grantee requirements and its related evidentiary documentation, and a timeline of events for varied forms of monitoring.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's narrative does not sufficiently address what process is in place for subgrantees to address any deficiencies. On page e62, the applicant briefly states "Any findings will be followed up with a corrective action plan...", however no additional information is provided. Additionally, the applicant is not clear on how funds will help meet the educational needs of students with disabilities and English learners.

Reader's Score: 7

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

The applicant provides varied opportunities for different stakeholders to communicate on the oversight practices and collaborate on how to reduce the administrative burden. For example, the OPSRC provides initial technical assistance to potential applicants, and through this technical assistance then better understands the educational model being proposed (pages e62-e63). This qualitative data informs what potential monitoring procedures may take place. Additionally, certain forms of communication, to include a reporting management system, have open lines of communication, and hosting "cohort conversations", provide opportunities to review and discuss monitoring practices and to inform ways to avoid duplication of effort (page e63).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. Provide technical assistance and support for--

- i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
- ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State;**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a sound plan for supporting subgrantees with technical assistance, starting with consultations for potential applicants and has incorporated School Design Center teams to provide on-going support and technical assistance for approved applicants (page e49). Furthermore, the applicant "supports charter schools with recruitment, enrollment, and retention in several ways." (Page e64). Additionally, OPSRC has developed a closure policy in conjunction with authorizers during its first grant cycle in 2017 (page e66).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide sufficient context on how authorizers will participate or access TA.

Reader's Score: 9

4. The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State; and

Strengths:

The applicant incorporates a requirement of obtaining parent/community feedback as an element of its application process and to undergo a needs-assessment process. Specifically, school teams will work directly with a consultant to gather input and hear directly from the community (page e66). Additionally, during the planning year, the community feedback will be used as a foundational building block. One of the strengths in this section are the different touchpoints the prospective applicant will be required to use the data in building its school design plan.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide sufficient context to how the data will be collected but that it will take place during the Planning Year.

Reader's Score: 3

5. The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly explains the flexibilities afforded to the charter schools based on the state law. The narrative includes details in the follow areas: personnel, budgeting, curriculum and instruction, scheduling and attendance, and governance. (Pages e67-e68) It is evident from the narrative that the law provides flexibility in its finances, educational model, and the operations of a charter school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 11

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 clearly delineates the responsibilities for each personnel that will be connected to the CSP grant and provides a realistic timeline for achieving its milestones (pages e69-e71). Furthermore, the applicant provides a substantial number of key personnel dedicated to managing the CSP grants, along with their qualifications (pages e71-e72).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's management plan does not provide sufficient context for managing the work of any external partners.

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates that it seeks feedback from both national organizations and the local entities that have received a subgrant. Including these two areas of feedback allows the OSPRC to continue to improve their process based on national best practices and local recommendations. (Page e73)

Weaknesses:

The applicant's management plan does not provide sufficient context on the type of data and feedback collected and how the personnel will use this feedback to make improvements in subsequent years.

Reader's Score: 1

3. **The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant has an understanding of the responsibilities and workload for managing the CSP grant and has provided an adequate amount of personnel dedicated to this. It includes 4 FTE to oversee the administrative aspects, the technical assistance and monitoring, the School Design Center and a partial amount provided by the CSP Grant Director. (Page e73)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

a. Allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State ; or

b. In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, the State has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing the appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Please specify whether they meet (a) or (b) and clearly explain why in the strengths.

(0 or 1 points)

Strengths:

The applicant clearly outlines that the state of Oklahoma and its charter law allow for multiple entities (e.g. school districts, higher education institutions, Native American tribes) to be an authorized public chartering agency. (Page e25)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear description of the types of funding available to charter schools. A strength in this section includes the applicant's description of the Redbud School Funding Act which allows an LEA that receives less than the state average ad-valorem tax receipt additional funding due to charter schools not receiving local funding. (Page e25) Additionally, it is clear that traditional funding flow directly from the state to the charter school. (Page e26)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide sufficient information on whether charter schools that qualify for Redbud School Funding will receive them in a prompt manner.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant provides a complete list of strategies used to disseminate best practices throughout the state. The forums developed include both topics driven by and developed by OPSRC and presentations and learning communities guided by charter leaders. (Page e26) As the applicant has experience in best practice dissemination, it is evident that the work will continue in the subsequent years of this five-year project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address how the State is using best practices to help improve struggling schools.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) Funding for facilities
- b) Assistance with facilities acquisition
- c) Access to public facilities
- d) The ability to share in bonds or mill levies
- e) The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's narrative describes the several opportunities charter schools are given in the state of Oklahoma to access both funding for facilities and rent facilities at a low market rate. Additionally, charter schools may enter into bond financing and are certainly included in bond planning conversations with the districts and if a charter school meets a certain criteria it may be eligible for the Redbud School Funding Act. (Page e27)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 5 - Competitive Preference Priority 5

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.

(up to 3 points)

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates it has experience to support charter schools that serve at-risk/educationally disadvantaged students as referenced in this section under the "Background" section of its application (page e27). The applicant clearly states that it will support charter schools through its School Design Center, providing technical assistance, professional development, and best-practice tools to authorizers and charters (page e28). Additionally, the OPSRC states it would support charter schools that serve this specific student population and ensure to conduct a community-needs assessment to determine the focus of the support.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide clear examples on how it will attempt to support charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services, if and when a charter school has those focuses.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2023 10:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2023 08:52 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oklahoma Public School Resource Center Inc (S282A230013)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	30
Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants		
1. Eligible Applicants	15	13
State Plan		
1. State Plan	35	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	11
Sub Total	100	82
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP1	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP2	2	1
Sub Total	2	1
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. CPP3	2	1
Sub Total	2	1
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. CPP4	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
Competitive Preference Priority 5		
1. CPP5	3	1
Sub Total	3	1

Total

110

88

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - State Entities - 11: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Oklahoma Public School Resource Center Inc (S282A230013)

Questions

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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant delivers a well-developed response, providing a detailed rationale for the project and exemplifying various forms of technical assistance. They offer accounting training, policy updates, school building management, and maintenance as specific examples of support (e30).

Their detailed logic model, based on their own experience and research from the National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) and including NACSA standards, establishes a clear connection to the desired outcomes and solidifies the program (e31).

A notable aspect of their proposal is establishing the School Design Center (SDC), which offers valuable technical assistance to schools applying for charters (e31). This assistance encompasses conducting community needs assessments to gather input from parents and community members (e31). The applicant emphasizes ongoing one-on-one consulting and sharing best practices at the annual Oklahoma School Innovation Summit (OSIS) to promote the adoption of high-quality practices (e32). They also offer school start-up kits to assist applicants in complying with new legal requirements (e32). Additionally, they conduct surveys of charter schools to evaluate authorizer needs and performance (e32). To enhance authorizer quality, they have developed tools like the Oklahoma Model Charter School Performance Framework and established a partnership with NNDA (e32). Authorizer training covers various topics, including best practices in special education and authorizing for small districts (e32).

The applicant provides a comprehensive timeline for the delivery of technical assistance (e34). They actively support charter school LEAs with identified needs by offering diverse support, frameworks, and options for converting failing charter schools (e34). Recognizing the importance of fostering a cohesive statewide system, they have implemented mechanisms such as the Oklahoma School Innovation Summit, the Innovative School Cohort, and the School Design Center (e36) to promote collaboration and synergy among stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

The application presented a wide range of activities to support charter schools, including opening, replicating, or expanding, all of which were informed by research-based evidence. However, it remains unclear how the support is targeted and deliberate, specifically in identifying struggling schools and LEAs and utilizing charter schools as a prescriptive response.

Sub

Regarding authorizers, the proposal lacks a clear identification of specific areas where authorizing could be improved through the grant. The performance measures associated with authorizer trainings are limited to attendance at summits and meetings without incorporating qualitative measures to guide the support provided. A more comprehensive and focused approach is needed to enhance the authorizing process and ensure the success of charter schools.

On the other hand, the resources offered by the applicant appear to provide a wide array of materials accessible to all charter schools through multiple channels. Additionally, there is required technical assistance that supports grant writing efforts. However, the application does not outline a targeted strategy to support struggling schools. It is essential to address the specific needs of struggling schools and develop tailored interventions to ensure their improvement and success.

While the application covers a broad range of activities and resources, there is a need for a more deliberate approach to identifying and addressing the challenges faced by struggling schools and LEAs. Additionally, a more comprehensive and qualitative assessment of authorizers is necessary to guide the support they receive.

Reader's Score: 4

2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and

Strengths:

The applicant provides an adequately developed response. The applicant offers SMART performance measures related to the outcome measures and aligns with the proposed outcomes. Each is accompanied by a method of evaluation that will demonstrate whether the outcome is met (e37). The objectives are measurable and achievable and are supported by the logic model.

Weaknesses:

The performance measures outlined in the application are primarily focused on attendance or participation rather than assessing actual knowledge or improvement. Additionally, the available quantifiable outcomes related to achievement are limited to annual statewide testing, which may not be suitable for making meaningful comparisons in this context. Furthermore, the application lacks cohort data that would indicate student growth over time, which is particularly important when working with struggling students. Notably, both qualitative and quantitative measures are not provided for each objective, leaving gaps in the evaluation framework.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The applicant's response is adequately developed. They explain each performance measure, clarifying why they are ambitious and achievable. One example is the Quality Authorizing performance measures, deemed attainable due to their established relationships with other schools. These measures are also considered ambitious as they aim to "change the landscape" of authorizing (e41).

The applicant seeks to add 25 new schools in their proposal, representing a significant 39% increase in the number of charter schools in the state (e39). The application includes objectives specifically targeting the growth of high-quality charter schools (e37). Additionally, the applicant sets a goal for 90% of expanding or replicating schools to have strategic expansion plans in place (e40).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The application lacks clarity in demonstrating the connection between outcomes and actual improvements, as opposed to mere increases. Moreover, the qualitative results presented are limited and fail to capture gains in practice or knowledge. Additionally, some of the outcomes stated are unclear. For instance, the applicant mentions adding 25 new, expanding, or replicating schools, which contradicts the statement about creating 25 new schools. This discrepancy becomes even more challenging to reconcile with the claim of nearly 40% growth in the number of schools. Perhaps using the number of seats would have been a more accurate indicator of growth in such circumstances.

The projected increase in educationally disadvantaged students is solely based on the school's location, with no strategies outlined to attract these students (e40). While the authorizing goals appear ambitious in terms of involvement, it is unclear what specific outcomes are intended to be achieved and whether these goals are indeed ambitious. Furthermore, the applicant fails to provide evidence that adopting a strategic expansion plan leads to improved outcomes. Including cohort-based evidence rather than grade-based evidence would have strengthened this section by allowing for observation of the same cohort of students over time.

Reader's Score: 3

4. The extent to which the projected number of subgrant awards for each grant project year is supported by evidence of demand and need, and the extent to which the proposed average subgrant award amount is supported by evidence of the need of applicants

Strengths:

The applicant's response is thorough and well-developed. They draw on historical data from a previous CSP grant to support the need for their proposed project (e42). To address various challenges, such as low state funding, limited state dollars for expansion, and the high costs associated with starting rural schools, the applicant suggests offering [REDACTED] in grants (e43). This amount is based on their experience with their first CSP grant, where they found that [REDACTED] was insufficient beyond the initial year. They also note that the state funding cycle creates a gap for rapidly expanding schools until state funding catches up in October (e43).

The applicant provides a chart to visually demonstrate the higher per-pupil spending at the start of enrollment (e45). This chart helps to illustrate the financial implications of their proposal.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Applicants Receiving Subgrants

1. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program and improve education results for students.

Strengths:

The applicant's application includes a well-developed plan to attract quality applicants, with detailed information provided (e46). They employ multiple channels, such as their website, emails, press releases, social media platforms, community meetings, and targeted outreach to authorizers, members of the OK PCSA, school staff, parents, and philanthropic entities, to advertise grants (e46). Information requests are followed by informational meetings, and a dedicated webinar has been created for prospective grantees (e46). The applicant offers a clear and comprehensive outline that illustrates the sub-grant process (e47). Their application process includes various components, such as technical vetting, budget

checks, compliance risks, and adherence to the federal allowable cost guide, all of which are detailed in their account (e48). They also provide a scoring rubric that outlines the evaluation components and priorities (e49).

Drawing from their experience with a previous CSP grant, the applicant describes a rigorous process for selecting peer reviewers who must be former grant recipients (e47). Lessons learned have led the applicant to include a section on identifying partners, particularly for-profit entities and CMOs (e51). The new application requires the inclusion of performance agreements, accountability measures, achievement information, and grounds for revocation (e52). Subgrant applicants are expected to provide information on community and family engagement, along with a needs analysis demonstrating the impact of the proposed school on the intended location (e53). They must also present evidence of racial and socioeconomic diversity, ensuring that the new school will not contribute to racial isolation (e55). Additionally, subgrantees are required to provide evidence of recruitment and retention strategies that accommodate students from diverse backgrounds, with enrollment and recruitment events specifically designed to facilitate the attendance of underserved groups (e56). The applicant emphasizes the importance of transportation and instructional models that support diverse students (e56). Expansion and replication schools need to provide data on achievement, audits, and state report card performance (e57). Priority in subgrant awards will be given to schools targeting underserved and disadvantaged students (e57) as well as support for opening new high schools (e58)

Weaknesses:

The applicant's plan for awarding subgrants states that awards are made to the five highest-scoring applicants. Without an established cutoff score, the quality of the pool of applicants is a variable that could allow lower-quality schools to receive grant funds (e50). The timeline provided hits the general key milestones but is not very detailed. Family and community involvement is a required component of the application, but there is no evidence that input is requested for the writing of the subgrant proposal itself. There is no requirement that a subgrantee provides transportation, creating a barrier to enrollment for some students, nor is it required that a subgrantee has found a facility for its program.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - State Plan

1. The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

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

Strengths:

An adequately developed monitoring plan is provided by the applicant. The applicant's monitoring plan encompasses seven components of the monitoring process (e59). This monitoring process aligns with the requirements set forth by the CSP (e59). In cases of poor performance or inadequate reporting, an additional layer of monitoring is implemented (e59). Annually, a risk evaluation is conducted on the grantees' budget and accreditation reports, and expenditures are continuously monitored (e61). Grant monitors receive training from the state department's federal program offices to minimize duplication of efforts (e62). The applicant describes a system that employs corrective action plans, which are then made available on their website (e62). Information is also shared with authorizers to ensure that efforts are not duplicated unnecessarily (e62).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Technical assistance is neither mandatory nor based on specific components of the grant process (e60). The seven components of the monitoring process are listed, but not all appear in the monitoring timeline (e60). The monitoring plan timeline suggests that some issues may not be addressed in a timely manner; for example, desktop monitoring does not occur until October of the first year, well after awards are made (e61).

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully developed and detailed plan outlining their efforts to minimize duplication. They provide technical assistance in advance, enabling the technical assistance teams to gain a better understanding of the applicants (e62). The information gathered from these sessions is then shared with authorizers to identify common data requirements that can be shared (e63). Furthermore, a web-based performance management system has been specifically designed for this project (e63). Multiple agencies collaborate to review the data, ensuring that accountability plans and oversight do not overlap (e63). Additionally, a working group comprising charter school authorizers convenes monthly to discuss best practices, with a specific focus on reducing duplicated efforts (e63).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. Provide technical assistance and support for--

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

ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State;

Strengths:

i. The applicant presents a fully-developed technical assistance (TA) plan for schools, covering various areas of support. The TA described by the applicant includes one-to-one assistance and mandatory training on state and federal funding eligibility. It emphasizes the importance of identifying policies and procedures that enable schools to participate in programming, receive the maximum commensurate share of federal funds, and effectively meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children targeted under those programs (e63).

To further support schools, a School Center Design team is available to provide TA in the aforementioned areas (e64). This team offers assistance specifically focused on enrollment, recruitment, and retention, with a special emphasis on educationally disadvantaged youth. Subgrantees are required to set at least one goal related to addressing outcomes for these students (e64).

ii. The proposal presents an adequately-developed plan for authorizer technical assistance (TA), highlighting the importance of supporting quality authorizing as a primary component of the logic model (e65). The applicant offers various forms of assistance, including quarterly meetings with NN4DA that address topics derived from surveys of authorizer needs and a charter school assessment of authorizers (e65). They provide a comprehensive list of relevant topics related to authorizing, covering essential issues such as renewal, performance agreements, revocation, and shutdown procedures (e65).

To ensure transparency and accountability, a yearly authorizer monitoring report will be made available to the public on an annual basis (e66).

Weaknesses:

The plan to enhance authorizer practices lacks specificity and clarity. While the proposal mentions that topics for quarterly authorizer meetings are derived from surveys conducted with operators and authorizers, there is a concern that these surveys may not adequately capture the crucial technical assistance needs required for ensuring high-quality authorizing. Although the resources are identified, it remains unclear how the areas in need of improvement are identified and addressed. Additionally, the roles played by external partners like NN4DA and NCSI are not sufficiently described or explained in detail.

Reader's Score: 8

4. The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State; and

Strengths:

The proposal offers an adequately developed plan to solicit input from parents and community members. A subcontractor, retained by the applicant using TA grant funds, is hired to work with school teams during the planning year to gather input on what community needs should be incorporated into school plans (e66). A community needs assessment is required as part of the subgrant application (e67). Subgrant applicants will be required to submit a plan that includes how families are engaged, how partnerships with families and the community will be incorporated into the design, enrollment practices that ensure underserved students are listed as well as requirements that strategies in the instructional model serve the target population, and membership on school boards to ensure engagement as schools are designed, and a needs assessment (e57).

Weaknesses:

The proposed plan for soliciting input is insufficiently detailed. More information is required about ongoing input from these stakeholders will be used during the implementation phase of the grant. The applicant does not provide specific targets or outcomes regarding community and family input. Although the applicant employs the SDC to solicit input, there are few details related to exactly how that input will be used. A timeline for the input process is not provided, nor are the data collection methods specified.

Reader's Score: 3

5. The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive and fully-developed description of the State's flexibility regarding charter schools. According to the Oklahoma Charter Schools Act, charter schools are granted exemptions from all state statutes and rules pertaining to schools, boards of education, and school districts (e67). These autonomies encompass various aspects such as personnel, including the option to opt out of the teacher retirement system (e67), as well as budgeting, curriculum, schedule, and governance (e68).

These flexibilities enable charter schools to develop customized hiring and retention policies specific to their program, utilize state funds freely, choose their own curriculum (while still participating in statewide assessments), and establish their own governance structure (e68). To ensure charter schools have a clear understanding of these provisions, the applicant offers technical assistance (e68). The OPSRC (Oklahoma Public School Resource Center) provides charter schools with support in five key areas: legal, finance, technology, communications, and teaching & learning (e68). Additionally, the applicant provides a webpage dedicated to charter school resources, further aiding schools in accessing valuable information (e68).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 11

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:

: This proposal includes a well-developed management plan. The applicant provides an RFA timeline for subgrants, including pre-authorization and ongoing technical assistance (e33). The applicant provides an implementation timeline with milestones, activities, dates, and persons responsible (e70). The budget presented demonstrates that sufficient funding is available for the project to be successful, including the hiring of additional CSP staff and consultants (e71). Key staff are listed, including resumes and responsibilities, and demonstrate that the team has the skills and experience to accomplish the project's goals (e72).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a detailed plan for managing external partners (e57). The management plan design covers most areas of the project, but no milestones or responsibilities are attributed to oversight of the academic program goals.

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The use of data from their first CSP grant demonstrates the applicant's ability to use feedback to support continuous improvement (e62). Improvements to the new subgrant process are drawn directly from this experience.

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides a poorly developed plan for feedback and continuous improvement. The proposal provides a description of the continuous improvement process but with limited details. It fails to specify who will receive the feedback, where the information will be posted, and what dissemination practices will be employed. Furthermore, the process heavily relies on subgrantee feedback without sufficient evidence of quantitative outcomes that could drive improvement. While the plan for using feedback from the previous grant is clearly outlined, the plan for future

Sub

iterations lacks sufficient detail to understand how feedback will be utilized in subsequent years. The proposal also does not mention the methods for data collection or identify the specific types of data to be collected.

Reader's Score: 1

3. The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

A fully developed description of the time commitments of key staff is provided in the proposal. The project director is designated as a full-time position, ensuring dedicated leadership for the project. Additionally, 4.4 full-time equivalents (FTE) staff members are allocated to monitor schools and provide one-on-one feedback (e74) effectively. As the monitoring component begins after disbursement, the applicant plans to hire a staff person who will serve as the CPS grant specialist. Furthermore, an additional staff member will be hired to support the monitoring activities (e60). The key staff members possess relevant backgrounds that contribute to the success of the program, and their resumes are included as supporting documentation (e72). Overall, the staffing structure and time commitments outlined in the proposal appear to be sufficient for achieving the goals and objectives of the grant. A fully developed description of the time commitments of key staff is provided in the proposal. The project director is designated as a full-time position, ensuring dedicated leadership for the project. Additionally, 4.4 full-time equivalents (FTE) staff members are allocated to monitor schools and provide one-on-one feedback (e74) effectively. As the monitoring component begins after disbursement, the applicant plans to hire a staff person who will serve as the CPS grant specialist. Furthermore, an additional staff member will be hired to support the monitoring activities (e60). The key staff members possess relevant backgrounds that contribute to the success of the program, and their resumes are included as supporting documentation (e72). Overall, the staffing structure and time commitments outlined in the proposal appear to be sufficient for achieving the goals and objectives of the grant.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

- a. Allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorized public chartering agency for developers seeking to open a charter school in the State ; or**
- b. In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, the State has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.**

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing the appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Please specify whether they meet (a) or (b) and clearly explain why in the strengths.

(0 or 1 points)

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates their commitment to addressing this priority. The proposal highlights the presence of various authorizers, including representatives from higher education institutions and Native American Tribes (e25). Additionally, the Oklahoma legislature, in its recent legislative session, approved the establishment of a Statewide Charter Board to review denied applications (e25). This board holds the authority to authorize statewide virtual charter schools, further strengthening the charter school landscape in the State (e25). The applicant's evidence showcases the comprehensive approach taken to address this priority, ensuring a diverse range of authorizers and a dedicated statewide charter board to oversee the charter school authorization process.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

- 1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.**

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

Oklahoma charter schools receive the full state aid allocation received by traditional schools minus a 3% authorization fee (e25). The State disburses funds at the same time as traditional schools (e25). Charter school contracts must include requirements and procedures for the schools to receive funding, aligned with statutory and other guidelines related to charter-school-eligible funds (e25). Charter schools in Oklahoma do not receive local funding. To compensate, a Redbud School Funding grant provides the state average of property taxes to these independent LEAs (ICSs) (e25). Funds flow directly from the State to ensure prompt receipt (e26).

Weaknesses:

Oklahoma charter schools do not receive local funding, instead receiving the state average of ad-valorem taxes. For charter schools operating in areas with above-average tax levies, there is a loss of local funds that traditional schools receive. In addition, the response does not explain whether the ad-valorem taxes comprise the entirety of local funding or are their other local taxes and fees included beyond the tax assessments.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Competitive Preference Priority 3

- 1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a state that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.**

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's description of how best practices are shared with struggling schools and LEAs is poorly developed. They provide some examples of practices shared on their website, such as policies, procedures, model planning, transportation, and school nutrition, which are accessible to all schools (e26). Additionally, they host an annual summit called the Oklahoma School Innovation Summit (OSIS), where leaders from both charter and traditional schools come

together to share best practices (e26). Furthermore, they establish an Innovative School cohort that brings design teams from charter and traditional schools to analyze problems of practice (e26). In this cohort, LEA-based teams collaborate on projects, aiming to foster community and enhance their capacity for change (e26).

Weaknesses:

The plan lacks a clear explanation of how struggling schools and LEAs will be specifically targeted for support. There is no provided definition or criteria to identify what constitutes a struggling program or LEA, and the shared best practices may not necessarily align with the unique needs of a particular school or LEA. The applicant does not adequately specify how these practices will effectively assist struggling schools. Furthermore, it remains unclear how the applicant intends to identify areas of need within struggling schools.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) **Funding for facilities**
- b) **Assistance with facilities acquisition**
- c) **Access to public facilities**
- d) **The ability to share in bonds or mill levies**
- e) **The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings**
- f) **Low- or no-cost leasing privileges**

(up to 2 points)

Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully-developed explanation of the funding opportunities available to charter schools in Oklahoma. The State has implemented the Redbud funding law specifically to support charter school facility acquisition. Charter schools that receive limited property tax revenue are eligible for state funding to assist with their facility needs. To qualify for this funding, these schools must demonstrate below-average local tax funding and primarily provide in-person or blended instruction to at least two-thirds of their enrolled students (e27).

Furthermore, the State provides charter schools with access to public facilities and offers them the option to lease at affordable rates (e27). Many charter schools take advantage of leasing facilities from local education agencies (LEAs) at rates below the market average. Additionally, charter schools have the opportunity to access government lease rates for privately owned facilities that accept such rates (e27). This flexibility allows charter schools to secure suitable facilities at favorable terms.

Moreover, state law permits charter schools to participate in bonds or mill levies, providing them with additional funding avenues. As a result, numerous charter school facilities have been financed through public bond funding (e27).

The combination of these funding initiatives showcases the diverse and well-established support available to charter schools in Oklahoma.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 5 - Competitive Preference Priority 5

- 1. To be eligible to receive points under this priority, a State entity must demonstrate that it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.**

(up to 3 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's description of its support for serving at-risk students is poorly developed. The proposal includes data indicating that charter schools receiving CSP grants have shown improved educational outcomes for these students compared to charter schools in general (e27). Furthermore, the proposal highlights that CSP subgrantees have significantly higher enrollment rates of black and Hispanic students compared to the state average while enrolling white students at lower rates (e17). It is worth noting that the charter schools benefiting from CSP funding subgrants are predominantly located in areas with a high concentration of educationally disadvantaged students (e28). The School Design Center (SDC) plays a crucial role in assisting charter schools in effectively serving at-risk students (e28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's submission lacks detailed information on student performance categorized by demographics. Aside from state assessment data, no other academic indicators, such as attendance records, are provided. The applicant acknowledges that Oklahoma does not currently have any charter schools specifically dedicated to dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling. Although support is available for these schools, the project itself does not specifically encourage the establishment of such programs or similar initiatives that prioritize college and career readiness. The activities outlined in the proposal lack sufficient detail to determine whether a more proactive approach is necessary.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2023 08:52 AM