

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 06:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kalmiopsis Community Arts High School (S282B230004)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	29
Sub Total	40	29
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	28
Sub Total	40	37
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	90

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers New Panel - 1: 84.282B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Kalmiopsis Community Arts High School (S282B230004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (1) Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 40 points).

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

Reader's Score: 29

Sub

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

Strengths:

- The proposed plan is well-developed with clearly defined milestones and activities with timeframes (pg. 34-38).

Weaknesses:

- It is not clear under the milestones and timeframes what if any progress monitoring steps are in place (pg. 34-38) to ensure completion of tasks.
- Management plan does not provide specific tasks (pg. 36-38).

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

- The cost analysis demonstrates a thorough consideration of needs and expenses, ensuring that each expenditure is justified and directly contributes to the proposal's objectives (pg. e73-86).
- The budget is aligned to the project's design and scope, allocating resources appropriately to key components that hold the most potential significance for the project's success (pg. e73-86).
- By striking a balance between the costs and the potential impact, the proposal reflects a financially responsible approach while maximizing the value and outcomes of the project (pg. e73-86).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

- The proposal clearly defines roles and responsibilities and dedicated allocations of time for the project including the principal, the project director and other key project personnel (pg. e34-35)

Weaknesses:

- The combined allocation of FTE does not seem consistent with the anticipated time to see the project through to completion to meet all the objectives as listed (pg. e34-35).

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The qualifications of key project personnel in the proposal are outstanding, with a strong emphasis on relevant training and extensive experience in their respective fields. Each team member's credentials align precisely with the project's requirements, demonstrating a deep understanding of the subject matter and the methodologies required to achieve the objectives. The proposal provides detailed profiles of key personnel, showcasing their expertise and past accomplishments in similar projects, which instills confidence in their ability to effectively execute the proposed project (pg. e26-28 and e538-554).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

- The proposal outlines a detailed budget management strategy (pg. e34-38).
- The applicant showcases a proactive and diligent approach to tracking and reporting expenses, which includes regular audits and internal controls, thus minimizing the risk of mismanagement or misuse of funds (pg. e34-38).

Weaknesses:

- The proposal indicates that a teacher leader will also serve as the Project Director and suggests the dual role of managing the CSP grant funds and being responsible for all the fiscal and fiduciary related items in accounting for the funds. There is no indication that the assigned person has the expertise or background to take on these dual tasks (pg. e28).

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

- The applicant has detailed a robust communication strategy to facilitate collaborative discussions, fostering a cohesive decision-making process that aligns with the project's objectives (pg. e36).
- The KCA Teacher Leaders are solely responsible for programmatic decisions and oversight of CSP funds and outlines that the school does not contract or consult with a Charter Management Organization (pg. e 36).

Weaknesses:

- It is not clear how programmatic decisions are made, the process, or how agreement is reached (p. e36).

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

- The proposal outlines a detailed organizational framework with clearly defined roles and responsibilities (pg. e1320, attachment 23b).

Weaknesses:

- The proposal lacks a system of accountability with checks and balances in the organizational structure (pg. e1320, attachment 23b).

Reader's Score: 3

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (2) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 20 points).

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

Strengths:

- The applicant's continuation plan showcases a strong commitment to the long-term sustainability and consistent operation of the charter school beyond the grant period (pg. e30-31, e291-3).
- The proposal outlines a clear strategy for financial stability, including alternative funding sources and cost-saving measures, ensuring the school's viability once the grant funds are no longer available (pg. e30-31, e291-3).
- The applicant demonstrates foresight in addressing potential challenges and risks, implementing measures to maintain the high-quality education outlined in the initial application (pg. e30-31, e291-3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were observed.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (3) Quality of the Project Design (up to 10 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

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

Strengths:

- The proposed project demonstrates a well-structured and compelling rationale that forms a strong foundation for its implementation pg. e192, e1192).
- The applicant's explanation of the project's purpose and objectives is clear and logical (pg. e192, e1192).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

- The proposal excels in providing a detailed and well-articulated set of goals, objectives, and outcomes for the proposed project (pg. e72).
- The objectives provide a clear roadmap for how the project will attain its goals (pg. e72).

Weaknesses:

- Make each goal is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART), to diminish ambiguity about what the project seeks to achieve and how (pg e72).

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (4) Need for Project (up to 30 points).

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

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

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

Strengths:

- The applicant thoroughly highlights the gravity and urgency of the issue, supported by compelling data and evidence. The problem's scope is well-defined, outlining its broader impact and underscoring the need for immediate attention and intervention (pg. e40-45).

Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not make explicit the alignment between the detailed magnitude of the students with the proposed design (pg. e40-45).

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

- The proposed project addresses a substantial and pressing need for the school and activities it aims to provide. The applicant thoroughly analyzes the need and demand within the target community, showcasing a comprehensive understanding of the needs and gaps that the project seeks to fill. The proposal effectively emphasizes the potential impact of the project in meeting these needs, outlining the expected benefits and outcomes for the students and community (pg. e40-45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority

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

(a) Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—

(1) With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators; and

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

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

Strengths:

- The applicant proposes to open a new school with a deep engagement of both experienced and committed educators and the community at-large (page e26-27).
- There is evidence of deep community ties in concept and need, as well as active support. The response fosters a design embedded within the ecosystem and community that is well-developed. (pg. e29-31).

Weaknesses:

- The timeline was unclear about the status of the development phase for section b of this requirement (pg. e34).

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2023 06:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2023 10:36 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kalmiopsis Community Arts High School (S282B230004)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	26
Sub Total	40	26
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	8
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	28
Sub Total	40	36
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	86

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers New Panel - 1: 84.282B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Kalmiopsis Community Arts High School (S282B230004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (1) Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 40 points).

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

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a general management plan which depicts the general responsibilities of the four teacher leaders who are collaborating to implement the proposed project (p. e-34-36). For example, one of the teacher leaders will serve as CSP Project Director with a .25 FTE allocated to manage the proposed project by compiling expense reports, processing payments filing and maintaining documents, and budget revisions (p. e-34-35). A list of broadly stated activities along with a timeline and the person responsible for carrying out the activities provides a global sense of how the proposed project will be managed.

Weaknesses:

The management plan is not fully adequate to accomplish project tasks. The management plan is not sufficiently comprehensive as it does not address specific objectives to be achieved by the proposed project and only lists fragmented activities. For example, the list of activities simply includes items such as phone and internet, outdoor stage, student handbook and materials, without clearly defining the proposed responsibilities (p. e-34-35).

Reader's Score: 7

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

Strengths:

The proposed costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The applicant proposes a total budget of [REDACTED] over the three-year grant period (p. e-15) for the purpose of (1) strengthening community collaboration, (2) developing curriculum and academic success, (3) governance and board development, (4) location and facilities development, and (5) fortifying operations management (p. e-73). The applicant proposes to serve approximately 100 students at full capacity (p. e-47). The proposed project will provide a viable school choice for the target area where students have access to proposed project services that would

Sub

otherwise not be provided.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a time commitment for the Project Director of .25 FTE. During the first year, .25 FTE will be dedicated to the project, though in Years 2 and 3, it will be .20 FTE (p. e-74). All time commitments for teacher leaders are .25 FTEs during the planning year. The categories for leadership contributions are community collaboration, governance and board development, location and facilities development, and operations management. The total time commitment of all personnel implementing the proposed charter school is 2.0 FTE and will be reduced to .525 FTE in year 2 and .2 FTE in year 3 (p. e-73).

Weaknesses:

The time commitments of the project director and key personnel are not appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. The combined .2 FTE in year three of the proposed project is insufficient to maintain the effective management and operation of the charter school. For example, the position of community engagement involves overseeing community engagement activities, hosting "open house" events, developing collaboration plans within the community, conducting social media outreach and website development, developing marketing materials, and recruiting students and teachers. The listed responsibilities cannot be conducted within a .25 FTE during year one and significantly less time during years two and three of the proposed project (p. e-73).

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

The qualifications of the four teacher leaders are relevant to the duties performed as part of the project as demonstrated in their resumes (p. e-538-553). The applicant appropriately lists the biographies of the four teacher leaders who propose managing the project (p. e-190). For example, one of the teacher leaders has documented experience in curriculum development, experiential, place-based, performing arts-integrated learning, differentiated instruction, and ESL- English as Second Language which are directly relevant to the objectives of the proposed project (p. e-538).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant proposes several independent activities that will aid in maintaining control over all CSP grant funds. The applicant proposes a part-time position of operations management with the expectation of implementing responsible administrative practices which include the coordination of budgeting and accounting systems (p. e-36). The applicant indicates that the governing board will include Trustees with experience in financial management and nonprofit administration (p. e-383).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe a plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds. The project responsibilities among the four teacher leaders do not include activities that are relevant to managing grant funds and maintaining control over all CSP grant funds. The applicant does not provide a job description for the position of operations management that would sufficiently indicate the adequacy to maintain control of all CSP funds (p. e-36).

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that its teacher leaders are solely responsible for programmatic decisions and oversight of CSP funds; the school does not contract with nor consult with a Charter Management Organization (p. e-383).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's plan for teacher leaders to be solely responsible for programmatic decisions and oversight of the proposed project lacks a structured decision-making process within the proposed charter school organization and with the authorizing agency that would demonstrate a plan for making programmatic decisions (p. e-383).

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

The applicant somewhat demonstrates a plan to administer the administration of the grant. The applicant indicates that the project director is responsible for administering and supervising the administration of the grant (p. e-37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not demonstrate an adequate plan to supervise the administration of the grant. The plan lacks fiscally responsible accounting principles that would support the adequate management of the proposed project. Instead, the applicant suggests that its board will be comprised of local community leaders with experience in financial management and nonprofit administration which does not fully support the applicant's capacity to administer and supervise the proposed project. Financial advice is obtained from nonprofit community organizations which is not indicative of an adequate plan but rather suggests an as needed and fragmented approach to managing the proposed project (p. e-37).

Reader's Score: 2

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (2) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 20 points).

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

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that most of the funding for the proposed project consists of up-front costs for furniture, technology, and salary expenses. The need for CSP funds drops significantly during years two and three of the proposed project which supports the continued operation of the charter school after federal funds are no longer available. The applicant demonstrates that it will operate the proposed project with student enrollment funds from the state. after grant funds are no longer available (p. e-39). The applicant appropriately notes that it has procured funding from the Ford Family Foundation, Josephine County Cultural Coalition, Four Way Community Foundation, and fundraising through the Illinois Valley Community Development Organization which will support the proposed project once grant funds under this program are no longer available (p. e-40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (3) Quality of the Project Design (up to 10 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a rationale for the proposed project. The applicant seeks to provide a quality education for youths who prefer a small school, a creative environment, and for students who struggled with authority in the past (p. e-497). The applicant proposes to provide an alternative to a mainstream model that may have not worked for students in the past and proposes to provide a place-based, art infused curriculum, and non-traditional grading methods (p. e-497).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant identifies its primary goals for this project which include (1) strengthening community collaboration, (2) developing curriculum and academic success, (3) governance and board development, (4) location and facilities development, and (5) fortifying operations management (p. e-72).

Weaknesses:

Some of the proposed goals are not clearly specified and are stated in only general terms. For example, goal three simply indicates governance and board development which is not sufficiently specific. Some of the goals are not measurable as they do not contain anticipated targets and timelines. For example, goal one only seeks to strengthen community collaboration without stating to what extent community collaborations are proposed to be strengthened. The proposed goals do not contain objectives and outcomes which would significantly increase the quality of the project design (p. e-72).

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (4) Need for Project (up to 30 points).

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

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant somewhat demonstrates the magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project. The problem is described as a lack of extracurricular activities offered by the local high school in the areas of fine arts, literary arts, and performing arts (p. e-44). The problem is due to a lack of funding within the target area. For example, the target population is in an isolated rural area with limited economic prospects where all schools receive Title I funds. The applicant proposes to utilize a place-based learning approach along with arts-based integration programs that will have benefits such as increased civic engagement while also developing empathy and creativity (p. e-47).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not fully demonstrate the magnitude or severity of the problem. For example, the applicant indicates that enrollment in the traditional high school has declined over time but does not state the reasons for this decline. Reasons for the decline in student enrollment may support the magnitude of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project. The applicant does not provide current data to demonstrate the income gap of 25% between the target area and the state as the data is from 2007-2011 which does not fully support the need for the proposed project (p. e-43).

Sub

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately demonstrates the magnitude of the need for services to be provided. It effectively lists several appropriate activities which fittingly encompass two overarching instructional models including an arts-based integration approach and place-based learning methods (p. e-47-48). The applicant provides several effective examples of activities that may be incorporated into the curriculum. They appropriately include topics such as researching the history of forest management in Southern Oregon, including traditional "good fire" methods of indigenous controlled burning; US Forest Service fire suppression techniques; clear cut logging, salvage logging, and sustainable logging; the Endangered Species Act and the spotted owl; and read first-person accounts of the "logging wars" (p. e-45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority

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

(a) Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—

(1) With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators; and

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

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

Strengths:

(a)(1) The applicant appropriately demonstrates that it will open a new charter school that is developed and implemented with meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators. For example, the four founding teacher leaders have all worked at the Dome school where they have amassed experiences that inform the proposed project (p. e27-29). The teacher leaders are collaboratively engaged in the development and implementation of the proposed new charter school.

(a)(2) The applicant demonstrates an assessment of community assets in its community-centered approach (e-31-34). The applicant effectively identifies community assets such as a community organizer and community radio public affairs host and a youth LGBTQ+IA community organizer (p. e-30). Community organizations such as Southern Oregon Guild of Artists and Artisans, a nonprofit organization in Kerby and the Dome School in Takilma, Oregon are fittingly associated as

community assets (p. e-31).

(b)The applicant's management plan contains the timelines and key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school (p. e-34-36).

Weaknesses:

(a)(2)The applicant does not demonstrate the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to maintain strong community ties.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2023 10:36 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 06:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kalmiopsis Community Arts High School (S282B230004)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	26
Sub Total	40	26
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	28
Sub Total	40	37
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers New Panel - 1: 84.282B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Kalmiopsis Community Arts High School (S282B230004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (1) Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 40 points).

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

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides responsibilities for each individual within the following areas: Community Collaboration, Curriculum and Academic Success, Governance and Board Development, Location and Facilities Development and Operations Management. (pgs. e34-38).

The management plan chart provides evidence of activities and related timelines. (pgs. e36-38). For example, the project director will oversee project expense reports (10/1/22 – 9/30/25).

The applicant provides a detailed chart for the timeline of key community engagement milestones which includes information such as the milestone, the current phase and the timeframe. (pgs. e1072-1074) For example, the task of planning for administering the first community needs survey has been completed.

Weaknesses:

The management plan chart does not provide evidence of milestones to indicating progress of completion. (pgs. e36-38). For example, all ELA curriculum planning/mapping will be completed by 8/1/2023.

The management plan chart does not provide evidence of specific tasks to complete each activity. (pgs. e36-38). For example, develop a community advisory board comprised of key community members to meet monthly with the goal to sustain community engagement activities.

Reader's Score: 7

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly outlined the costs necessary to meet the objectives, design and significance of the proposed project. There is evidence that there has been a great deal of thought contributed to the expenditures included in the budget as well as the salaries assigned to the instructional staff. The costs provided in detail are in alignment with current market values and appear to be necessary rather than extraneous. (pgs. e1114-1151). For example, the professional development request to attend the National Charter Conference in Austin, TX for team leaders to gain networking opportunities, theory and resources to impact students and staff. Another example is the furniture selected to create a classroom that aligns directly to the place based curriculum implemented to meet the needs of the student population.

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a list of tasks assigned to each teacher leader. (pgs. e36-38). For example, the project director oversees project expense reports.

Weaknesses:

The applicant states a .25 FTE for the Project Director in addition to teaching duties, and overseeing curriculum and academic success as well as governance and board development. (pgs. e34-35). The amount of time dedicated as project director does not seem reasonable based upon the tasks included for the role.

There is no evidence stated regarding accountability strategies for any of the key project personnel to ensure that the tasks are reviewed for accuracy in completion. (pgs. e34-35).

Each of the Teacher Leaders have been assigned roles in addition to their instructional obligation to students. There is no evidence of the time commitment assigned to each of the roles. (pgs. e34-35). For example, there is no evidence of the amount of time to be dedicated to location facilities and development, governance and board development, curriculum and academic success, and community collaboration.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

The applicant has provided sufficient evidence substantiating the qualifications for the key personnel to provide significant support for the proposed project in the prospective roles. The personnel included have appropriate qualifications for each of the identified roles. (pgs. e538-554). For example, each teacher leader holds either the appropriate credentials and/or post-secondary degrees that are aligned to the responsibilities related to this proposal.

Sub

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that Teacher Leaders are solely responsible for programmatic decisions and oversight of the CSP grant funds in lieu of contracting with a Charter Management Organization. (p. e35). For example, a board will be developed comprised of community members, staff, parents and students to provide advisement regarding finances and non-profit administration. The Three Rivers School District also provides oversight of SPED services and transportation services.

There is evidence that the school has procedures in place to follow all local and state regulations related to annual financial reporting and audits, policies for reimbursements of funding and annual program review. (pgs. e1353-1357; Attachment G).

Weaknesses:

There is no evidence that outlines strategies for the Teacher Leaders to coordinate all of the components to maintain control of the grant funded project. (p. e35). For example, weekly meetings for teacher leaders to document project progress and review activities for sustainability and/or revision.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The applicant outlines the tasks assigned for each Teacher Leader specific to areas that align to the project. (pgs. e36-38).

The Organizational Structure graphic states that the Three Rivers School District serves as the ultimate decision-maker. (pgs. e1320; Attachment 23b).

Weaknesses:

As a non-hierarchical organization, the applicant does not provide evidence of a structured decision-making process or Accountability Plan regarding programmatic decisions. (p. e1320; Attachment 23b).

There is no evidence to clarify the coordination of decision-making strategies between the school and the Three Rivers School District. (p. e1320; Attachment 23b).

Sub

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of tasks and responsibilities for Teacher Leaders that supports the administration of the grant project including managing daily tasks. (pgs. e36-38).

Weaknesses:

The Project Director responsibilities include project management of the grant including any grant related tasks. However, the time dedicated to this role and responsibilities is .25 FTE in addition to the role of educator while also overseeing curriculum, academic services, governance and board development. (pgs. e36-38).

There is no evidence of a sustainability plan related to the administration of the grant if there is a change in personnel or other tasks are added to the list of responsibilities to meet the needs of students. (pgs. e36-38).

Reader's Score: 2

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (2) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 20 points).

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

Strengths:

The applicant clarifies that the bulk of the expenditures fall within the startup year. After the initial year, the enrollment funding will disperse allowing the applicant to minimize the financial need for CSP funding. (p. 30). Teacher Leaders have agreed to lesser annual salaries for the first year to help minimize overhead costs. (p. 31).

The applicant provides evidence of funding sustainability beyond the end of the CSP grant funding cycle with previously established funding pipelines through: the Ford Family Foundation and the Josephine County Cultural Coalition. In addition, the Four Way Community Foundation funds have been raised through the Illinois Valley Community Development Organization. (p. 31).

Additional strategies listed by the applicant to offset costs include: relying on volunteers rather than salaried positions, seeking additional types of fundraising efforts, and providing professional development through in-house resources. (p. 291)

There is also evidence of significant in-kind donations to help minimize operational costs for example, financial advisement from the Small Business Development Center, community artists volunteering their time, community partners waiving fees and in-kind facility rentals. (p. 31).

School leaders will closely monitor expenses in collaboration with the finance committee. If there appears to be challenges with financing, the applicant will seek external resources for financial solutions. For example, Charter School Capital Organization. (p. 293).

The applicant included a pass through retainer plan to provide assistance if any unforeseen costs are identified as a result of district requirements. A contingency Plan is described by the applicant to be enacted in the event that enrollment is less than forecasted, the applicant has designed a plan for a reduction in expenditures to meet the financial means. For example, reduced enrollment equates to smaller food expenses and Title 1 funding for allowable reimbursements. (p. 292).

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (3) Quality of the Project Design (up to 10 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant states the rationale for the project is... "to serve students who aren't fitting in elsewhere"... our primary targeted student population will be students not currently enrolled in the Three Rivers School District, or homeschooled, unschooled students, virtual students and drop out youth. (p. e192).

In order to address the needs of the students, the applicant explains the school design includes: Studio classes, place-based learning, youth-driven leadership and intensives. (p. e1192).

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant states 5 key priorities for this funding proposal: 1. Prepare a place-based, community collaborative learning model in the field; 2. Develop an arts integrated, community collaborative learning model in the school; 2. Sustain a teacher-run organizational structure supported by a governing board; 3. Incorporate the surrounding nature preserves into modular classrooms for student benefit; and 4. Maintain responsible fiscal management. (p. 24).

There is evidence that each of the 5- key priorities is aligned to the tasks and responsibilities for each teacher leader. For example, the financial plan (pgs. e1383-1385); the professional development plan (pgs. e1344-1345); Students, Enrollment & Admissions plan (pgs. e1347-1349); and Leadership & Governance (pgs. e1193-1195).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not include clear evidence regarding the alignment of the goals and objective and the key elements of the proposed plan. (pgs. e1344-1345).

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (4) Need for Project (up to 30 points).

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

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes the area surrounding the school as rural and comprised of residents experiencing both extreme generational and situational poverty. Students have access to only limited opportunities and many families choose to homeschool due to the lack of affordability for schools with advanced resources. (p. e1084).

There is evidence that the school leaders have developed curricula to meet the needs of the students residing in this area that has historically been home to families of loggers affected by lumber mill closures. (pgs. e1085, e1088-1089). For example, the applicant describes the curricula as both place based and arts based to incorporate both areas for well-rounded experiences to enhance student learning.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide evidence of the data utilized in support of the design of the proposed plan. (pgs. E46-48). For example, evidence to articulate what this proposal includes to meet academic needs of students versus their previous academic experiences.

Sub

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence that academic services for Special Education students, ELL students, McKinney-Vento students, migrant students and community outreach services will be supported through a collaboration with the Three Rivers School District. (p. e1320; Organizational Structure).

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority

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

(a) Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—

(1) With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators; and

(2) Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development

of the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter

school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties.

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that the school is founded by 4-teachers who will share the administrative, as well as, the teaching duties for this non-hierarchical organizational model. (p. e27).

A breakdown of the instructional content area and administrative tasks is provided for each of the 4-founders. (pgs. e27-29).

The applicant states that the previously established Dome School, of which all 4-teachers have previous affiliation, is significant with informing the new campus. (p. e30).

There is evidence provided for an ongoing assessment of community assets indicating nine community members with a variety of specializations as well as six community organizations with specific examples of partnership opportunities to benefit students. (pgs. e30-31).

A timeline of key community engagement milestones is provided with the progress phase and timeline (pgs. e31-34).

The applicant includes a Community Advisory Council and a Family Advisory Council (p. 171)(p.264 - Attachment 21).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide evidence of protocols to ensure the use of community assets on an ongoing basis. (pgs. e30-31)

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 06:18 PM