

**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: Red Granite Charter School Inc. (S282B230007)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	40	28
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	28
<b>Continuation</b>		
<b>Quality of the Continuation Plan</b>		
1. Continuation Plan	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	17
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	30	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	40
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. CPP	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	3
<b>Total</b>	105	88

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Red Granite Charter School Inc. (S282B230007)

## 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: 28

#### 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 management plan presented in the proposal is highly commendable and aligns well with achieving the project's objectives on time and within budget (pg. e26 and e110-112).
- The applicant has provided a comprehensive and well-structured plan that clearly defines responsibilities for each team member, ensuring a cohesive and efficient workflow. Additionally, the budget allocation appears reasonable and well-justified, reflecting a clear understanding of the project's scope and financial requirements (pg. e26 and e110-112).

###### Weaknesses:

- While the management plan demonstrates a strong preparedness for project execution, further elaboration on risk management and contingency measures were missing (pg. e110-112, Appendix I).
- No milestones and timelines were observed.

Reader's Score: 3

##### 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 proposal exhibits a strong alignment between the costs and the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (pg. e150-182).
- The budget reflects reasonable and well-justified expenses in most areas that are directly tied to achieving the project's goals (pg. e150-182).
- The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the project's scope and potential impact, ensuring

**Sub**

that the proposed costs are both efficient and effective in delivering the intended outcomes (pg. e150-182).

**Weaknesses:**

- There is a concern with the reasonableness of the consultant salaries in relationship to the budget and the sustainability as the school grows (pg. e152-180).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 presents a robust plan concerning the time commitments of key project personnel (pg. e27, e154-158).
- The applicant has shown a clear understanding of the significance of each team member's role and their expertise, ensuring their appropriate and adequate involvement in the project (pg. e27, e154-158).

**Weaknesses:**

- There is no evidence of a project director or principal investigator making it unclear about the principal's ability to accomplish the task. For example, the .25 - .5 FTE allocated for the principal seems inconsistent with the accomplishment of the project given the additional duties as described (pg. e154-5).

**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 proposal presents key project personnel with exceptional qualifications, including relevant training and extensive experience in their respective fields (pg. e168-176).
- Each team member's expertise aligns precisely with the project's objectives, instilling confidence in their ability to successfully execute the proposed project (pg. e168-176).

**Weaknesses:**

- It is unclear as to the role of the district administrator (pg. e27).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 details that the Governing board will have "full authority and autonomy over the CSP grant" (pg. e28).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were observed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

- The board has provided a contract and documentation that articulates the agreement and understanding that Red Granite has full autonomy to make programmatic decisions (appendix g).

**Weaknesses:**

- The fiscal agent per the proposal is the district office and the school will align their policies and procedures to the district suggests that the school has yielded some flexibility to district or may in the future do so in making programmatic decisions that might not align with district policies or procedures (pg. e28).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 explains that the board has full autonomy and supervision over administering the grant (pg. e28).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were observed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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 robust and well-prepared approach to sustaining the charter school's operations beyond the grant period (pg. e113, Appendix M).
- The proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the school's long-term sustainability and outlines concrete measures to ensure its continued success in alignment with the initial application (pg. e113, Appendix M).

**Weaknesses:**

- There is no demonstration of other funding sources (Appendix M).
- There is no evidence of strategies to absorb costs beyond the life of the grant (Appendix M).

**Reader's Score: 17**

**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: 10**

**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 presents a strong rationale, clearly defining its purpose, objectives, and intended outcomes (pg. e31-46).
- The applicant effectively justifies the need for the project, supported by relevant data, research, and a comprehensive understanding of the identified problem or need (pg. e31-46).
- The rationale showcases a well-reasoned and logical approach, highlighting the project's potential impact and significance (pg. e31-46).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were observed.

**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 clarity and measurability when outlining its goals, objectives, and outcomes (pg. e31-46, Appendix L).
- Each goal is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART), leaving no ambiguity about the project's intended achievements (pg. e31-46, Appendix L).
- The objectives are well-defined and provide a detailed roadmap for attaining the goals, accompanied by quantifiable indicators and metrics that will allow for systematic evaluation of the school's success (pg. e31-46, Appendix L).
- The strong emphasis on specificity and measurability showcases the applicant's thorough planning and commitment to achieving tangible and impactful results (pg. e31-46, Appendix L).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were observed.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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: 30**

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 proposal addresses a problem of significant magnitude and severity, as evidenced by the compelling data and evidence presented including residing in a district with 40.9% of the students being identified as economically disadvantaged and developing a model that does not exist in the surrounding school districts, Waldorf Education (pg. e10 and Appendix M).
- The proposal provided a survey of parents (appendix N) that demonstrates 150% immediate demand for seats.
- The applicant demonstrates a thorough understanding of the problem's scope and its impact of the school on the target community (Appendix M).
- The proposal effectively highlights the urgency and importance of addressing the problem (Appendix M).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were observed.

**Reader's Score: 15**

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

**Strengths:**

- The applicant provides data from a similar model in the same state exhibiting outstanding enrollment and results, Two River Community Charter Schools, (pg. e34).
- The applicant highlights the holistic and nature engaged model along with the aligned activities to accomplish their desired outcomes including an adaptability and flexibility to the daily and seasonal rhythms that impact student learning (pg. e36-38).

**Sub**

- The applicant presents a comprehensive analysis of the demand and gaps in existing services, showcasing a deep understanding of the community's needs (Appendix M).
- The proposal effectively underscores the potential impact of the project in addressing the identified need, highlighting the significance of its implementation (Appendix M).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses observed.

**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 is proposing a new charter school serving grades PK – 2nd grade in year one and adding an additional 240 students in year two in grades PK-7th (pg. e.10).
- The applicant's proposal showcases a strong commitment to meeting the requirements of the priority (pg. e14-16).
- The plan demonstrates meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and educators, fostering a collaborative and inclusive approach to developing the charter school (pg. e14-16).
- Moreover, the community-centered approach is evident through the thorough assessment of community assets, ensuring that the charter school's development is informed by the community's unique needs and strengths (pg. e14-16).

**Weaknesses:**

- While the proposal addresses the key components of the priority effectively, a timeline for key milestones or specific engagements is missing.



**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2023 10:42 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Red Granite Charter School Inc. (S282B230007)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	40	27
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	27
<b>Continuation</b>		
<b>Quality of the Continuation Plan</b>		
1. Continuation Plan	20	16
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	16
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	30	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	40
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. CPP	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	3
<b>Total</b>	105	86

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Red Granite Charter School Inc. (S282B230007)

## 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: 27

#### 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 generally indicates that its governing board understands the grant timelines and grant budget and is committed to working within those parameters (p. e-26). The applicant proposes a logic model that contains several activities relevant to the management of the proposed project which appropriately include activities such as the introduction to Waldorf pedagogy and outdoor learning techniques; the hiring of a principal, lead teachers, and consultants; and the development of promotional materials (p. e-110-112).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not propose a management plan with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. Instead, the applicant provides a general statement that it has been planning the opening of the school since May 2022 and indicating a commitment to implement the proposed project (p. e-26).

Reader's Score: 3

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 applicant proposes a budget of [REDACTED] for the duration of five years (p. e-188). The costs are mostly reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide justifications for its high consulting budget in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. For example, [REDACTED] is allocated for one consultant over the course of the five-year project implementation without clear justification of how the consultant affects achieving the proposed objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The role of the consultant is simply described as providing support which is not sufficiently detailed to determine if the costs associated with the services are reasonable (p. e-167).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 indicates that the principal of the charter school will contribute .25 FTE toward the proposed project (p. e-153).

**Weaknesses:**

The part time principal position of .25 FTE is not appropriate and adequate for a project of this magnitude to meet the objectives of the proposed project (p. e-153). The applicant does not indicate that a project director or principal investigator will be hired for the proposed project. The applicant does not provide time commitments for key staff except for the time commitment for the principal. Without time commitments, clear job descriptions, and specifically defined roles toward the proposed project, it is difficult to determine if the time commitments of the key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

**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 proposes to hire a part-time principal and a lead teacher who will join other key personnel for starting the school (p. e-65-68). Key personnel include a consultant who will work to support the proposed project. Her resume supports the qualifications she needs to serve in her consultant role as Development Director, supporting staff and administration in the implementation of a new school (p. e-168 and e-57-63). The Director of Public Relations and Marketing is supporting the school's governance board and serving as a liaison between the school and its authorizer (p. e-172). Her credentials effectively include professional training and advanced degrees. Teachers will work on curriculum and lesson planning and school development outside of their regular teaching duties with compensation paid for extended contract (p. e-153).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant also indicates the District Administrator will serve toward the proposed project but does not describe his specific responsibilities toward the proposed project. The applicant only describes some general responsibilities for the positions of principal and lead teacher but does not include a job description that would aid in determining that the proposed positions will be filled with candidates who are qualified. For example, the part-time principal will implement start-up activities for the school During Year #1 of the Grant (Planning Year). Years 2-5 will be dedicated to grant administrative work including coordination of professional development, conferences, fulfilling grant requirements and reporting, performance monitoring and data collection, and compliance assurances (p. e-152). Job descriptions for teachers are not provided by the applicant which does not fully support the applicant's proposal that teachers with relevant training and experience will be hired for the proposed charter school.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

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 convincingly indicates that its Governance Board will have full authority and autonomy over the CSP grant funds. The Wausau School District will appropriately serve as the fiscal agent, providing monthly financial reports so that the Governance Board can make financial decisions pertaining to CSP grant funds and the general operating budget. The Board will effectively adopt the district's financial policies and procedures as a well-functioning large School District (p. e-28).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant appropriately indicates that it has been given autonomy to make all programmatic decisions pertaining to the school (p. e-28). The applicant has a written performance contract with the Wausau Board of Education but has the autonomy and flexibility to determine its pedagogy and implementation of its vision and mission (p. e-49). Section 2.2. of the charter contract specifically states that the Governance Board shall be responsible and accountable for implementing the duties and responsibilities associated with the charter school (p. e-76). The applicant effectively indicates that the school Governance Board consists of experienced and dedicated non-staff stakeholders securing the best interests of the school's mission and vision while tailoring its efforts to fit within the framework of a charter school as defined by federal law. Multiple committees from within the charter school will make a report to the Governance Board at the board meetings to keep the Board well informed (p. e-116).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not detail the type of programmatic decisions that the Board is going to make. The applicant does not differentiate between school level decisions and organizational decisions that may be made by the principal or other key staff that would support the quality of the plan to make programmatic decisions. The applicant does not describe the mechanisms to be used between key staff and the Governance Board to communicate programmatic decisions that need to be made. For example, there is not a proposed meeting schedule or an administrative schedule that would indicate when meetings will be held.

Reader's Score: 4

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 fittingly indicates that its governance board full autonomy and authority over the CSP grant including management and oversight responsibilities (p. e-152-155). The applicant effectively describes the responsibilities of its key project staff which correspond to the adequate administration of the grant. For example, the principal will be responsible for all start-up activities during year one of the grant administration which fittingly include the

**Sub**

coordination of professional development, conference, fulfilling grant requirements and reporting, performance monitoring and data collection (p. e-152). Administrative duties from existing staff will support the administration of the grant, which includes financial services by the district and work done by other administrative staff of the charter school that are all specific to grant duties. (p. e-154-155).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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 appropriately anticipates that it will be able to operate the proposed charter school after grant funds under this program are no longer available (p. e-128). The applicant effectively indicates that grant funds are going to be used as start-up costs for the proposed project, and fittingly proposes to raise funds for additional expenses that fall outside of the regular operating budget (p. e-128).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not demonstrate other funding sources that will potentially fund the proposed charter school such as per pupil state funding, donations, and other grants. The applicant seeks [REDACTED] in grant funds, with [REDACTED] appropriated for year five of the grant. The applicant does not indicate a regular operating budget which makes it unclear what additional funds will be needed to continue with the operation of the proposed project.

**Reader's Score: 16**

**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: 10**

**Sub**

**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 provides an appropriate rationale for the proposed project where the Waldorf model will help provide a pedagogy that is different from traditional schools (p. e-31-35). This teaching model will include traditional but also non-traditional methods of instruction that encourage students to become self-motivated and conduct self-assessments. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed methods will lead to academic success as research supports a 98% rate of college or university going rate after high school graduation (p. e-34). The proposed rationale is supported by a comprehensive logic model that fittingly depicts the inputs such as the CSP grant funds, the charter board, staff and facilities, and Waldorf-inspired schools will potentially achieve the short- and long-term outcomes including the creation of a learning community that fosters individual growth through the processes of thinking, feeling, and willing (p. e-110-112).

**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))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes 12 clearly specified and measurable goals (p. e-118-120). For example, goal six appropriately seeks to conduct clear and transparent ongoing formative and summative assessments of student progress within an articulated framework of Waldorf standards co-aligned to recognize the common core standards at the state and federal level which are all working to improve student achievement. This goal will effectively be measured by maintaining verifiable records of student progress: Student Progress Reports (Whole-Child Rubric), End of Year Narrative Report, and Individual Student Portfolio (Main Lesson Book Review). Twice a year language arts and math assessments in addition to the annual state standardized testing and twice yearly Fastbridge Benchmark assessments for grades 5-8. In addition to the programmatic goals, the applicant proposes performance measures that are mostly clearly specified and measurable (p. e-181-185). For example, the applicant anticipates that its students exceed the academic state average of 40% proficiency by at least 10% as measured through student assessments: Wisconsin State Test and standardized assessment tools (at least twice annually).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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: 30

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 appropriately describes the problem to be addressed by the proposed project. For example, the applicant seeks to help students increase their academic achievement so that it corresponds to the national percentile for proficiency. In addition, the applicant proposes to share successful pedagogical practices with other schools within the district (p. e-31). The applicant underscores the magnitude of the problem to be addressed as there is only one other Waldorf-inspired elementary/middle school in the state of Wisconsin. That school is an hour away, and the long commute does not make attendance there a viable option for families. The applicant will serve its target area's educational needs with a holistic and outdoor education option (p. e-35).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant appropriately demonstrates that it will provide an educational pedagogy that does not currently exist in the target area where there is a strong desire for outdoor, developmentally appropriate, Waldorf-inspired schooling. The applicant anticipates students will graduate as confident, curious, and independent thinkers who will lead a life of purpose, contribution, and direction. It proposes to serve 96 students starting in the 2024/25 school year offering PreK through 2nd grade. During the second year, the school will expand to serve 240 students in PK-7th grade. The applicant effectively establishes the magnitude for the need of services as its needs assessment reveals that 150 of 514 families (29% of those surveyed) were ready to enroll their students at the proposed charter school at the time of the survey which supports the magnitude of need for the services to be provided (p. e-130-150).

**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 effectively proposes to develop and implement a charter school. The applicant will collaborate with current and former teachers of the Waldorf school community.

(a)(2) The applicant effectively conducted an assessment of community assets which will increase the likelihood that a community-centered approach will inform the development of the charter school (p. e-14 and Appendix N). The assessment demonstrates significant support of the proposed charter school from the community. For example, teachers will be trained in cooperation with the Tomorrow River Community Charter Schools and Great Lakes Waldorf Institute (p. e-16).

(b)The applicant's management plan demonstrates how it will develop and implement the proposed charter school (p. e-26).

**Weaknesses:**

(a)(2) The applicant does not demonstrate 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.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/03/2023 10:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 06:39 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Red Granite Charter School Inc. (S282B230007)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	40	26
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	26
<b>Continuation</b>		
<b>Quality of the Continuation Plan</b>		
1. Continuation Plan	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	17
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	30	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	40
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
1. CPP	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	3
<b>Total</b>	105	86

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Red Granite Charter School Inc. (S282B230007)

## 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 includes a Logic Model that provides evidence of outputs and outcomes, tasks and responsibilities to accomplish tasks and meet objectives with related short, mid and long-term impact. (pgs. e1110-1112: Appendix M). For example, staff and administrators will oversee curriculum development that leads to engaging professional development, developing ownership in curriculum and then a Waldorf certification.

#### Weaknesses:

There is no evidence of timelines assigned to the responsibilities and milestones included in the Logic Model. (pgs. e1110-1112: Appendix I). For example, short-term impact may be 3-months, mid-term at 6-months and long-term at 1-year.

Reader's Score: 3

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 applicant provides evidence of the requested expenditures to meet the objectives and design of the proposed project. (pgs. e152-180). For example, expenditure categories include: personal salaries and benefits, consultant fees, classroom supplies and furniture for student use, professional development registration costs and travel related fees for staff, materials for library development and materials for student use that support curriculum objectives.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provides a proposed budget for personnel and consultant fees that amounts to approximately [REDACTED] of the total allocation. (pgs. e152-180). This may not be reasonable as enrollment increases and additional supplies are needed to accommodate for student growth. There is no evidence of a strategy to review and revise budget expenditures if this occurs.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 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 evidence of the time commitments for the Consultant in the Principal role with a .25 FTE, (1) Lead Teacher in a 1.0 FTE role and teachers receiving extended contract pay. (p. e154).

**Weaknesses:**

Based upon the responsibilities provided by the applicant, a .25 FTE for the Project Principal may not be adequate to meet the demands of the project. (pgs. e154-155).

The applicant does not provide evidence regarding the number of teachers who will receive extended contract pay for duties completed outside of the contracted day. (p. e155).

**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. For example, there is evidence that the Consultant in the Project Principal role and the Consultant overseeing public relations, marketing and project management both have relevant experience and qualifications that are aligned to each role outlined for this project. (pgs. e168-176).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no evidence provided regarding the job description for the district administrator. (pgs. e168-176).

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 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 the Wausau School District serves as the fiscal agent, overseeing and providing control over all CSP funding. Per governing board guidelines, the district will provide monthly fiscal reports to the governing

**Sub**

board for decisions related to the CSP operating budget. (p. e28).

The applicant provides evidence that the Project Principal will serve as the primary conduit between the Wausau School District and the school to provide communication, documentation and consultation regarding the management plan and project needs. (p. e154).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no identified weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides evidence that the Project Principal will supervise all grant administrative work such as professional development opportunities for teachers, tasks to meet grant funding requirements, reporting tasks, data collection regarding the management plan and ensure compliance related to proposal tasks. (p. e152).

The Lead Teacher fills the role of Curriculum/Pedagogical Coordinator and provides oversight for curriculum and the development of lesson plans, as well as, collaborating with the consultants regarding implementation of the proposal components. Additional support with curriculum will be provided by classroom teachers under the direction of the Lead Teacher. (p. e152-153).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no evidence that clarifies the decision-making process regarding programmatic decisions. (pgs. e152-153).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 has identified the role of the Project Principal to provide support with grant administrative work for the school and the Wausau School District provides the financial oversight of the grant program. (pgs. e28; e152).

The applicant includes implementation of the proposed plan in the list of responsibilities for the Lead Teacher (Curriculum/Pedagogical Coordinator). (p. e152).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide evidence of the strategies to ensure that all tasks are completed with accuracy and in a timely manner. (pgs. e152-153).

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

### 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 provides evidence regarding the continuation of the programmatic components of the proposal (p. e113-129; Appendix M). For example, sustaining outreach for student recruitment to increase enrollment, creating a teacher mentor program to sustain best practices and ensure teachers complete Waldorf teacher training, increase engagement with families and community members, and engage partnerships with other school districts.

The applicant provides assurance that beyond grant funding, increased enrollment will provide additional funding and the Red Granite School will rely upon fundraising campaigns to provide support for student trips and staff professional development expenses. The school will also reach out to community partnerships to assist in providing needed materials not already provided through other funding sources. (p. e128).

#### Weaknesses:

There is no evidence of strategies to absorb the responsibilities of the key personnel funded through CSP funds beyond the life of the grant cycle. (p. e113-129; Appendix M).

There is no evidence of strategies to meet the fiscal needs of an increased student population and a changing landscape of staff and students beyond the CSP grant cycle. (p. e128).

Reader's Score: 17

### 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: 10

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))

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant states that the Red Granite Charter School seeks to provide a tuition-free education for disadvantaged students in rural Central Wisconsin. The school follows a sustainable education model design, the Waldorf Model, an educational pedagogy that is not implemented elsewhere in the state. Students will benefit from a holistic approach and developmentally appropriate focus on learning that appeals to the arts, a desire for nature as well as the Waldorf methodology of learning. (pgs. e17; e1113; Appendix M).

**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))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides evidence of the project objectives and performance measures related to curriculum and teaching practices, support for parents and community regarding the pedagogical and development theory of the school, recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers, maintaining a professional growth plan for teachers, implementing an effective evaluation tool, consistent use of summative and formative student assessments, curriculum and instruction alignment to high academic standards, ongoing professional development for Red Granite staff and governing board members, integration of 21st century skills into lesson plans, adhering to academic freedom to meet the needs of the students, and inclusive approach to school governance and the creation of a learning environment to meet the learning needs of the whole student. (pgs. e181-185).

The project objectives and performance measures are aligned to the objectives and outcomes that the applicant has provided in the Management Plan. (pgs. e1110-1112; Appendix M).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no identified weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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: 30**

**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 states that the areas surrounding the Red Granite Charter School experiences between 10.2% to 12.2% poverty rate with approximately 40.9% of students from those areas at a considerable economic disadvantage with collective ELA and Math proficiency that falls below the national proficiency percentile. (pgs. e30-31).

The applicant states that the Red Granite Charter School will provide more options for these students to enhance their education. The CSP project proposal is designed to address the needs of these students providing enhanced academic learning, integrated learning through the arts, and technological literacy.

The applicant provides evidence that the proposal follows a robust continuous improvement plan through the collaboration with the Wausau School District. (pgs. e30-31).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no identified weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 15**

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

**Strengths:**

The Red Granite Charter School will implement the Waldorf pedagogy to create a learning community that fosters individual growth through thinking processes developed through knowledge-based learning and an integrated curriculum. With an emphasis on process over product and the utilization of self-assessment tools, academic assessments in reading and math, students will develop self-motivation and a growth mindset (pgs. e32, e34-35).

The school will be providing outdoor and environmental education while working out of the core principles of Public Waldorf Education. Through experiential learning, Red Granite students will prepare for high school, careers, and college with developed skills in gardening, cooking, cleaning, animal husbandry, handwork, and woodworking. (p. e10).

**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 Red Granite will collaborate with teachers at the Tomorrow Red River Community Charter Schools and teachers from the Wausau School District. (p. e14). Furthermore, the applicant states that there is a plan in progress to collaborate with the Wausau School District Special Education Department and the English Language Learner Department.

Professional development opportunities for teachers including: professional learning communities, conferences, national board certification or other certifications and teacher in residence opportunities. (p. e16).

The applicant provides evidence of a community needs assessment conducted in the Summer of 2022. (p. e14).

#### Weaknesses:

There is no evidence provided regarding the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis. (pgs. e14-16).

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/02/2023 06:39 PM