

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 03:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Namahana Education Foundation (S282B230014)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	30
Sub Total	40	30
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	24
Sub Total	40	32
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP Developers New Panel - 3: 84.282B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Namahana Education Foundation (S282B230014)

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: 30

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 includes a 12-member governing board that is identified with respective roles and responsibilities (p e-20). Executive Director role is clearly described (pages e-20 and e-21). The applicant also plans to hire an Academic Coach, Manager of Finance and Operations, Office Manager and Student Services Coordinator (p e-21). Pages e-27 to e-29 detail the grant activities by function with starting and ending dates as well as the responsible person. These components demonstrate the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives.

Weaknesses:

The management plan does not address facility needs and this may impact the delivery of the project tasks both on time and within budget. It is unclear where the school will be specifically located and whether the team has identified a facility. It is also unclear whether there is a need for major renovations or improvement to provide a safe environment for students. There is no discussion of the types of furniture, equipment, or supplies that might be needed to align the program with the "aina", "kanaka" and "ao" (p e-14) based focus

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 grant is being written to fund four positions – Executive Director, Manager of Finance and Operations, Academic Coach and Office Manager (p e-30) with competitive salaries and appropriate benefits. Travel is included for conferences and professional development (p e-32). Community engagement costs have also been identified at [REDACTED] (p e-33).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the applicant will fund the purchase of curriculum, equipment, furniture, supplies or professional development for teachers or other staff beyond the Executive Director’s attendance at conferences. Community engagement is budgeted at [REDACTED] for 3 years (p e-33) to include community meetings with food. It is unclear if this includes marketing costs, mailers or website expenditures to promote student recruitment.

Reader's Score: 3

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 Executive Director is identified as the Project Director (p e-26) and the grant will fund this full-time position during the grant planning period (p e-30). Other key personnel are identified as the Manager of Operations, Academic Coach and Office Manager (p e-33). These positions appear to be appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project within an adequately developed plan.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to indicate the percentage of time for each grant funded position that will be exclusively devoted to the grant project as opposed to general school operations in order to ensure the timely completion of the goals and objectives.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Pages e-33 to e-38 identify and describe in detail the responsibilities of key personnel including the Executive Director, Academic Coach and Board. The positions demonstrate the initial qualifications needed for grant achievement. Pages e-33 to e-38 identify and describe in detail the responsibilities of key personnel including the Executive Director, Coach and Board. The positions demonstrate the initial qualifications needed for grant achievement.

Weaknesses:

It would appear that the proposed Executive Director lacks previous experience in the administration of middle school and high school programs (e-38 and e-39). No minimum qualifications are described for the positions to be

Sub

hired.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

CSP funds will be controlled by the governing board but tracked by the Executive Director and accountant and reported monthly to the Board (p e-39). An annual audit will be conducted (p e-39). Between the monthly reporting and the annual audit, the applicant has demonstrated that a plan is in place to adequately maintain control over all CSP funds.

Weaknesses:

None 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's plan for programmatic decisions will be based on the use of smarter balanced assessments, Hawaii state assessments and NAEP to monitor student progress for making changes to the Personalized Learning Plans (p 29) and curriculum observations and evaluations will be utilized to monitor professional development needs (p 32). This appears to be adequate.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has indicated that grant funds will be specifically used for the hiring of personnel and travel costs for the Executive Director, but does not address how potential changes will be identified or initiated or made to the grant project specifically with respect to changes in staffing or travel needs and plans should conferences be changed.

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 applicant has demonstrated the adequacy of its plan to administer the grant by assigning responsibility to the Executive Director (p e-43) with oversight by the Board through monthly reporting.

Sub

Weaknesses:

None 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 appears to have the resources to continue to operate the charter school beyond the grant period through a variety of revenue sources. The applicant notes a state grant of [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] grant from a private donor providing [REDACTED] a year until 2032 (p 33). The supporting foundation has raised [REDACTED] for the facility (p e-44). There is a five year financial plan (p e-44). The applicant has engaged the community to ensure ongoing enrollment.

Weaknesses:

None 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 use of a unique "Aina" based learning in combination with Big Picture Learning (p e-45) provided at 60+ schools nationally (p e-46) and internationally. The core design includes a personalized curriculum, advisory structure, applied learning, and "Aina" based learning (p e-47) with internships, performance based assessments, parental involvement and business engagement (p e-48) designed to meet the identified community needs.

Sub

Weaknesses:

None 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:

Five goals are described on pages 41-43 aligned to Hawaii state standards which provide the beginning of a strong educational plan.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the goals are to be measured or how the applicant will know when the goals are achieved. Statements are global indicating that "Students will...." with no indication of a measurement for success. Measurable outcomes lack dates and baseline data. Goals as presented do not appear to be SMART goals. Objectives and outcomes are not specifically tied to individual goals.

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: 24

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:

Pages 47-48 describe the community as an education dessert, specifically for the North Shore combined with low engagement rates, high drop out rates, and high suicide rates indicating the need for the proposed charter.

Weaknesses:

Data is not provided to support the claims of low engagement, high drop out and suicide rates.

Sub

Reader's Score: 14

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:

Services to address the identified needs include the location of the school on the North Shore and the identified community based educational program (p e-14) providing a beginning foundation for the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to describe any services that will be offered to address the aforementioned suicide rate identified by the applicant as a need.

Reader's Score: 10

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 Namahana School is being developed with meaningful and ongoing engagement with a strong academic committee that includes six identified educators from the community (p e-14). This is in addition to an education advisory group of teachers (p e-14). The project has been in development since 2015 which is an indicator that the collaboration is ongoing and is a community-centered approach. There are additional qualified educators in place to develop the community focused program (p e-15). Significant community engagement was in place and utilized during the COVID-19 Pandemic (p e - 15). Personalized learning plans will be embedded in the program to ensure ongoing collaboration between students and families with field studies and internships creating ongoing connections with the community (p e-17). The applicant provides a timeline of activities that demonstrate the start of a high quality plan to plan, develop and implement the charter school opening in 2025 (p e-19) and expanding to include a fully developed middle school by May of 2026 (p e-19)

Weaknesses:

The application lacks important detail regarding interim milestones for the proposed 2 year development of the middle school program. It is unclear how the applicant will measure its progress to ensure a successful 2025 launch with specific enrollment goals along with a final curriculum and assessment program. While the applicant notes its ongoing engagement with the community (e-15), it is unclear how the community provided feedback and input to shape the specifics of the educational program.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2023 03:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 04:28 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Namahana Education Foundation (S282B230014)

Reader #2: *****

	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	18
Sub Total	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	8
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	30	22
Sub Total	40	30
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP Developers New Panel - 3: 84.282B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Namahana Education Foundation (S282B230014)

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 mechanisms for accountability for the implementation of this plan presented are strong and begin with the school's board and include the roles across the proposed charter school. The plan relies upon the governing board's strong role in providing internal controls over the organization. (e19).

The format of the timeline presented is appropriate, clear and actionable. (e27) The responsible party for each action item on the timeline is clearly defined. (e27). The date for completion of each item is reasonably defined and appropriate. (e29).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address whether or not the management plan presented is adequate to achieve this project's goals.

The applicant does not present a significant history of completing projects on time and within budget.

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 costs listed on page e30 and forward are thoroughly described and reasonable.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 Executive Director will manage the completion of the project. This role will have adequate support from the leadership team roles and consultants.(e33)

Weaknesses:

It is unclear what percentage of time will be dedicated to this project in terms of percentage of full time equivalent employees.

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 applicant's future school leader has extensive academic preparation and appears extensively civically engaged in the target area. (e30).

Board member details are included on page e30. As a group, their strengths lie in education, instruction, accounting, and grant administration. This board expertise appears adequate to implement the project as described and to guide the development of this school.

Weaknesses:

The head financial position and lead academic positions under the Executive Director do not have minimum credential or qualifications listed. (e19, e20).

The applicant lacks legal expertise on the board.

The application provides scant information on the future executive director's previous leadership experience in a school setting.

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 application includes reference to specific accounting methods and software, an audit, board internal controls, the governing board's finance committee and its oversight function. (P. e38.) This level of detail is sufficient to show that the applicant has a reasonable plan to successfully maintain control over all CSP grant funds.

Sub

Weaknesses:

The nebulous fiscal agency role of the Namahan Education Foundation towards the future Namahan School is unclear. On page e38, it is described as a financial supporting organization, which is not a defined term.

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:

School has a strong articulated data-driven academic program to drive continuous improvement for its academic program. (e.40.)

Weaknesses:

The application does not include a data-driven process to drive continuous improvement of the implementation of these grant related activities.

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 plan contained on page e27 appears adequate to supervise the administration, management, and oversight responsibilities of the grant. The monthly board meeting schedule and monthly reports to the board are described on page e43 and appear adequate to ensure accountability.

Weaknesses:

The plan as presented could provide greater details on the tools the Executive Director will use to progress monitor and drive this project to success outside of the formal accountability process.

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:

Strengths:

The school has a strong quantifiable plan to sustain this charter school once these funds expire. (e45). It includes revenue based upon state per pupil allocations and a [REDACTED] private grant. (e45). They have also considered facilities funding and sourced over [REDACTED] towards a campus. (e.45). This plan is robust and appropriate for a charter school at this stage in the development process and it has been sufficiently implemented to date so as to be reasonably convincing that it is realize-able.

Weaknesses:

There is scant mention of the ways that diversified revenue streams can be used to bolster charter schools.

There is scant information of contingency plans in case one of the items included in the continuation plan does not materialize.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

There is a clear rationale between the needs of the community this school is intended to serve, the lack of current services in the community, the needs of that community, the ability of this provider to fill those needs, and the promise of the educational program put forward to fulfill those needs with its particular focus on Big Picture Learning and Aina-based approach. (e45).

There is a strong amount of research presented to support the use of the programs proposed in this proposed school. (.e45)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 outcomes listed are clearly specified and measurable. (e57)

Sub

Weaknesses:

There are no project goals. (e57).

The objectives listed are not measurable. (e57)

Objectives 2-5 utilize vague language and are too global in scope too be considered clearly specified. (e57)

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: 22

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 application presents compelling information on the transportation barriers some students experience requiring them to have to commute 10-15 hours per week to go to school. (e.48). These issues are exacerbated by unique ecological issues in the target region affecting the roadway infrastructure. (e.48)

Weaknesses:

No evidence is presented about the severity or magnitude of issues related to student achievement to students in attending school in the target area.

No evidence beyond the transportation issues is presented about how the curricular offerings of this proposed school respond to a need in the local education landscape that is currently unfilled and needed.

Reader's Score: 11

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 application presents compelling information on the transportation barriers some students experience requiring them to have to commute 10-15 hours per week to go to school. (e.48). These issues are exacerbated by unique ecological issues in the target region affecting the roadway infrastructure. (e.48)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No evidence is presented about the severity or magnitude of issues related to student achievement to students in attending school in the target area.

Reader's Score: 11

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 details a nearly complete response to competitive preference subpart (a) (1) and (2). In the past, applicant school leaders conducted six listening sessions, preceded by a survey of over 600 locals, to gather input from the target school community about the charter school. In 2018, input from educators with a nexus to the target market was solicited through an educator advisory group. Their deliverables included helping with crafting the school mission, vision, model, and curriculum. (e15)

Going forward, these efforts at creating a community-centered approach have been reflected in the design in the school's core values. In addition, to maintain educator voice, the school's governing board has an academic committee comprised of educators. (e14) The school also intends to hire school employees and numerous education consultants during the pre-opening phase as well as continuing to engage other community groups.(e15)

There is a clear and convincing plan to operationalize this vision. Responsibilities for it are clearly identified. This plan represents a strong response to subpart (b).

Weaknesses:

It is difficult to assess whether the applicant fully satisfies this criterion. The proposal states that community input was used to create the school mission, vision and values; however, the application does not include a sufficient description of the responses given during the community feedback gathering activities to support these claims.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2023 04:28 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 02:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Namahana Education Foundation (S282B230014)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	40	31
Sub Total	40	31
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	18
Sub Total	40	26
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP Developers New Panel - 3: 84.282B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Namahana Education Foundation (S282B230014)

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: 31

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 application clearly presents the governing board's role in ensuring project success, particularly in its discussion of the Governing Board's relationship with the Executive Director (pages e20-21).

The financial plan, in particular the planned relationship with Namahana Education Foundation (page e23), demonstrates an understanding of the importance of financial management and oversight.

The applicant provides adequate information about planned internal controls and the processes through which the school will develop and review policies (pages e25-26).

Weaknesses:

Parts of the timeline are inconsistent with the narrative. For example, the application provides that the Manager of Finance and Operations and the Academic Coach will both be hired in July 2024 (page e22). However, the timeline of grant activities sets the hiring window for both positions as October through December 2024 (page e27). As another example, while the application describes the Academic Coach as focused on professional development (page e22), the timeline of grant activities extends the scope of that position to include staff recruitment, curriculum development, community engagement, and student and family outreach.

The application places significant startup and policy responsibilities on the Office Manager, including co-creating administrative policies and the employee handbook and sharing information with parents and the community (page e22). The scope of these responsibilities may be incompatible with the job title and responsibilities expected with that position.

Reader's Score: 7

Sub

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 budget narrative includes planned expenses related to personnel who are critical to the success of the proposed project, such as the Executive Director, Manager of Finance and Operations, and Academic Coach (pages e279-280).

The budget and budget narrative demonstrate the school's focus on being community-centered, as the costs include planned community events (pages e32-33).

Weaknesses:

The applicant details significant investments in the professional development of the Executive Director, including travel to conferences (page e32), coaching (page e284), and school visits (page e285). The application lacks a similar level of detail about the professional development plans for other staff, beyond identifying the Academic Coach as the personnel responsible for professional development.

The applicant does not connect all the proposed costs to the project's objectives.

Reader's Score: 3

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 application clearly explains the time commitments associated with the Executive Director, Manager of Finance and Operations, and Academic Coach (pages e30-31, e33), each of whom is critical to the success of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant clearly explains the time commitments of critical personnel, the timeline of those commitments is inconsistent across the application. For example, the application provides that the Manager of Finance and Operations and the Academic Coach will both be hired in July 2024 (page e22). However, the timeline of grant activities sets the hiring window for both positions as October through December 2024 (page e27).

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Given the relative inexperience of the school's proposed Executive Director in leading middle and high schools, the partnership with Big Picture Learning provides critical training, support, and learning experiences (pages e36-37).

The governing board is composed of individuals with a wide range of skills and expertise (pages e33-34), including education.

Weaknesses:

The application does not demonstrate that the proposed executive director has middle or high school leadership experience (pages e238-39).

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

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 application fully demonstrates how the applicant will maintain control over all CSP grant funds (pages e38-40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 application clearly outlines the plan to use a variety of assessment, personalized learning plans, and other data to make programmatic decisions. The plan smartly includes specific timelines for data-driven decision-making, school-wide data discussions, and performance goals (pages e40-41).

The application anticipates one of the complexities of data-driven decision-making by having plans specifically for students new to the school (page e41).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant specifies how it will use data to drive decision-making related to curriculum and professional development at the individual level, the applicant does not address how it will initiate changes related to schoolwide programmatic progress.

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 application demonstrates an understanding of administering the grant versus overseeing the grant through its full explanation of how the proposed Executive Director will have management responsibilities over the grant and the governing board will exercise oversight responsibilities through progress and financial reporting (page e43).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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's early actions in engaging the community to assess demand, get input into school design, and develop a program responsive to community feedback (page e15-16) helped the school start with a focus on continuation. Because it already has a site, private contributions, the support of its community, and a five-year financial plan that considers its enrollment projections (page e44), the school is well-positioned to continue operating consistent with the application once grant funds are no longer available.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 application fully explains a convincing rationale for the school, which will be the first public middle and high school in the area (page e45). The proposed geographic enrollment preference (page e45) evidences the validity of this rationale.

The academic plan, which is grounded in important and applicable research (pages e47-48), demonstrates how the school will bring the rationale to life.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 application offers a variety of types of objectives and outcomes, in recognition of the needs of the community (page e57).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The measurable outcomes are a combination of objectives (e.g., opening with 120 students in 7th and 8th grade) and performance outcomes (e.g., proficiency rates) (pages e57-58), without prioritization or distinction.

Several of the measurable outcomes lack dates by which the school will achieve those outcomes (page e57-58).

The performance outcomes lack context and baseline information, which makes determining feasibility difficult.

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: 18

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 application convincingly lays out the scope of the problem, given the relative geographic inaccessibility of public schools for middle and high school students in the North Shore community (pages e58-59).

Weaknesses:

The application lacked data to support purported low levels of student engagement, graduation, college matriculation, and career pathways (page e59). Similarly, although the application referenced high suicide rates (page e59), it offered no documentation or data to provide context and support for that problem. This criterion was thoroughly discussed, and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 9

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 partially connects the program design to community needs and values (pages e45-46).

Weaknesses:

The application provides only a cursory discussion of the need for the services in this section. Elsewhere, it offers more detail connecting the program design to community needs (pages e45-46). However, it provides limited data to support the design and does not report out community input that may have led to specific programmatic decisions.

Sub

Reader's Score: 9

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 lists numerous current and former educators as involved in the school's design and governance. Having educators actively involved on multiple bodies, including the Educator Advisory Group and the governing board's academic committee (pages e14-15), demonstrates the commitment to meaningful and ongoing engagement with current and former educators.

The applicant implemented a comprehensive community engagement process during the charter application process, including polling, listening sessions, one-on-one conversations, and small group meetings (pages e15-16).

The meaningful involvement of numerous community leaders in the school's development (page e18) and the intended implementation of 'Āina-based learning ('ĀBL) (pages e17-18) are both promising for the school's community-centered approach.

The timeline of grant activities provided adequate information and practices to ensure ongoing community engagement, specifically through outreach sessions, community meetings, and community events (page e29).

Weaknesses:

The application lacked a discussion of how specifically the community engagement and input shaped the school's mission, vision, and model.

While the application listed numerous community leaders as members of their governing board, it did not assess how their capacities, skills, and knowledge would benefit the charter school specifically. Furthermore, the sections of the application focused specifically on the governing board's responsibilities (pages e20-21) did not mention their role as community assets or their need to maintain strong community ties.

Although the application listed planned community engagement in the forms of outreach and input sessions (page e29), it did not discuss protocols or deliverables that would ensure meaningful consideration of community feedback and input.