

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2023 04:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Siembra Leadership High School (S282E230012)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	14
Sub Total	20	14
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	27
Sub Total	35	27
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	5
Sub Total	10	5
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	21
Sub Total	35	30
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CSP Developers Replication Panel - 2: 84.282E

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Siembra Leadership High School (S282E230012)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (1) Quality of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 points).

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant notes this school system is primarily drop-out recovery and serving students whom are overcoming significant barriers such as homelessness, parenthood, and the juvenile justice system (pg. e19). Due to this, the applicant acknowledges the school does not outperform the state rate for graduation or attendance; however, the applicant does cite retention of 100% of reclassified students, 87% mastery in English, 86% in science, and 80% in math as well as 80% college-ready (pg. e19). The applicant does convincingly cite performance in the area of college and career training, postsecondary enrollment, and employment as a strength with their 280 students earning more than 350 college credit in the previous year (pg. e21).

Weaknesses:

The applicant is unable to show traditional data points of above-state-average performance (pg. e20).

Reader's Score: 3

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant states they have not experienced closure or noncompliance, and notes their charter renewal in 2021.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

The applicant states they have not experienced any financial or operational management issues, student safety issues, or other significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance (pg. e21).

Weaknesses:

In the provided accounting documents, the auditor finds several compliance issues, some of which are repeat issues (pg. e160-162).

Reader's Score: 3

4. (iv) **The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

The applicant cites above average school climate surveys with a score of 42/50 versus 40/50 for the state (pg. e22). The applicant discusses their measurement of social-emotional learning using the Development Assets Profile (DAP) and states their measurable outcome is a goal of 37/60 and recently achieving a 45/60 (pg. e22).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant's description includes two measures: school climate and social-emotional learning; there is no mention of student mental health, civic engagement, or crime prevention and reduction which seems lacking considering the level of community engagement previously described (pg. e22).

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (2) **Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 35 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 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The applicant provides a project management timeline including hiring a project manager for planning and development for the first 18 months (pg. e23). The second portion of the plan includes implementation over four years and features objectives such as a hiring campaign, ordering supplies, annual conferences, data review, meetings, and various enrollment activities (pg. e23).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's timeline seems extensive for the objectives to be met. The applicant's provided plan is somewhat simplistic and does not include details beyond the normal operations for a charter school (pg. e24).

Reader's Score: 4

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 states the funds will be used for staff salaries, professional development, technology, strategic planning, and recruitment marketing (pg. e24).

Weaknesses:

The costs cited are primarily normal operating costs for a school except for the strategic planning contract and project manager. It is not clearly defined how these funds will lead to actual expansion of the school and sustainability runs a risk given all of the funds go to salaries (pg. e24).

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 has assigned percentage time commitments of key personnel for the project with the primary responsibility on the newly hired project manager (pg. e25).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has spread out time commitments for four key personnel, however, the quick decline noted for the executive director/principal (■■■■ in Year 1 and decreasing to ■■■■ by Year 5) could be a concern for adequate oversight and management throughout the life of the project (pg. e24).

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))

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly provides demographics for educators, and education and experience for leadership personnel which align with the school's desired outcomes (pg. 25-27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant states they will solely manage all CSP funds utilizing only one outside contractor (Strategic Planning Facilitator). The applicant notes a contracted accounting firm and states the project manager will be responsible for monitoring fidelity to the budget and allowable expenses day-to-day (pg. e28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant lacks details about accounting controls and practices currently utilized. An area of concern is tasking the project manager with monitoring fidelity to the budget and allowability of expenses on a day-to-day level without additional local oversight (pg. e28).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant outlines adherence to community-led decision-making via board committees and staff meetings with an emphasis there is not a single source of decision-making (pg. e28-29).

Weaknesses:

There is a risk in the applicant's approach that without a clearly defined structure for decision-making, projects can become stagnant and risk a lack of progress (pg. e28-29).

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 states the program manager will be the primary personnel to administer and oversee the grant including progress, expenses, and outcomes via quarterly reports to the board and principal (pg. e29).

Weaknesses:

The position of a program manager is not mentioned in other sections of the narrative and is not allocated in the time commitments or salaries. This section does not align with other project plans and details (pg. e29).

Reader's Score: 3

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (3) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 10 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 states the recognition of the intent to supplement with CSP funds and states its intent to seek other funds for sustainability by the end of the five-year grant period (pg. e29). The applicant notes receipt of the New Mexico Public Education Department supplemental funds previously and fundraising efforts through its 501(c)(3) (pg. e30).

Weaknesses:

The applicant is unable to detail secured funding or promised funding beyond the grant award for project sustainability; this is a concern and risk for the continuation, especially since the grant primarily funds salaries for key personnel (pg. e29-30).

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates rationale sufficient to its goal of re-engaging and retaining underserved students through an academic program that is highly supportive, community-driven, and project-based (pg. e30). The applicant highlights a 1:47 ratio of social workers compared to the average 1:1000 in traditional schools (pg. e30). The applicant discusses their community engagement and desire to utilize these funds in developing a Strategic Plan to sustain their commitments as they expand (pg. e31). In addition, the applicant describes their project-based learning approach and additions to the program through the project (pg. e32). The applicant also discusses dual enrollment and internship opportunities for students that will be expanded as part of the project (pg. e35). The rationale provided addresses the described needs of the students served by the school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Sub

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 outlines the projects goals, objectives, and outcomes with the primary objectives of increase engagement in high-quality education for underserved students and disconnected youth, implement an academic approach that is project-based, community-led, and highly supportive to maintain or improve students' academic, college and career outcomes (pg. e38-39). The applicant thoroughly details the metrics for their desired objectives.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the objectives presented are part of the current school's operations, beyond adding 170 seats over five years. If the goal is expansion, a large focus of these objectives seem broad and typical for school improvement.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (5) Need for Project (up to 25 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: 21

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes the findings of New Mexico's student population overall, citing consistent ratings in the bottom three states for education, economic well-being, and child well-being (pg. e40). Additionally, these outcomes are directly linked to educational inequities and the applicant mentions a lawsuit that found the state violated the educational rights of students of color, low-income, and disabilities (pg. e40). The applicant highlights New Mexico's issues are unique given their demographics, geography, and linguistic diversity (pg. e41).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides broad data regarding the state as a whole but does not focus on the local demographics and specific needs of the community.

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant describes their student demographics and provides some evidence of how their program can address the needs of the population, using students with disabilities as a specific example (pg. e42). The applicant claims innovation with its entrepreneurship solution (pg. e42).

Weaknesses:

The link between the need and solution is made but with limited to no evidence of efficacy. It is unclear whether the gap described can be solved via the solution provided.

Reader's Score: 8

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 intends to expand enrollment at their existing charter school describing "meaningful, ongoing engagement with educators" (pg. e14). The applicant states the school's philosophy is shared among three pillars: Learning by Doing, Community Engagement, and Student Support (pg. e14). The applicant describes their community-centered approach citing partnerships with various municipality groups as well as internships with local sites (pg e15). Additionally, the applicant describes community involvement in the school's governance board and site-based leadership team (pg. e15-16). The applicant outlines their 18-month planning period and intention to work with a Strategic Planning Facilitator to inform programming and community engagement conversations to update the skills and knowledge deemed important by community members (pg. e17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/01/2023 04:33 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2023 04:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Siembra Leadership High School (S282E230012)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	14
Sub Total	20	14
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	27
Sub Total	35	27
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	4
Sub Total	10	4
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	35
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CSP Developers Replication Panel - 2: 84.282E

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Siembra Leadership High School (S282E230012)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (1) Quality of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 points).

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant serves a student population experiencing extreme challenges and achieves significant success in re-engaging students, in post-secondary credits for its students, and in achieving student mastery in English, science, and math according to alternative mastery-based metrics approved by its charter authorizer (e19-20). Applicant notes that while it does not outperform the state at large on state standardized tests, more than 80% of its students demonstrate mastery and demonstrate college and career readiness.

Weaknesses:

The applicant admits to not tracking its students' postsecondary success, which could be a key indicator of programmatic effectiveness and could inform programming and strategy (e21). Alternative metrics of mastery-based project learning, without a correlation to post-secondary success, can be suspect. The applicant readily admits that due to its student population, it does not outperform the state averages in testing (e20), attendance, or graduation. This connection would be helpful in establishing the quality of the eligible applicant.

Reader's Score: 3

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant has not experienced closure or noncompliance, and was renewed when eligible. (e21)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

Applicant notes that it has not had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety issues (e21).

Weaknesses:

Applicant's audited financial statements make repeat findings as to potential misstatements of its financial statements for a variety of miscalculations and misstated expenditures each under \$ [REDACTED] (e160-162). While these are minor findings, that their auditor recommends policies that would ensure proper accounting can be a concern about the applicant's accounting practices more generally. In addition, the audit notes a significant pension fund liability of over \$ [REDACTED] that has gone unaddressed otherwise. (e139).

Reader's Score: 3

4. (iv) **The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

Applicant presents that it outperforms the state average on its school climate survey, earning a 42/50 as opposed to the 40/50 statewide average (e22). Applicant also presents that it exceeds its internal goal on the Development Assets Profile social emotional assessment tool, but does not explain how it could be known whether that result is strong.

Weaknesses:

Applicant provides only sparse description of its parent satisfaction and school climate data, and does not address student mental health, civic engagement, crime prevention, or any other non-academic areas that it is interested in measuring or advancing (e22).

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (2) **Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 35 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 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

Strengths:

Applicant provides a full 18-month planning and development phase with key milestones baked in to further identify smaller activities that will need to be accomplished in advance of implementation. (e23-24). The applicant has further created an annual cadence of key milestones for each year that the program is implemented, and assigns key personnel responsible for various aspects of these milestones. As the applicant's intention is to improve the existing programming and expand the enrollment, the milestones and cadence presented appear reasonable.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

Costs are nearly all associated with the personnel needed to achieve the objectives and design and implementation of the project, including the program leadership (e255-257). Travel costs and for necessary professional development are reasonable (e262).

Weaknesses:

The applicant identifies an [REDACTED] raise for cost of living year over year (e257-258). While this year's federally approved cost of living increase is [REDACTED] that amount is an outlier and unreasonable to anticipate such an increase year over year. Thus, the salary increases contemplated by the grant appear improperly inflated.

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 scope of the project is aligned to the applicant's current area of expertise, so the time commitments of the project director and key project personnel are appropriate to meet the objectives. The social worker and community engagement coordinator's time is also well documented to be reasonable to support expansion (e25).

Weaknesses:

The project contemplates a roughly 50% growth in enrollment for the school as a whole, and building systems and supports for that influx of students. As the Executive Director is in effect the school leader, it is not reasonable that her time on this project will reduce to 5% by year 5 (e24).

Sub

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:

Most of the hired project personnel has relevant training and experience for their roles. The executive director has founded the program where students currently are able to receive project-based learning experiences contemplated by the proposed project (e25-26); the Curriculum Director has significant experience as an assistant principal and principal (e27) and the community engagement coordinator has been functioning in this capacity within the school's community for the last 7 years (e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant has adequately described its intention to work with an outside accounting firm that has managed numerous grant funds for the applicant successfully in the past (e28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's audit noted several findings with respect to minor discrepancies within its budget (e160-162). As the applicant has not otherwise addressed this issue or explained how it has resolved this issue, this issue may impact the fund controls of this proposed project.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant has addressed how it generally makes decisions with the input of broadly engaging stakeholders in strategic planning, and asserts that it will do the same with respect to this proposed project (e28). This suggests, somewhat convincingly, that programmatic decisions with respect to this proposed project will be democratically sourced among stakeholders of the charter school and broader community.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant has detailed that it has successfully made community-engaged decisions in the past, it has not necessarily articulated a plan to make all programmatic decisions with respect to this proposed project.

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)

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that the Project Manager will oversee the project plan (e23) and timeline (e17). Due to the strength of these plans, this process is reasonable.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided an insufficient, unclear plan that relies on an individual who is not yet identified. While the applicant has indicated that this individual will "gather data" from other key personnel, the applicant has not articulated a plan with a system or structure, and admits that it is not yet developed, but will be, during the scheduled planning period (e29).

Reader's Score: 3

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (3) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 10 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 identifies broad areas of collaborators, opportunities for corporate and government fundraising, and an intent to continue to seek additional sources of funding for discrete project components (e29-30). As such, this appears to be the beginning of such a continuity plan that could use further development.

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides unspecific information with respect to being poised for future grants and fundraising through a foundation. The applicant notes that it is working to identify additional sources of funds through corporate, foundation, and government grants, but has not indicated that it has secured any. Thus, the plan for continuation is still in development.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (4) 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 intends to scale its wraparound services for students in a proven model that serves to support engagement and success in school; the applicant's model includes an arsenal of case-management type work where social workers identify and support tailored needs of students, project-based learning to address both subject mastery and student engagement, community project work where students engage in projects to both uplift the community and, through engagement, improve academic achievement (e30-31). The applicant's theory is that growing this system in providing additional opportunity and increasing enrollment will improve academic, engagement, and post-secondary outcomes for more high-need students. The applicant cites multiple studies to support various aspects of this rationale, and as such, it is well-documented and convincing.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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 lists several clearly specified and measurable output goals that, if achieved, would be further proof of concept for this model well-executed. Aside from one goal of increasing enrollment, all other goals are related to improving student outcomes across academic proficiency and across post-secondary success (e38-40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

- 1. (5) Need for Project (up to 25 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: 25

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 identifies a significant need to support students in New Mexico, where despite a range of diverse backgrounds, a majority of students face widespread poverty and the obstacles that come about as a result of widespread poverty (e40-41). The applicant provides a convincing description of the stark situation facing students only being compounded by COVID-19 (e42).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

The applicant presents a convincing description that the services its proposed project would provide address the need of significant magnitude. Not just for students with disabilities that the applicant discusses in great detail (e41-42), but for all students in New Mexico facing various hardships, the applicant's model to provide robust non-academic supports coupled with proven project-based learning to push subject matter mastery, improve community engagement, and provide meaningful work experiences to students in high school to better prepare them for their post-secondary life compellingly addresses the magnitude of the need for services. While not confirmed, the applicant notes that its program has pioneered the entrepreneurship model of education in New Mexico and is unaware of another program that provides a similar model for students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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 applicant provides a thorough plan here to expand a high-quality, unique charter school through an inclusive planning process that specifically centers the community in student-led community projects. The applicant details how leadership is shared among stakeholders of the charter school (e14), and how central to the project is community-embedded projects such as internships, job shadowing, and social services (e15) that result in improved student engagement and improved academic outcomes. As a result, the applicant's description here is convincing.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2023 04:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 01:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Siembra Leadership High School (S282E230012)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	12
Sub Total	20	12
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	31
Sub Total	35	31
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	5
Sub Total	10	5
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	35
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CSP Developers Replication Panel - 2: 84.282E

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Siembra Leadership High School (S282E230012)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (1) Quality of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 points).

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 12

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a number of successes for the targeted student population including academic. (e19-21)

Weaknesses:

The applicant lags behind the state average in a number of categories including academic growth and academic achievement. (e19-21)

Reader's Score: 2

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant has never had a school closed, a charter revoked or had their affiliation revoked. (e21)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant states they have no issues in finance or operations. (e21)

Weaknesses:

The applicant's budget presentation is confusing and difficult to understand. It is unclear how allocations change from year to year.

Reader's Score: 3

4. (iv) The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates strengths in student mental health and parent satisfaction, including academic outcomes for students and student social success. (e22)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide evidence regarding civic engagement or crime prevention and reduction. (e22)

Reader's Score: 2

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (2) Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 35 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 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan that strongly supports the objectives and provides a high level of detail including timelines and milestones. (e22-24)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 outlines their costs and demonstrates that they are reasonable as related to the work they will do. This includes salary and professional development costs. (e24)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly articulate some of the salary increases leading to potential unsustainability. (e24)

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 details how new and existing staff will reasonably be able to support the objectives. (e24-25)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 key personnel demonstrate significant training and experience including past success serving students with high needs. In school based settings they have been able to produce strong academic outcomes for students. (e26-27)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides plans to maintain control over all CSP grant funds by working with an experienced accounting firm to maintain control of the funds. (e28)

Sub

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 applicant offers a plan for making decisions related to the program including a mechanism for gathering input from multiple stakeholders. (e28-29)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not make it clear who will make the final decisions. It is unclear who has the final say in a number of areas related to implementation of the grant and project.

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 provides a clear method for managing with internal staff including assigned responsibilities and structure. (e29)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include any external oversight. They are not receiving any outside objective help with the project. (e29)

Reader's Score: 4

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (3) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 10 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 describes some steps to ensure continuity going forward, including a long term budget (e29-30). They also detail financial processes for evaluating spending on an ongoing basis.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not identify clearly which costs are long term and which are short term. They also do not describe how funding from the state will build over time. (e29-30)

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (4) 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 applicant provides clear and compelling reasons for their project, including a logic model that demonstrates the benefit to students (e30-31).

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 applicant details their goals and explains clearly how they will be achieved including timelines and benchmarks. (e38-40)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (5) Need for Project (up to 25 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: 25

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 students served by the project are some of the highest need in the state, including a significant portion with disabilities and from disadvantaged economic circumstances (e40-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

The applicant clearly illustrates the magnitude of need for the students to be served by the project by detailing the needs of the population including a large portion with disabilities and various other needs (e41-42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 applicant demonstrates a commitment to ongoing work with teachers, a focus on the community and a detailed plan. They show dedication to working with partners in the community to enhance student achievement. (e14-16)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 01:24 PM