

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

CHARTER SCHOOL PROGRAM STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

CFDA # 84.282A

PR/Award # U282A080011

Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT00406575

Closing Date: FEB 01, 2008

****Table of Contents****

Forms

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)	e1
2. Standard Budget Sheet (ED 524)	e6
3. SF 424B - Assurances Non-Construction Programs	e8
4. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities	e10
5. ED 80-0013 Certification	e12
6. Dept of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424	e13
7. 427 GEPA	e15

Narratives

1. Project Narrative - (Abstract Narrative...)	e17
Attachment - 1	e18
2. Project Narrative - (Project Narrative...)	e19
Attachment - 1	e20
3. Project Narrative - (Other Narrative...)	e77
Attachment - 1	e78
4. Budget Narrative - (Budget Narrative...)	e105
Attachment - 1	e106

This application was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this application. Some pages/sections of this application may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Application's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Application PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

* 1. Type of Submission: <input type="radio"/> Preapplication <input checked="" type="radio"/> Application <input type="radio"/> Changed/Corrected Application	* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="radio"/> New <input type="radio"/> Continuation <input type="radio"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): _____ * Other (Specify) _____
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

* 3. Date Received: 02/01/2008	4. Applicant Identifier: _____
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: _____	* 5b. Federal Award Identifier: _____
-----------------------------------------	------------------------------------------

State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State: _____	7. State Application Identifier: _____
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name: New York State Education Department	
* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): (b)(2)	* c. Organizational DUNS: 806782173

d. Address:

* Street1: 89 Washington Avenue
Street2: _____
* City: Albany
County: Albany
* State: NY: New York
Province: _____
* Country: USA: UNITED STATES
* Zip / Postal Code: 12234

e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name: Sch Impr & Comm Services (Reg)	Division Name: Office of Public School Choice
-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix: Dr.	* First Name: Darlene
Middle Name: M.	
* Last Name: Mengel	
Suffix: _____	
Title: Supervisor - Education Programs	
Organizational Affiliation: NYS Education Department	
* Telephone Number: 518-474-1762	Fax Number: 518-474-3209
* Email: dmengel@mail.nysed.gov	

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

A: State Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

* 10. Name of Federal Agency:

U.S. Department of Education

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

84.282

CFDA Title:

Charter Schools

* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:

ED-GRANTS-120307-001

* Title:

84.282A Charter School Program State Education Agencies

13. Competition Identification Number:

84-282A2008-1

Title:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

New York State

* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:

NYS 2008-2011 CSP Project

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

16. Congressional Districts Of:

* a. Applicant

* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:

* a. Start Date:

* b. End Date:

18. Estimated Funding (\$):

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="23,059,262.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text" value="(b)(4) 0.00"/>
* c. State	<input type="text" value="2,916,044.00"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="25,975,306.00"/>

* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)

- Yes
- No

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications** and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

** I AGREE

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: * First Name:

Middle Name:

* Last Name:

Suffix:

* Title:

* Telephone Number: Fax Number:

* Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative: * Date Signed:

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424 (Revised 10/2005)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

*** Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.

Attachments

AdditionalCongressionalDistricts

File Name

Mime Type

AdditionalProjectTitle

File Name

Mime Type



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
 New York State Education Department

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1(a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$ 0	\$ 40,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 92,000
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 0	\$ 18,212	\$ 23,676	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 41,888
3. Travel	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,800	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 30,800
4. Equipment	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. Supplies	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,839	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 12,839
6. Contractual	\$ 7,866,323	\$ 8,585,666	\$ 6,318,218	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 22,770,207
7. Construction	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
8. Other	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 90,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 7,910,323	\$ 8,687,878	\$ 6,439,533	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 23,037,734
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 0	\$ 9,360	\$ 12,168	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 21,528
11. Training Stipends	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	\$ 7,910,323	\$ 8,697,238	\$ 6,451,701	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 23,059,262

***Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office):**

If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

(1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? Yes No

(2) If yes, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 4/1/2006 To: 3/31/2007 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency: ED Other (please specify): _____

(3) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? or, Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control Number: 1890-0004

Expiration Date: 06/30/2005

Name of Institution/Organization:
New York State Education Department

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1(a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	b)(4) 687,235	\$ 667,852	\$ 677,088	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 2,032,175
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
3. Travel	\$ 10,000	\$ 11,800	\$ 11,300	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 33,100
4. Equipment	\$ 2,316	\$ 1,792	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 4,108
5. Supplies	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 12,000
6. Contractual	\$ 145,343	\$ 176,000	\$ 310,100	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 631,443
7. Construction	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
8. Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 848,894	\$ 861,444	\$ 1,002,488	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 2,712,826
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 68,724	\$ 66,785	\$ 67,709	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 203,218
11. Training Stipends	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	\$ 917,618	\$ 928,229	\$ 1,070,197	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 2,916,044

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Approval No. 4040-0007
Expiration Date 04/30/2008

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee- 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

Previous Edition Usable

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

Tracking Number: GRANT00406575

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis- Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327- 333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93- 205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

<p>* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL Mary Drzonsc</p>	<p>* TITLE Dep Comm for Operations & Management Services</p>
<p>* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION New York State Education Department</p>	<p>* DATE SUBMITTED 02-01-2008</p>

Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97) Back

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(See reverse for public burden disclosure.)

Approved by OMB

0348-0046

<p>1. * Type of Federal Action:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a. contract</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. grant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> d. loan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance</p>	<p>2. * Status of Federal Action:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. initial award</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award</p>	<p>3. * Report Type:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> b. material change</p> <p>For Material Change Only:</p> <p>year quarter</p> <p>date of last report</p>
<p>4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prime <input type="checkbox"/> SubAwardee Tier if known:</p> <p>* Name: New York State Education Department</p> <p>* Address: 89 Washington Avenue Albany NY: New York 12234</p> <p>Congressional District, if known:</p>	<p>5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:</p>	
<p>6. * Federal Department/Agency:</p> <p>Department of Education</p>	<p>7. * Federal Program Name/Description: Charter Schools</p> <p>CFDA Number, if applicable: 84.282</p>	
<p>8. Federal Action Number, if known:</p>	<p>9. Award Amount, if known:</p>	
<p>10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant (if individual, complete name):</p> <p>* Name: NA NA</p> <p>* Address:</p>	<p>b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a):</p> <p>* Name: NA NA</p>	
<p>11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.</p>	<p>* Signature: Mary Drzonsc</p> <p>* Name: Ms. Theresa E. Savo</p> <p>Title: Deputy Commissioner for OMS</p> <p>Telephone No.: 518-474-2547</p>	

	Date: 02-01-2008
Federal Use Only:	Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)

Public Burden Disclosure Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 20503.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

* APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION

New York State Education Department

* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Prefix: Ms. * First Name: Theresa Middle Name: E.

* Last Name: Savo Suffix: * Title: Dep Comm for Operations & Management Services

* SIGNATURE: Mary Drzonsc * DATE: 02/01/2008

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANTS

1. Project Director

* Name:

Dr.

Darlene

M

Mengel

PhD

* Address:

NYSED - Office of Public School Choice Programs

89 Washington Avenue

Albany

County

Albany

NY: New York

12234

USA: UNITED STATES

* Phone Number:

518-474-1762

Fax Number:

518-474-3209

Email:

dmengel@mail.nysed.gov

2. Applicant Experience:

Yes No Not applicable to this program

3. Human Subjects Research

Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project Period?

Yes No

Are ALL the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

Yes Provide Exemption(s) #:

No Provide Assurance #, if available:

Tracking Number: GRANT00406575

Please attach an explanation Narrative:

FileName

MimeType

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct

description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1890-0007. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. **If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to:** Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248.

Attachment Information

File Name

Mime Type

Project Narrative

Abstract Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **6119-Final_Abstract_for_USDOE.pdf**

ABSTRACT

The NYS 2008-2011 Charter Schools Program (CSP) Project meets the purpose of the CSP by increasing the awareness of the charter school model in disseminating information about charter schools and successful practices in charter schools to teachers, parents, community members and other public schools; by expanding the number of high-quality charter schools available to students in New York State by both providing sub-grants for planning, program design, and implementation; and by conducting an evaluation of the effects of charter schools operating within New York State.

The project's expected outcomes are to: (1) increase the number of new high quality charter schools, and, in particular, quality secondary schools; (2) utilize CSP grant funding to improve student outcomes; (3) support charter schools to be fiscally responsible and stable for long-term viability; and (4) promote the awareness of charter schools, including best practices found in charter schools.

The New York State Education Department ("NYSED," "SEA," "SED") has been a recipient of federal CSP funds since 1999. Since then, NYSED has sub-allocated up to 50 percent of the award to the State's other major charter authorizer, the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York ("SUNY BOT," "SUNY"). NYSED and SUNY have carefully assessed the impact this project has had upon both policy and practice in New York State. The CSP funds will be used to address governance, which is a common challenge among charter schools, by having a greater emphasis on training for charter schools' Boards of Trustees and their leadership. To create a continuum of K-12 high quality charter schools in New York State, the CSP grant funds will also be used to have a greater emphasis on secondary charter schools.

Project Narrative

Project Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **6332-Mandatory_Final_Project_Narrative_to_USDOE.pdf**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Competitive Preference Priorities:

Competitive Preference Priority 1	Page	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2.....	Page	2
Competitive Preference Priority 3.....	Page	6
Competitive Preference Priority 4.....	Page	8
Competitive Preference Priority 5.....	Page	9

2. Application Requirements:

Application Requirement (i).....	Page	11
Application Requirement (ii).....	Page	11
Application Requirement (iii).....	Page	11
Application Requirement (iv).....	Page	11
Application Requirement (v).....	Page	11
Application Requirement (vi).....	Page	11
Application Requirement (vii).....	Page	16

3. Selection Criteria:

Selection Criteria (i).....	Page	17
Selection Criteria (ii).....	Page	22
Selection Criteria (iii).....	Page	24
Selection Criteria (iv).....	Page	26
Selection Criteria (v).....	Page	38
Selection Criteria (vi).....	Page	42

1. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITIES

Priority 1: Secondary Schools

New York State defines secondary school students as those in grades 9 through 12. New York State charter school law allows charter schools' admission policies to "provide expanded learning opportunities for students at-risk of academic failure." (§2854(2)(a) of the Education Law). A combination of these characteristics will be a priority for the purpose of approving applications to sub-grantees. To emphasize high federal and State academic expectations for student success, the SEA will disseminate NCLB requirements and accountability information to charter schools. The charter schools' progress in attaining those high expectations will be a continued focus throughout this CSP grant period.

Mandatory State assessments provide data that tracks student academic achievement over time, thus providing on-going information about individuals and cohorts of students as they progress through the grades and giving indicators of potential academic failure, including the likelihood of not completing high school. Interventions may be designed and applied in a timely manner to prevent such failure. This data also allow further comparison of charter school students' academic success with students in their districts of location, with schools across the state with similar demographics, and with students statewide.

Each charter school in New York State is required to submit an annual report which includes evidence of attainment of its goals, including absolute, comparative, and growth measures. Technical assistance will be provided to schools where needed as part of the ongoing oversight of progress in improving student achievement.

New York State will give those projects that support activities and interventions aimed at improving the academic achievement of secondary school students a priority in the grant

application process. Ten points will be added to the score of any sub-grant applicant that successfully addresses this priority thus encouraging developers to focus on secondary students.

The SEA will encourage and support the aggressive recruitment of secondary school students from existing middle level charter schools, thus ensuring a continuous quality charter school experience for these students. Existing charter schools will be supported in efforts to grow in grade levels, with a similar result for those students. Current charter school strategies to attract and retain secondary level students will be shared with applicants. The SEA will highlight and promote such strategies and accomplishments of existing charter schools serving high school students by writing articles and descriptions to be posted on the SEA's Office of Public School Choice Program's (PSCP) website, which includes links to the individual schools' websites, and through presentations and technical assistance to other charter schools.

Priority 2: Periodic Review and Evaluation

New York State Education Law was amended by adding a new article 56 to incorporate the Charter Schools Act of 1998. Article 56 establishes the New York State Board of Regents (BOR) as the only entity authorized to issue a charter in New York State. Prior to the issuance of a charter by the BOR, a charter entity must approve the application whether it is a new, renewal, or revised charter application. The statute establishes the entities that authorize charter schools and requires each to conduct a periodic review and evaluation of the charter schools each oversees.

§2853(2) of the Education Law provides "the board of regents and charter entity shall oversee each school approved by such entity, and may visit, examine into and inspect any charter school, including the records of such school, under its oversight. Oversight by a charter school entity and the board of regents shall be sufficient to ensure that the charter school is in

compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and charter provisions.” In addition to this statutory provision, the charters authorized by the Board of Regents (BOR) as the charter entity elaborate on the nature of oversight. “The Charter School and the School Board acknowledge that the Regents are authorized to oversee the Charter School’s operations in all respects...To permit the Regents to fulfill this oversight function under the Act and ensure that the Charter School is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Charter, the Charter School agrees to abide by and implement the Oversight Plan.” The terms of the Oversight Plan requires that the State will “visit the charter school at least twice annually to conduct an informal review of the school’s progress to date; conduct comprehensive and special education monitoring at least once during the charter school’s charter; and conduct announced and unannounced visits, as well as reviews, interviews and audits, and institute any other procedures deemed necessary, as circumstances warrant, to ascertain the ongoing fiscal and educational soundness of the charter school.” The BOR and each charter entity have developed evaluative oversight or accountability systems regardless. These systems are designed to allow the charter school and the entity to determine if the school is progressing successfully to renewal and serves as an indicator of the likelihood of the school’s ability to make a compelling case for renewal. A central component of that system is a schedule of periodic visits to, and inspections of, charter schools. In its oversight or accountability plan, each charter school must define the performance objectives as approved by its charter entity and demonstrate how progress toward these objectives will be measured. This accountability plan is critical to the periodic and ongoing review and evaluation of a charter school, particularly for the purpose of renewal.

During each year of instruction, charter entity staff visit authorized charter schools twice annually seeking evidence of effectiveness in key areas: teaching and learning (curriculum,

instruction and assessment); climate (environment and discipline); facility (building or physical plant); and fidelity to the school's charter. The visits include interviews with the school leader, staff, parents, students and reviews of student work. The site visit reports convey the inspectors' insights, conclusions and discussions with the schools. These reports also help inform parents and other members of the public about the school's progress toward meeting its academic goals as specified in the school's Oversight or Accountability Plan. In addition, all charter schools are required to undergo an annual fiscal audit.

In the third year of a school's five year charter term, the charter entities conduct an extensive and rigorous comprehensive review of all aspects of the charter school. The charter entities conduct independent evaluation of the charter schools they authorize by contracting with an external inspection or evaluation team of their own choosing. These teams may consist of staff from the charter entity and/or persons with particular expertise in specific areas of school operations, including NCLB programs. These teams conduct desk audits of documents, spend two to four days onsite at the school, and prepare comprehensive monitoring reports for the charter entity. Charters may be renewed for a term of up to five years. In addition, the NYSED, on behalf of the BOR, conducts a comprehensive review of all charter schools, regardless of the charter authorizer.

Charter schools are given the opportunity in the fourth year of their charter term to correct all issues and concerns discovered during the third year comprehensive monitoring review. In July of the year in which the charter is to expire, charter schools submit their renewal application. The renewal application must include: "(a) a report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter; (b) a detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction

and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the board of regents; (c) copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision 2 of §2857 of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements; and (d) indications of parent and student satisfaction.”

The renewal of a charter school is based on affirmative evidence gathered from a variety of data sources by the independent evaluators. This data serves as the basis that all charter entities and the BOR use to determine whether the school’s results merit renewal of its charter for another term.

Within six months of the end of an authorized charter school’s charter, NYSED staff submits the proposed renewal charter to the BOR for approval and extension of the provisional charter. NYSED staff must provide evidence to explain why a charter renewal is deserved and make the necessary findings to support a recommendation to the BOR for renewal of BOR-authorized charter schools. For submissions by other charter entities, NYSED staff also must examine the affirmative evidence from the charter entity explaining why a charter renewal is deserved and must make the necessary findings to support a recommendation that the BOR approve or return the proposed renewal charter to the charter entity for reconsideration. Staff must make the findings that “the charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will, during the renewal period, operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely, during the renewal period, to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision 2 of §2850 of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) during the renewal period, will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the proposed

charter school.” These findings can only be substantiated based upon the periodic reviews and evaluations that are conducted by each charter entity, including the State Education Department.

Priority 3: Number of High-Quality Charter Schools

Section 2852(9) of Education Law, established that “the total number of charter issued pursuant to this article shall not exceed one hundred.” The statute further stated that “a conversion of an existing public school to a charter school or the renewal or extension of a charter shall not be counted toward the numerical limits established by this subdivision.” The first new charter schools were approved and issued charters in 1999, and the one hundredth new charter school was approved and issued a charter in 2006. The number of charter schools in operation increased at a slow but steady rate over eight years. This slow rate of charter school growth and the legislatively imposed cap on the number of new charter schools that could be established has impacted the State’s ability to expend its CSP grant in a timely fashion and without significant carryover.

The New York State Legislature has provided a remedy to this situation by enacting several amendments to Article 56 of Education Law that were contained in the 2007-08 State budget bill. Specifically, “Part D-2 of Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2007” was enacted and in part revises §2856 (9) of the Education Law to expand “the total number of charters issued pursuant to this article...not to exceed {one} two hundred.” The SEA and the charter entities were able to proceed with the review and authorization of a number of applications that had been received in anticipation of the cap revision. The SEA and charter entities presented new charter school applications to the BOR for action at its December 2007 and January 2008 meetings. The BOR issued twenty-two new charters at its recent meetings. Therefore, 22 newly approved charter schools will open for instruction in September 2008. In addition, Objective 1 states that there

will be 10 new high quality charter schools created in the 2008-2009 school year. The charter entities have indicated that a combined total of 12 to 15 charter school applications are forthcoming to the BOR for action by March 2008. The State expects to receive several more applications in June 2008.

As previously indicated, all charter school applications must include a “description of student achievement goals for the school’s education program and the chosen methods of evaluating that students have attained the skills and knowledge specified for those goals. Such educational program shall meet or exceed the student performance standards adopted by the board of regents for other public schools” as stated in §2851(2)(b). Evidence of the quality of charter schools in New York State is strongly indicated in the results on the State’s grade 4 and 8 ELA and Math assessments for the most recent school year 2006-07. On the State’s grade 4 ELA and Math assessments, 47 charter schools reported results in terms of the percent of students passing. Of these, 55 percent had more students passing than their district of location in ELA and 73 percent had more students passing than their district of location in Math. Twenty six charter schools reported results, with 58 percent of charter schools showing more students passing than their district of location in ELA and 60 percent in Math. In the last Annual CSP Performance Report, only one school of the 96 charter schools in operation was identified as a public school in need of improvement.

As indicated in Priority #2, NYSED staff must find, on behalf of the BOR, that an applicant’s proposed charter school will operate in an educationally sound manner. Staff must also find that “the charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will, during the renewal period, operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely, during the renewal

period, to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) during the renewal period, will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the proposed charter school.”

Additional evidence of the State’s high expectations for the quality of its charter schools is attested in the closures or dissolutions of several charter schools. Two of the original charter schools that opened in 1999 voluntarily dissolved their charters. Another early charter school had its charter revoked for a combination of factors, including student achievement and school governance. Yet another charter school had its charter revoked before the school opened because of governance and fiscal concerns, and still another charter school surrendered its charter because it had not been able to open. In these instances, the SEA or the charter entity was unable to make the findings that the school was educationally or fiscally sound.

Finally, 47 charter schools have been in operation long enough (five years) to apply for renewal; 31 of these charter schools obtained a full five-year charter renewal. The remaining sixteen of the 47 obtained a charter renewal for less than a five-year charter term. Only six charter schools failed to receive a charter renewal, and closed at the end of their fifth year of operation. The close scrutiny of the charter schools that have applied for renewal, the focus on student achievement outcomes, and the closure of some of the charter schools all attest to the BOR and the charter entities’ keen interest in the quality of their charter schools.

Priority 4: One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a Local Educational Agency (LEA), or an Appeals Process

Article 56 of the New York State Education Law provides for four charter entities, as follows: “A charter entity shall be: (a) The board of education of a school district eligible for an apportionment of aid under subdivision twelve of section thirty-six hundred two of this chapter,

provided that a board of education shall not approve an application for a school to be operated outside the school district's geographic boundaries and further provided that in a city having a population of one million or more, the chancellor of any such city school district shall be the charter entity established by this paragraph; (b) The board of trustees of the state university of New York; or (c) The board of regents. ...The charter entity and the board of regents shall be deemed to be the public agents authorized to supervise and oversee the charter school.” (§2851(3)(a)(b)(c)).

Charter authorizers include the Board of Regents, the Trustees of the State University of New York and the Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools. In addition, any local board of education may also act as a charter authorizer. To date, only the Buffalo City School District’s Board of Education has acted as a charter authorizer.

Priority 5: High Degree of Autonomy

Once the BOR has awarded a charter, the new charter school accepts increased freedom from the traditional rules that public schools must follow in exchange for increased performance based accountability. A charter school is accountable for meeting its measurable student achievement goals or risk non-renewal of its charter. This increased autonomy coupled with increased accountability infuses all aspects of the oversight of charter schools, beginning with a rigorous application process that applicants must go through to receive a charter as well as to maintain its charter.

Charter schools in New York State are fiscally autonomous, according to statute. “A charter school shall be deemed an independent and autonomous public school.” (§2853 (1)(c) of the Education Law). Further, “the board of trustees of the charter school shall have final authority for policy and operational decisions of the school.” (§2853(1)(f) of the Education

Law). In keeping with this authority, it is the trustees of each charter school's board that are responsible for approving the school's annual budget and for monitoring its finances.

An application for a charter school shall include "a proposed budget and fiscal plan for the school including evidence that the fiscal plan is sound and that sufficient startup funds will be available to the charter school." (§2851(2)(e) of the Education Law). Resources are allocated in the budget at the direction and discretion of the applicant and upon approval will be adopted by the charter school board of trustees. While each charter school has a high degree of autonomy over the charter school's budgets and expenditures, accountability is also maintained. "A charter school shall be subject to the financial audits, the audit procedures, and the audit requirements set forth in the charter and shall be subject to audits of the comptroller as set forth in section thirty-three of the general municipal law. Such procedures and standards shall be consistent with generally accepted accounting and audit standards. Independent fiscal audits shall be required at least once annually." (§2854 (1)(c) of the Education Law).

Charter schools in New York State receive their own allocations of federal entitlement funds directly from the SEA. Charter schools receive per student funding from the school districts of residence of its enrolled students. The amount of per student funding is calculated by the NYSED for each school district. In the event a school district fails to fulfill its financial obligation, there is a procedure in place for the State to deduct unpaid obligations from state aid due to the district and remit those funds to the applicable charter school.

The Charter Schools Institute of the State University of New York has the authority to issue one hundred of the two hundred charters authorized by statute. The issue of charter school autonomy is so important that the part of the Institute's mission is to "vigorously respect, defend and advocate for each charter schools independence and autonomy."

2. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Application Requirement (i): *The response to this requirement is addressed in Selection Criteria (i).*

Application Requirement (ii): *The response to this requirement is addressed in Selection Criteria (iii).*

Application Requirement (iii): *The response to this requirement is addressed in Selection Criteria (iii).*

Application Requirement (iv): *The response to this requirement is addressed in Selection Criteria (i).*

Application Requirement (v): *The New York State Education Department will not be establishing a revolving loan fund.*

Application Requirement (vi): Request for Waivers

1. **Coordination with SUNY:** The NYSED has been a recipient of the federal CSP Grant since 1999. Since that time, NYSED has sub-allocated up to 50 percent of the award to the State's other major charter authorizer, the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York ("SUNY BOT" or "SUNY").

The conditions of this sharing of funds, which has allowed the SUNY BOT to award sub-grants and administer a sub-grant program, have been delineated under a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), (Attachment A) between NYSED and the SUNY BOT. It will be reviewed by NYSED and SUNY and revised accordingly to reflect activities beyond July 31, 2008.

The Charter Schools Institute was created to assist the SUNY BOT in meeting its responsibilities under the New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998. As a single purpose

entity concerned solely with the authorization, monitoring and renewal of charter schools, the Institute is uniquely suited to assist the NYSED in its administration of the grant program. The SUNY BOT and the SUNY Charter Schools Institute were recently featured in a new United States Department of Education (USDOE) guide on high quality charter authorizing, *Supporting Charter School Excellence Through Quality Authorizing*. By partnering with SUNY, the NYSED is able to leverage expertise on SUNY's staff and provide continuity in oversight of charter schools authorized by SUNY, while ensuring and maintaining appropriate overall program accountability.

In reference to the March 14, 2001 letter from John Fiegel, Director of Public School Choice Programs, USDOE approved an amendment to our CSP grant allowing NYSED to sub-allocate to SUNY up to half of the CSP grant funds, as outlined in the attached MOA. It was stated in that letter that a waiver of the CSP statute was not necessary. A March 2, 2006 letter from Theresa E. Savo, NYSED Deputy Commissioner for Operations and Management Services, NYSED, to Dean Kern, Director, Charter Schools Program, USDOE, referenced that in the approved application for PR/Award Number U282A050007 the NYSED would again sub-allocate a portion of the grant to SUNY and based on the above-mentioned March 14, 2001 letter that a waiver need not be sought for such an arrangement. An April 6, 2006 letter from John Fiegel, Director, Parental Options and Information, USDOE stated that the USDOE's position had not changed since prior awards S282A990055 and S282A02003. The letter went on to state that USDOE approved NYSED's request to sub-allocate a portion of its approved grant to the SUNY BOT.

To the extent, however, that the USDOE's position has changed in this regard, we hereby request such a waiver. If the USDOE's position has remained the same, we request USDOE approval for NYSED to continue the sub-allocation to the SUNY BOT.

2. **Limitation on number of awards a charter school may receive:** The NYSED respectfully requests that the Secretary provide a waiver, for the narrow circumstances described below, from the limitation that a charter school may not receive more than one grant for planning and program design activities and one grant for initial implementation of a charter school. This waiver is necessary for the State to fully realize the potential of the successful operation of charter schools in the State and to help address the competitive preference priority for improving the academic achievement of secondary students who are at greatest risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards and not completing high school.

Specifically, the NYSED requests that it be afforded the opportunity to award planning and implementation funds to multiple "schools" operating under a single charter with the conditions that the new "school" must be:

- a. Likely to improve student learning and achievement and operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner.
- b. A distinct high school program designed to improve the academic achievement of secondary school students that are at greatest risk of not meeting challenging State academic requirements and not completing high school.
- c. Comprised of a student population that is significantly blended as evidenced by at least 30 percent of incoming cohort of 9th grade students should be from other than the existing charter school.

- d. Different administratively than the existing school program. This may include but not be limited to a different: school leader, governance structure, or Management Company.
- e. Separate physical location from the existing school program.

The New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998 (as amended) does not allow a charter school to operate more than one school or house any grade at more than one site and as a result, the “new school” distinction is predicated on the charter school’s high school program meeting the requirements above. Charter Schools that already serve a full complement of high school grades (grades 9-12), will be ineligible to apply for these supplemental charter school program funds afforded under the waiver.

The NYSED and SUNY propose to award sub-grants to eligible applicants for high school projects that meet the criteria established above consistent with its proposed sub-grant program for new charter schools. We propose that each eligible applicant receiving funds use such funds only to plan and/or implement a charter high school under its existing charter. Additionally, we propose that an eligible applicant receiving a sub-grant may use the funds only for post-award planning and design of the high school educational program, which may include refinement of the desired educational results and of the methods for measuring progress toward achieving those results; and professional development of teachers and other staff who will work in the charter high school; and initial implementation of the charter high school, which may include informing the community about the school; acquiring necessary equipment and educational materials and supplies; acquiring or developing curriculum materials for the high school program; and other initial operational costs that cannot be met from State or local sources.

This waiver request is targeted at expanding opportunities for students at greatest risk of academic failure. Open enrollment high school options in Buffalo, New York City and other parts of the state are simply inadequate to meet demand. There are many successful operators of charter schools in New York. For example, standouts include the Carl C. Icahn Charter School in the Bronx (recognized by the USDOE for Closing the Gap), the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) charter schools in New York City, Harlem Village Academy Charter School (recognized and visited by President Bush last year), the Syracuse Academy of Science Charter School (the #1 scoring public school in the Syracuse City School District for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years on the 7th grade and the 8th grade ELA exams (English language arts), and numerous others.

New York State is proud of its high standards for graduation and is working to improve its graduation rates. Recently, New York State's Commissioner of Education, Richard Mills said, "The statewide graduation rate has gone up only slightly and is unacceptably low." "We need to act urgently now. There are some bright spots. Graduation rates of African-American and Hispanic students have increased. New York City has gained. But we still have far to go. Many school leaders I've talked to are using effective strategies and showing gains. We must make their methods commonplace." April 2007: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Gradrates2006releaseFINAL.htm>

Expanding the availability of high quality public high schools by providing incentive to successful charter school operators to tackle the high school challenge appears to be a natural extension of the Commissioner's charge.

Application Requirement (vii):

§2853(4) of the New York State Education Law provides, “Special education programs and services shall be provided to students with a disability attending a charter school in accordance with the individualized education program (IEP) recommended by the committee or subcommittee on special education of the student’s school district of residence. The charter school may arrange to have such services provided by such school district of residence or by the charter school directly or by contract with another provider.” Thus, charter schools are **not** considered to be LEAs for the purpose of providing special education programs and services. §2853(2) of the New York State Education Law provides, in part, “Oversight by a charter entity and the board of regents shall be sufficient to ensure that the charter school is in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and charter provisions.”

In order to ensure compliance with all aspects of the IDEA, including but not limited to sections 613(a)(5) and 613(e)(1)(B), all charter authorizers conduct annual formal and informal monitoring visits, as well as comprehensive monitoring, to visit classrooms, review records, and interview parents, teachers, administrators, and trustees, to ascertain compliance with all charter provisions and applicable statute and regulation. Any instances of non-compliance are noted, and the school is required to take all necessary steps to ensure such compliance. The SED shares its findings with other authorizers when such monitoring is conducted with the other authorizers’ charter schools, and both agencies collaborate to determine the necessary next steps. At no time, however, does the SED relinquish its responsibility for such oversight or for administering consequences for such non-compliance, in accordance with §2855 of the New York State Education Law.

3. SELECTION CRITERIA

Selection Criteria (i): Assisting educationally disadvantaged and other students

The purpose of the charter schools grant program (CSP) in New York is consonant with the purpose of the New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998 to increase “learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure” (§2850(2)(b)). Section 2852(c) of Education Law, as amended by this Act, states: “in reviewing applications, the charter entity is encouraged to give preference to applications that demonstrate the capability to provide comprehensive learning experiences to students identified by the applicants as at risk of academic failure.”

The indicator that most charter school applicants have used to project risk of academic failure is percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. A recent study noted that students in New York City charter schools are, on average, posting higher gains in reading and mathematics than their counterparts in the city’s regular public schools. The study found that New York City charter school students in grades 3-8 gained about 12 percent in math and 3.5 percent in English language arts each year more than the comparison group in the regular public school. The study included a random selection of students who won lotteries to attend charter schools compared with students who did not win slots. More than 93 percent of the charter school students in the study came from low-income families versus 73 percent of the regular public school students. (Source: Hoxby, Caroline M. and Sonali Murarka. “New York City's Charter Schools Overall Report”, Cambridge, MA: New York City Charter Schools Evaluation Project, June 2007)

CSP grant funds enable sub-grantees to improve educational opportunities for all students, including the educationally disadvantaged students. Funds are used to purchase

instructional resources, provide professional development, and implement business systems, governance structures, and academic accountability plans.

The SEA's CSP grant program objectives and activities indicate New York State's intent to continue to assist in educating all students, including the educationally disadvantaged. The SEA's CSP grant program objectives and activities are as follows:

OBJECTIVE 1: To increase the number of new high quality charter schools, and, in particular, quality secondary schools.

Activity 1: Authorizers will recommend for charter approval only those schools that have a high likelihood of significantly improving student achievement, especially for students at risk of academic failure.

Activity 2: The SEA and SUNY will add 10 points to the score of each sub-grant applicant that successfully addresses the priority of serving secondary school students.

Activity 3: For added flexibility, applications for CSP planning, program design, and implementation grants as well as the dissemination grants, will be continuously accepted.

Activity 4: To emphasize high academic expectations, the SEA will disseminate NCLB requirements and accountability information to charter schools.

Activity 5: As part ongoing oversight on each school's progress in improving student achievement, the SEA will review evidence in each school's annual report regarding achievement of goals (absolute, comparative and growth measures). The SEA will provide technical assistance to charter schools.

Activity 6: Charter authorizers will conduct annual, monitoring and renewal visits to charter schools.

Activity 7: The SEA will highlight the accomplishments of existing charter schools serving secondary school students on the SEA's website and include links to the individual schools' websites.

Activity 8: Authorizers will strongly encourage applicants interested in establishing charter schools serving secondary school students.

Activity 9: The SEA and SUNY will award sub-grants for CSP planning, program design, and implementation as well as dissemination activities.

OBJECTIVE 2: To utilize Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant funding to improve student outcomes.

Activity 1: Charter authorizers will conduct annual, monitoring and renewal visits to charter schools.

Activity 2: As part of providing ongoing oversight on each school's progress in improving student achievement, the SEA will review evidence in each school's annual report regarding achievement of goals (absolute, comparative and growth measures). Technical assistance will be provided to charter schools.

Activity 3: The SEA will recommend charter school closure or non-renewal for any charter school identified as not being educationally sound.

Activity 4: The SEA and SUNY will award sub-grants for CSP planning, program design, and implementation as well as dissemination activities.

Activity 5: The SEA and authorizers will monitor charter schools' results on State assessments and other assessments in grades where State assessments are not given.

Activity 6: The application for planning, program design, and/or implementation grants will require the applicant to describe their plans to train Board of Trustee members on the use of student achievement data.

OBJECTIVE 3: Support charter schools to be fiscally responsible and stable for long-term viability.

Activity 1: The SUNY Charter Schools Institute, which is authorized to award one-half the charters in New York State, will strongly encourage its applicants to spend one year planning and developing strong fiscal policies and procedures before opening the school.

Activity 2: The New York State Office of State Comptroller (OSC) will audit each charter school in the State over a five year period and conduct risk-based audits thereafter. OSC will review the internal controls, financial practices and operations of charter schools to help ensure that there is adequate protection against fraud, theft or professional misconduct. These audits help strengthen accountability by reviewing how public resources are used, and can be used as a tool in the development of internal controls. The SEA will follow-up on the audit and provide technical assistance to the charter schools.

Activity 3: When recommending approval, renewal, or a revision to a charter, the SEA's Office of Audit Services will review the charter school for fiscal soundness pursuant to §2852(2) of the New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998. The Office of Audit Services will also examine the annual audits of each charter school.

Activity 4: The application for planning, program design, and/or implementation grants will require the applicant to describe their plans to train Board of Trustee members on the use of student achievement data. The Board of Trustees will be required to set aside monies for initial training and refresher courses on their roles, responsibilities, and scope of authority including

fiscal oversight. Charter school sub-grant recipients will be required to report on the status of training provided.

Activity 5: The SUNY Charter Schools Institute provides annual training on the expectations of fiscal accountability for charter schools contained in their Financial Oversight Handbook.

OBJECTIVE 4: The SEA and SUNY Charter Schools Institute will distribute information about charter schools, the chartering process, and best practices found in charter schools to teachers, parents, communities and other public schools.

Activity 1: The SEA will disseminate information in the SEA's P-16 Newsletter, on the SEA's website, dedicating a specific link to charter school information, and at Staff and Curriculum Development Network (SCDN) and District Superintendent (DS) meetings.

Activity 2: The SEA will create a "pocket guide" for information dissemination to teachers, parents, and the community that includes Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), websites, core information about charter schools including grant opportunities and best practices.

Activity 3: Upon completion of each dissemination grant project, the SEA will distribute information on each such project to all charter schools, public school districts and BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Services) via the SEA website, and/or Statewide presentations.

Activity 4: Authorizers will promote and encourage school level dissemination of best practices at State, regional and national conferences.

Activity 5: The SEA will disseminate information about charter schools' best practices to other public schools. The SEA and SUNY Charter Schools Institute will inform teachers, parents and the community about the SEA's charter school grant program through notices in the *State Register*, on the SEA's website (<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/psc>), on SUNY's Charter Schools

Institute website (<http://www.newyorkcharters.org>), and mailed to potential charter school grant applicants. The SEA will have direct contact with charter school applicants and through support organizations such as the New York Charter Schools Association (<http://www.nycsa.org>) and the New York City Center for Charter School Excellence (<http://www.nycchartercenter.org>). During the 2008-2011 CSP grant period, the SEA and SUNY will identify any necessary information that teachers, parents, and the community still need regarding the charter school grant program and will design and distribute a pocket guide geared toward each of those audiences.

The SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State by using the above-mentioned methods. Information from the final reports of a dissemination sub-grantees will be disseminated through presentations at conferences, regional coalition meetings, Staff and Curriculum Development Network (SCDN) meetings, and District Superintendent (DS) meetings. Articles will be published in the SEA's P-16 Newsletter.

Selection Criteria (ii): The degree of flexibility afforded by the SEA to charter schools

New York State Charter School laws are ranked among the strongest charter school laws in the nation. New York State Charter School law provides for multiple authorizers of charter schools for the purpose of application approval. They include the Board of Regents, the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY), the board of education of every public school district, and the Chancellor of a city school district having a population of more than one million (§2851(3) of the Education Law). Charter school applicants may apply to the authorizer of their own choosing.

Charter schools in New York State are under the oversight of their authorizers and the Board of Regents but they are also afforded a substantial degree of autonomy. This autonomy is clearly established in statute:

“A charter school shall be deemed an independent and autonomous public school, except as otherwise provided in this article” (§2853(1) (c) of the Education Law).

This autonomy includes control over the establishment of their educational programs, budget, expenditures, daily operations and personnel. This autonomy also extends to the exemption of charter schools from other State laws and regulations. Public charter schools in New York State are subject to all laws, rules and regulations affecting health and safety, civil rights, and student assessment applicable to other public schools except as specifically provided in §2854(1)(b) of the Education Law. Charter schools are also subject to New York’s Open Meetings Law and Freedom of Information Law (§2854(1) (e) of the Education Law) as well as certain requirements of the compulsory education law (§2854(1) (b) of the Education Law). Charter schools otherwise have a blanket waiver from all State and local rules, regulations, and laws applicable to public or private schools, boards of education, and school districts, including those related to school personnel and students, except as specifically provided in the school’s charter or §2854(1)(b) of the Education Law.

The administrative relationship of the charter and the authorizer is defined in statute:

“The board of regents and charter entity shall oversee each school approved by such entity, and may visit, examine into and inspect any charter school, including the records of such school, under its oversight. Oversight by a charter entity and the board of regents shall be sufficient to ensure that the charter school is in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and charter provisions” (§2853(2) of the Education Law).

In carrying out their oversight responsibilities, New York State’s charter authorizers respect the flexibility given to charter schools as they implement the State charter school law.

The New York State authorizers allow charter schools to set goals in line with their missions and operate autonomously, while holding them to high standards of performance.

Selection Criteria (iii): The number of high-quality charter schools to be created

The SEA and the other charter authorizers grant new charters only to applicants that demonstrate the capacity to provide a high-quality public school choice, and renew charters only to those schools that have demonstrated solid evidence of success. Since the NYS Charter Schools Act of 1998, Article 56, the number of high-quality charter schools in operation and educating students grew steadily to one hundred in 2006 when the cap on the number of charter schools was reached.

In 2007 the Governor lifted the cap on the number of charter schools in New York State from one hundred to two hundred, giving the SEA authority to approve one hundred new charter schools in the New York State. The SEA expects 22 new charter schools to open for instruction in September 2008, and to create an additional 10 high quality charter schools in 2008-2009.

The SEA will continue to maintain very high standards of accountability for all new applications and renewal applications. Since 1999, the SEA and the charter entities denied charter renewals of six charter schools due to poor academic performance and revoked the charter of one charter school due to poor academic performance and fiscal mismanagement.

With the State statute now allowing for 100 additional charter schools, the SEA and charter entities will promote and disseminate more information about charter schools and how charter schools are established. The SEA will use CSP grant funds to promote the development of charter schools that serve the secondary or high school level. At least three new proposed charter schools plan to serve secondary or high school level students.

The SEA's offices work together to facilitate the integration of Federal funds and programs in all public schools and charter schools. Information about Federal funding opportunities and allocations is available on the SEA's webpage at: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/Documents/funding-opport.htm>. The SEA also has a webpage dedicated to the all aspects of the NCLB Act, including program descriptions, allocations, upcoming workshops, parent and community involvement, and contact information at: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/nclb/nclbhome.htm>.

The SEA's Office of Public School Choice Programs (PSCP) is the primary contact for charter schools and ensures that charter schools are informed of the all Federal funds available to them. Additionally, the SEA's Office of Grants Finance provides all public schools and charter schools with information about allocation amounts, fiscal guidelines, budgeting procedures and forms, and resources associated with the accessing the Federal grant programs at <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/cafe/>.

The PSCP will conduct annual training for new charter schools and personnel new to operating charter schools to ensure that they are aware of the full array of the federal funds and programs available to them. Staff from various SEA offices will present information and provide technical assistance to new charter schools at the training sessions.

Charter schools have applied for eligible federal funds since the 2001-2002 school year. To ensure that all new and significantly expanding charter schools receive their commensurate share of federal funds, the SEA's Office of Management Services (OMS) collects enrollment data and other information twice a year. In April of each year, OMS collects an estimate of the number of students to be enrolled in a new charter school or in an expanding charter school and uses these estimates to calculate preliminary allocations of federal funds to these charter schools.

In the Fall, OMS collects enrollment information again and the number of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch (FRPL) to calculate the final allocations of the NCLB funds for the charter schools. The SEA notifies them of their federal fund allocations by mail, electronic mail, and announcements on the SEA webpage. The PSCP staff work with staff in other offices in the SEA to ensure that charter schools receive accurate and timely allocations.

Selection Criteria (iv): Quality of the Management Plan

The SEA's Office of PSCP has staff in its New York City office and its Albany office. The Albany office is staffed by a project director, report manager, grants manager, one data manager, a support staff person, and two lead reviewers. The grants manager and the report manager also act as lead reviewers and regional liaisons. The State is divided into geographic regions, each having one staff member acting as its regional liaison responsible for providing technical assistance and monitoring to charter schools in that geographic region and to be the lead reviewer for all initial and renewal charter school applications within that region.. The New York City office has one data staff member and four regional liaisons who also act as lead reviewers. The project director oversees all of the activities relating to charter schools. The report manager oversees the writing of the annual, quarterly, and final performance reports. The grants manager oversees the day to day activities with the grant program, including the developing of the RFPs, the review processes, and the financial oversight of the sub-grants. The PSCP grants manager works closely with staff in the offices of Contracts Administration, Grants Management, and Administrative Support to manage the grants. The data manager works with the data staff member in the New York City office and with two additional staff members in Albany, both working in the Office of Information and Reporting Services.

All staff in the Office of PSCP participate in annual comprehensive monitoring and renewal visits to charter schools including monitoring CSP sub-grants where applicable. They also collect, track and report data pertinent to the CSP grant program.

SUNY's Charter School Institute (CSI) staff also develop and review RFPs and authorize and monitor charter schools. See Attachment A for the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) describing their activities.

Staff responsibilities associated with milestones for major activities to fulfill objectives are included in the management plan. The budget contains staff salaries, travel costs for monitoring visits and attendance at meetings, sub-grant awards including Dissemination Grant awards, and administrative needs including postage and supplies.

The objectives and the major activities are found in Selection Criteria (i). Reference to those is recommended when reviewing the Management Plan found in Table 1.

Table 1: NYS 2008-2011 CSP Project Management Plan

Lead Person: PD = Project Director, GM = Grants Manager, RM = Reporting Manager, LR = Lead Reviewers, DS = Data Staff, CSI = SUNY Charter Schools Institute Staff

ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
			08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
Objective 1: To increase the number of new high quality charter schools, and, in particular, quality secondary schools.														
A1	Review of applications for educational/fiscal soundness	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A1	Recommend BOR issuance of a Charter	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A2	RFP is revised to add 10 points for priority to high school focus	GM, CSI	X											
A3	Announcements of RFPs' availability	GM, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

			2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
A4	Provide website links to NCLB and Accountability Info	DS, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A4	Provide new charter schools with info in introductory letter	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A5	Goals in Annual Reports are reviewed	LR, CSI	X			X	X			X	X			
A5	Technical assistance to CS	LR, CSI	X	X			X	X			X	X		
A6	As per Charter agreement, Conduct annual site visits	LR, CSI	X		X		X		X		X		X	
A6	3 RD YR Comprehensive Monitoring Visits	LR, CSI		X	X			X	X			X	X	
A6	4 th YR Renewal Visits	LR, CSI	X	X			X	X			X	X		
A7	Identify charter schools' accomplishments	PD, CSI		X				X				X		

ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
			08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
A7	Highlight info on PSCP website	PD, DS		X	X			X	X			X	X	
A8	Add to the initial application a notice about secondary school priority	PD, CSI	X											
A9	Release grant RFPs	GM, CSI	X											
A9	Train reviewers, including peer Reviewers	GM, CSI	X	X			X					X		
A9	Award grants	GM, CSI		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A9	Monitor, review continuation applications and final reports	GM, CSI, LR, DS, RM		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Objective 2: To utilize Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant funding to improve student outcomes.														
A1	Same information found in Objective 1: A6													
A2	Same information found in Objective 1: A5													

ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
			08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
A3	Review of initial and renewal apps for educational soundness	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A3	Recommend closure or non-renewal if necessary	PD, LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A4	Same information found in Objective 1: A9													
A5	Review state assessment results	PD, LR, CSI	X		X		X		X		X		X	
A5	Review other assessment info in annual reports, renewal applications	PD, LR, CSI, DS, RM	X			X	X				X	X		X
A6	RFP requires plans for BOT training on use of student achievement data	GM, CSI	X											
A6	Review quality of plans	GM, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
			08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
Objective 3: Support charter schools to be fiscally responsible and stable for long-term viability.														
A1	Provide info to applicants on a planning year	CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A2	OSC audits go to PSCP staff	PD, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
A2	Staff reviews audits	PD, LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
A2	TA provided to charter schools	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A3	Annual audits submitted by CS	PD	X	X			X	X			X	X		
A3	OSA provides reviews of audits	PD, LR, CSI		X	X			X	X			X	X	
A3	TA provided to charter schools	LR, CSI			X	X			X	X			X	X
A3	Fiscal review of applications	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A4	Same info found in Objective 2: A6 for the use of student achievement data													

ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
			08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
A4	RFPs require BOT training	GM, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
A4	Review training reports	LR, CSI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A5	Annual training for fiscal Accountability	CSI		X					X				X	
Objective 4: The SEA and SUNY will distribute information about charter schools, the chartering process, and best practices found in charter schools to teachers, parents, communities and other public schools.														
A1	Establish a system to regularly communicate awareness and best practices	PD, CSI		X										
A1	Disseminate information	PD, CSI			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A2	Identify info for audiences	PD, CSI			X									
A2	Design and distribute guide	PD, CSI				X	X							
A3	Gather info from Dissemination Grant Project final report	GM, RM, DS										X	X	

ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	LEAD PERSON	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
			08/08-10/08	11/08-01/09	02/09-04/09	05/09-07/09	08/09-10/09	11/09-01/10	02/10-04/10	05/10-07/10	08/10-10/10	11/10-01/11	02/11-04/11	05/11-07/11
A3	Place info on website	DS										X	X	
A3	CS and SEA present best Practices	LR, PD												X X
A4	Provide information on conferences to Dissemination Grant Awardees	GM, CSI										X	X	X X
A4	Work with CS to make Presentations	GM, CSI, LR										X	X	X X
A5	Identification of charter schools' best practices	PD, CSI, DS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X X
A5	Disseminate information	DS, CSI			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X X

The NYSED and SUNY make the public aware of sub-grant funds to eligible applicants through New York State's legally required notification process, involving the filing of a Notice of Availability with the New York Department of State. The sub-grants for planning and implementation are awarded using a competitive RFP (Request for Proposal) process. SED and SUNY staff work collaboratively on the development of the RFP but each publish an RFP separately and make them available electronically on their websites. Charter school applicants having SUNY as their authorizer may apply to SUNY's CSI for sub-grant funds. Charter school applicants having the Board of Regents (BOR), NYC Chancellor, or the Buffalo Board of Education (BOE) as their authorizer may apply to SED for sub-grants. Those applicants not BOR authorized must obtain initial approval from their authorizer (NYC Chancellor or Buffalo BOE).

All applicants must include in their proposals a prescribed set of information including a cover page, assurance documents, budget, budget narrative, and project narrative. The project narrative must include the descriptions found in §5203(3) of No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The point values associated with those descriptions and the budget are indicated in the RFP. A copy of the rubric that will be used for scoring the proposal is also provided to the applicant at the same time the RFP is provided. The applicant then knows exactly how many points are associated with each response.

The rubric mirrors the sections and questions asked in the RFP. It is used by the SEA and SUNY to determine the quality of the applications. The level of detail and response to each section is reviewed. Training is provided to all staff and peer reviewers who review and score the proposals. Discussions of acceptable and reasonable responses occur during the

training. Clarification of the questions asked is provided. The SEA and SUNY then provide continuous technical assistance to all reviewers throughout the review process.

Pursuant to §5204 (c) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, each proposal is reviewed and scored by a minimum of two reviewers, including a peer reviewer. Eligible peer reviewers in New York State are charter school faculty, administrators, and board of trustee members. Recruitment of peer reviewers involves invitations and/or notices to charter school administrators and boards of trustees. Once recruited, peer reviewers attend a one-day training session in Albany, New York and then periodic sessions also in Albany at which reviewers will collaborate on the reviews of sub-grant proposals. Peer reviewers receive Application Reviewers' Guidelines which include general information about the process, an assurance to be signed (regarding confidentiality, any existing conflict of interest, and a reviewer's impartiality assurance), a process evaluation, and travel reimbursement paperwork instructions.

Scores from the peer reviewers and the charter entity staff will be averaged, and scores that meet the passing standard of a score of 75 will result in sub-grants. If a proposal has resulted in two scores with a twenty or greater point difference, a third reviewer will then review and score the proposal. All three scores will then be averaged to get a final score.

Applicants receiving sub-grants will be notified that their proposals have been accepted and will be informed of the amounts of their awards. As necessary, budgets will be adjusted and approved. A rolling application process will be used. Our review process takes approximately 30 days to determine whether a proposal is approvable.

Upon approval, sub-grant recipients are responsible for writing final year-end reports after year each of receiving CSP grant funds, participating in monitoring activities, and working with lead reviewers from PSCP and CSI staff throughout the award period.

It is anticipated that in addition to the 22 recently approved charter schools, approximately ten (10) new charter schools will apply for planning and implementation grants each year of the three year CSP grant period, thus awarding approximately a total of 52 such sub-grant awards during the three year CSP grant period. The awards will be made after the issuance of the charter. According to statute, schools that submit an application to establish a charter school prior to July 1st must receive approval/disapproval by December 31st of that year. Sub-grant awards can then be made to applicants issued a charter.

Continuation awards for charter schools that applied for a 36 month grant would be made upon the review of their continuation application which includes a Project Progress Narrative covering the previous year and the upcoming year's activities, and a Budget Narrative for the upcoming year. In addition, monitoring results of the previous years' use of funds will be reviewed. The same process is completed for year three of the grant.

The SEA and SUNY plans to offer pre-charter planning grant awards to those applicants developing an application (such as teachers or community members, In New York State, for-profit entities and not-for profit agencies or their employees are not eligible to apply.) who received a passing score and requested a waiver in their CSP application. In some instances, an applicant has submitted an application in June and will not have a charter issued until the following January. Depending on the interest shown by applicants and the scores they received, the SEA and SUNY will grant pre-charter planning grants during the three year grant award period.

Selection Criteria (v): Dissemination Activities

New York State is proposing to use CSP grant funds to support dissemination activities. It is anticipated that supporting such activities will create a network of high quality charter schools by beginning to establish a network of charter school staff who can share their insight and accomplishments.

The applicants must meet all of the eligibility criteria found in §52043(f)(6)(A) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. New York State is defining that as having been open for instruction at least three consecutive years. The applicant must then demonstrate overall success by showing substantial progress in improving student academic achievement, a high level of parent satisfaction, and the necessary management and leadership ability. In meeting this eligibility criteria, New York State will consider whether or not a charter school has a corrective action plan, is on probation, is on a list as being furthest from State standards, is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations and all charter provisions, how its performance compares with the district of location, how it has improved in meeting its stated academic goals and parent surveys or other measures of parent satisfaction.

The RFP for dissemination grants states that the project activities, as outlined in §5204(f)(6)(B) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, should be aligned with the New York State learning standards, supported by research, and show documented results. Steps to include training and technical assistance must be identified. Applicants selecting to develop assessments or materials must include validation study results to show evidence of “successful practices.” Applicants selecting to assist individuals with developing partnerships must have practices that have led to documented results and represent a product or service that can be shared with the partner school or schools.

Applicants will be required to demonstrate how their dissemination activities would result in increased student performance, whether the increase would be directly or indirectly related to grant activities, and how the effects of their activities might be recognized and measured. By requiring applicants to address this question in the proposal stage, the SEA plans for them to look closely at the proposed activities and intends to use CSP grant funds for projects that are likely to result in increases in student achievement.

From the onset, the SEA will attempt to increase the likelihood that the dissemination activities will improve student achievement by asking the applicant to address the following in its narrative: qualitative and quantitative information to support the need for the project, the validation study or documented results to show necessary evidence of success, the alignment with the New York State learning standards and the modification for learners of all abilities (including ELL and bilingual education learners) and a description of the evaluation component of the project.

The steps taken by the SEA to award funds to eligible applicants begin with the NYSED and SUNY making the public aware of sub-grant funds to eligible applicants through New York State's legally required notification process, involving the filing of a Notice of Availability with the New York Department of State. The sub-grants for dissemination activities are awarded using a competitive RFP (Request for Proposal) process. SED and SUNY staff work collaboratively on the development of the RFP but each publish an RFP separately and make them available electronically on their websites. Charter school applicants having SUNY as their authorizer must apply to SUNY's CSI for sub-grant funds. Charter school applicants having the Board of Regents (BOR), NYC Chancellor, or the Buffalo Board of Education (BOE) as their authorizer must apply to SED for sub-grants. Grant applicants that apply to SED for

funds and who have an authorizer other than the Board of Regents must also obtain initial approval from their authorizer (i.e., the Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools, the Buffalo City School District's Board of Education, or other local board of education, as appropriate).

All applicants must include in their proposals a prescribed set of information including a cover page, assurance documents, budget, budget narrative, and project narrative. The applicant must meet the qualifying experiences found in §52043(f)(6)(A) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. There are no points associated with these experiences. The charter school must have been in operation for at least three consecutive years, show the required evidence of student achievement, parent satisfaction, and management and leadership.

If the charter school has met those qualifying experiences, it will then be scored on the content of its proposal. Point values are associated with the budget and project narrative sections of the proposal. The point values are indicated in the RFP. The project narrative describes the activities allowed under §5204(f)(6)(B) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

A copy of the rubric that will be used for scoring the proposal is also provided to the applicant at the same time the RFP is provided. The applicant then knows exactly how many points are associated with each response.

The rubric mirrors the sections and questions asked in the RFP. It is used by the SEA and SUNY to determine the quality of the applications. The level of detail and response to each section is reviewed. Training is provided to all staff and peer reviewers who review and score the proposals. Discussions of acceptable and reasonable responses occur during the training. Clarification of the questions asked is provided. The SEA and SUNY then provide continuous technical assistance to all reviewers throughout the review process.

Pursuant to §5204 (c) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, each proposal is reviewed and scored by a minimum of two reviewers, including a peer reviewer. Eligible peer reviewers in New York State are charter school faculty, administrators, and board of trustee members. Recruitment of peer reviewers involves invitations and/or notices to charter school administrators and boards of trustees. Once recruited, peer reviewers attend a one-day training session in Albany, New York and then periodic sessions also in Albany at which reviewers will collaborate on the reviews of sub-grant proposals. Peer reviewers receive Application Reviewers' Guidelines which include general information about the process, an assurance to be signed (regarding confidentiality, any existing conflict of interest, and a reviewer's impartiality assurance), a process evaluation, and travel reimbursement paperwork instructions.

Scores from the peer reviewers and the charter entity staff will be averaged, and scores that meet the passing standard of a score of 75 will result in sub-grants. If a proposal has resulted in two scores with a twenty or greater point difference, a third reviewer will then review and score the proposal. All three scores will then be averaged to get a final score.

Applicants receiving sub-grants will be notified that their proposals have been accepted and will be informed of the amounts of their awards. As necessary, budgets will be adjusted and approved. The review process takes approximately 30 days to determine whether a proposal is approvable.

Upon approval, sub-grant recipients are responsible for writing final year-end reports after year each of receiving CSP grant funds, participating in monitoring activities, and working with lead reviewers from the Office of Public School Choice Programs and CSI staff throughout the award period. Following the dissemination award period, the charter school will work in conjunction with its charter entity and the SEA to make presentations as discussed in Selection

Criteria (i), and to provide the necessary information to be disseminated to other public schools in New York State.

It is anticipated that approximately two (2) charter schools will be awarded dissemination grants each year of the three year CSP grant period, thus awarding approximately a total of six (6) such sub-grant awards during the three year CSP grant period.

Continuation awards for those same charter schools that will enter into year 2 of the dissemination grant would be made on the basis of the submission of a continuation application which provides a Project Progress Narrative covering the previous year and the upcoming year's activities, as well as a Project Budget Narrative for the upcoming year. Results from reviews of such information and from monitoring of the previous years' use of funds contribute to the decision to continue funding for year two.

Selection Criteria (vi): Evaluation

Under New York State Finance Law, all State government agencies are required to procure contracts for commodities, services, and technology through a competitive bidding process. Until that competitive bidding process is complete, the State Education Agency (SEA) is unable to identify an individual or organizational entity to assist in the planning, design, development, and implementation of the SEA's evaluation plan for the proposed CSP grant project. However, to prepare for the competitive bidding process and to develop the evaluation plan for the proposed CSP grant project, SEA staff communicated with several CSP Project Directors in other states about the development of their respective evaluation plans. The information these CSP Directors shared at the December 2007 USDOE CSP Directors' Conference and via telephone after the meeting has proved invaluable. Information gleaned from these individuals was used to strengthen the New York State CSP project objectives and the

related performance measures, develop the evaluation plan and to prepare the Request for Proposal (RFP) necessary to identify and procure a consultant evaluator for the SEA's CSP project. Similarly, conversations with Dr. Jonathan Plucker of the Center for Evaluation and Education and Policy at the CSP Directors' Conference in Washington, D.C. in December and more recently by telephone were extremely helpful. While this proposed evaluation plan will not identify a specific evaluator, it does contain a description of the project objectives, the performance measures, and types of qualitative and quantitative instruments needed to effectively monitor the progress of each the stated outcomes.

The SEA intends to select a program evaluator through the competitive bidding process. The SEA seeks a well seasoned evaluator who meets the following minimum criteria:

- A Ph.D. in educational research and evaluation;
- Experience assisting State agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of project or program evaluation plans;
- Specific working experience with State level program staff in the refinement of project objectives, performance measurements, and data collection instruments and evaluation methods;
- Demonstrated success implementing the Logic Model and/or other Management Frameworks; and
- Familiarity with charter schools

The SEA currently has in place two methods for collecting quantitative data. Specifically with regard to the evaluation of student academic achievement data, the State Education Department's Office of Information and Reporting has the primary responsibility of collecting this data from *all* public schools, *including charter schools*, and preparing an annual

report to the Board of Regents, the Governor and the State Legislature. The report contains current and trend analysis data on student achievement in reading, writing, mathematics, science, and vocational courses; graduation, college attendance and employment rates for all public schools. The Office of Information and Reporting will continue to have primary responsibility for collecting and analyzing student achievement data specific to charter schools for the Office of PSCP.

In addition, §2857(3) of the Education Law requires the BOR to report annually to the Governor, the Temporary President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the Assembly specifically on the status of charter schools in New York State. On behalf of the BOR, the Office of PSCP collects and analyzes charter school specific data for preparation of this annual report. The annual report must contain the following information:

- The number, distribution, and a brief description of new charter schools established during the preceding year;
- The NYSED's assessment of the current and projected programmatic and fiscal impact of charter schools on the delivery of services by school districts;
- The academic progress of students attending charter schools, as measured against comparable public and nonpublic schools with similar student population characteristics wherever practicable;
- A list of all actions taken by a charter entity on charter applications and the rationale for the renewal or revocation of any charters; and
- The good faith efforts of the charter schools to attract and retain students with special needs (SWD) and students with limited English proficiency (LEP); and
- Any other information regarding charter schools that the BOR deems necessary.

Each charter school is required to submit an annual report to the Office of PSCP which corresponds to the data outlined above but specific to the individual charter school by August 1st of each year, and in November of each year from the SUNY authorized charter schools. The Office of PSCP compiles and analyzes the data, and prepares a draft report for internal review by March of each year; sends the annual report to the BOR for final approval in May of each year; and, if no further action is required, the annual report is sent to the Governor and the Legislature in June of each year.

The information collected through this evaluation plan will be used to assess and monitor the SEA's progress toward meeting the CSP project objectives and to inform changes to the activities proposed. Progress toward the overall project objective of improving student achievement in New York State Education Department charter schools will ultimately provide information about what strategies are successful and should be replicated and encouraged.

In Table 2, the NYSED describes four CSP Project Objectives, as well as the related performance measures and evaluation activities for each of the objectives. The NYSED will submit a report annually on the performance of New York State's CSP project objectives and activities to USDOE via the required CSP Annual Performance Report (ED524B).

**Table 2: New York State Education Department
NYS 2008–2011 CSP Project Evaluation Plan**

Project Objective (1): To Increase the number of new high quality charter schools, and in particular, quality secondary schools.			
<i>Performance Measure (1A): The State will create ten (10) new high quality charter schools each year of the grant.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
By the July 1 st statutory deadline of each year, authorizers will know the number of new charter school applications submitted for Regents consideration at their December meeting.	Track the number of new charter school applications submitted;	Excel database	Summary of each new application submitted containing an analysis of the findings necessary to recommend the Regents approve this high quality charter school.
By October 15 th , staff will have completed a rigorous review of all new charter school applications based on project criteria and priorities, and conducted interviews with all applicants.	Track panel reviewers' concerns and applicants' responses to those concerns	Application Review Panel Matrix/Recommendation	Regents approved Final Paginated Charter
By October 31 st , staff will have recommended that the Regents approve 10 high quality charter schools at their December meeting.	Track the required findings (including education and fiscal soundness) necessary to recommend authorizer and/or final Regents approval.	Applicant Interview Protocols	
By December 31 st , the Regents will issue initial charters to 10 new high quality charter schools annually	Track final number of schools chartered at the end of each grant period.	Regents Item: Summary of Charter School Application and Recommendation	
In January of each year, the authorizers will announce the availability of CSP Sub-grants and priorities on secondary schools.	Track the number of grant applications submitted in each grant period, identifying those by priority.	Peer Review Scoring Rubric	Peer Reviewers Completed Scoring Rubric

Each year, authorizers will select and train at least 3 teams of 3 peer reviewers to anonymously review and score CSP sub-grantee applications	Track the questions submitted by the public to a dedicated email address and post responses on website to assist charter developers.	Excel database for tracking sub grantee applications	Project Director analysis of applications reviewed and outcome
<i>Performance Measure (1B): The State will award a planning/implementation grant to at least 90% of successful high school applicants that apply for funds in each year of the grant period.</i>			
The grant scoring rubric will be developed with a ten point advantage for high school programs.	Track the peer review scoring rubrics and input Quantitative and qualitative data into database.	CAFE System to monitor expenditures	Conduct a quarterly analysis of spending levels and grant disbursement
	Track the final number of charter schools awarded funds at the end of each grant period.	Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	
<i>Performance Measure 1(C): Ninety-five percent (95%) of all charter schools will make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) and be identified as a "Charter school in Good Standing" in each year of the grant period.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
By September 5 th of each year, the State will release a preview of the Accountability Overview Report re: elementary-middle and the secondary charter schools.	Track the status of charter schools' academic progress in meeting its overall academic goals identified in its charter	Basic Education Data System (BEDS) Data Collection Form	Accountability Overview Report
By November of each year, the State will release the School Improvement lists and the Final School Report Cards.		Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature

Project Objective (2): To utilize Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant funding to improve student outcomes.			
<i>Performance Measure (2A): Sixty percent (60%) of all charter school students in grades 3-8 and high school will meet or exceed state academic standards on the State ELA assessment each year of the grant period (GPRA).</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
<p>By August 1st of each year, the charter schools submit their Annual Reports indicating how well the charter school has met its approved goals, and specifically indicating student performance on internal and State assessments.</p> <p>By September 5th of each year, the State will release a preview of Accountability Overview Report re: elementary-middle and secondary level charter schools.</p>	<p>The Department’s Office of Information and Reporting Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.</p> <p>Track the status of charter schools’ academic progress in meeting their overall academic goals identified in their charters.</p> <p>Annual Reports Submitted by Charter Schools</p>	<p>Basic Education Data System (BEDS)</p> <p>Annual Report Data Collection Form</p> <p>Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols</p> <p>Formal and Informal Staff Site Visit Reports</p>	<p>School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status</p> <p>Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature</p>
<i>Performance Measure (2B): Sixty percent (60%) of all charter school students in grades 3-8 and high school will meet or exceed state academic standards on the State Math assessment each year of the grant period (GPRA).</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
<p>By August 1st of each year, the charter schools submit their Annual Reports indicating how well the charter school has met its approved goals, and specifically indicating student performance on internal and State assessments.</p> <p>By September 5th of each year, the State will release a preview of Accountability Overview Report, i.e., Report Card Preview) with 2007-08 school accountability status at elementary-middle level and at the secondary level.</p>	<p>The Department’s Office of Information and Reporting Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.</p> <p>Track the status of charter schools’ academic progress in meeting its overall academic goals identified in its charter</p>	<p>Basic Education Data System (BEDS)</p> <p>Annual Report Data Collection Form</p> <p>Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols</p>	<p>School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status</p> <p>Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature</p>

	Annual Reports Submitted by Charter Schools	Formal and Informal Staff Site Visit Reports	
<i>Performance Measure (2C): The percentage of students who meet or exceed state academic standards in ELA will increase by 2% in each year of the grant period.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
By August 1 st of each year, the charter schools submit their Annual Reports indicating how well the charter school has met its approved goals, and specifically indicating student performance on internal and State assessments.	The Department's Office of Information and Report Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.	Basic Education Data System (BEDS) Annual Report Data Collection Form	Charter School and District-level School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature
By September 5 th of each year, the State will release a preview of Accountability Overview Report.			
<i>Performance Measure (2D): The percentage of students who meet or exceed state academic standards in Math will increase by 2% in each year of the grant period.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
By August 1 st of each year, the charter schools submit their Annual Reports indicating how well the charter school has met its goals and performed on the State assessments.	The Department's Office of Information and Report Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.	Basic Education Data System (BEDS) Annual Report Data Collection Form	Charter School and District-level School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature
By September 5 th of each year, the State will release a preview of Accountability Overview Report			

<p><i>Performance Measure (2E): In each year of the grant period, seventy-five percent (75%) of charter schools will have a greater percentage of students who meet or exceed state academic standards on the State ELA assessments than the district in which the charter school is located.</i></p>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
<p>By September 5th of each year, the State will release a preview of the Accountability Overview Report</p>	<p>The Department's Office of Information and Report Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.</p>	<p>Basic Education Data System (BEDS)</p> <p>Annual Report Data Collection Form</p> <p>Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols</p>	<p>Charter School and District-level School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status</p> <p>Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature</p>
<p><i>Performance Measure (2F): In each year of the grant period, seventy-five percent (75%) of charter schools will have a greater percentage of students who meet or exceed state academic standards on the State Math assessments than the district in which the charter school is located.</i></p>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
<p>By September 5th of each year, the State will release a preview of the Accountability Overview Report</p>	<p>The Department's Office of Information and Report Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.</p>	<p>Basic Education Data System (BEDS)</p> <p>Annual Report Data Collection Form</p> <p>Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols</p>	<p>Charter School and District-level School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status</p> <p>Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature</p>
<p><i>Performance Measure (2G): In years two and three of the grant period, the percentage of charter school students graduating will increase by 3% annually.</i></p>			

Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
By August 1 st of each year, the charter schools submit their Annual Reports indicating how well the charter school has met its goals and performed on the State assessments.	The Department's Office of Information and Report Services collects all student assessment data, conducts the analysis, and prepares the Student Report Cards.	Basic Education Data System (BEDS) Annual Report Data Collection Form Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	Charter School and District-level School Report Cards identifying AYP determinations and accountability status Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature
By September 5 th of each year, the State will release a preview of Accountability Overview Report			
Project Objective (3): Support charter schools to be fiscally responsible and stable for long-term viability.			
<i>Performance Measure (3A): One hundred percent (100%) of funded charter schools will participate in Board of Trustee development and training focused on their roles, responsibilities, and scope of authority in year one of the grant period.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
Authorizer approval of board members	Track demographic BOT data (i.e., pre-approval questionnaire, dates of membership, length of terms, positions held, expertise, etc.)	Excel database Prospective BOT member Approval Questionnaire	Descriptive Report of development and training for charter School BOTS and identification of best practices and future training needs
Authorizer approval of BOT Training consultant(s)	Track the training dates and content of training	BOT minutes Pre- and Post- BOT surveys assessing quantity and quality of training.	Report Analyzing the impact of charter school training for existing BOT members
Annual Charter School Submission of Project Progress Narrative and Budget Narrative	Track BOT attendance at board development and training	Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	

Final Project Charter School Submission of Project Progress and Budget Narrative		Charter School Project Progress and Budget Narrative Final Project Progress and Budget Narrative	
<i>Performance Measure (3B): In years two and three of the grant period, one hundred percent (100%) of new Board of Trustee members will participate in the same Board development and training focused on their roles, responsibilities, and scope of authority.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
Authorizer approval of new board members	Track new board member nominations and approvals from the BOT minutes which are required to be submitted to the authorizer	Excel database BOT minutes	Descriptive Report of development and training for new charter School BOTS and identification of best practices and future training needs
Authorizer approval of BOT Training consultant(s)	Track demographic BOT data (i.e., length of term, positions held, etc.)	Pre- and Post- BOT surveys assessing quantity and quality of training.	Report Analyzing the Impact of new charter school BOT training at end of grant period.
Annual Charter School Submission of Project Progress Narrative and Budget Narrative	Track the training dates and content of training	Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	
Final Project Charter School Submission of Project Progress and Budget Narrative	Track BOT attendance at board development training	Charter School Project Progress and Budget Narrative Final Project Progress and Budget Narrative	
<i>Performance Measure (3C): In years two and three of the grant period, 100% of all Board of Trustee members will participate in refresher courses and/or update sessions.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting

Authorizer approval of BOT Training consultant(s) and curriculum	Track the refresher course training dates and content/focus	Excel database BOT minutes BOT surveys of training and future training needs	Descriptive Report of development and training for charter School BOTS perhaps and identification of best practices and future training needs
Annual Charter School Submission of Project Progress Narrative and Budget Narrative		Authorizer Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols Charter School Project Progress and Budget Narrative	Report analyzing the impact of charter school BOT training at end of grant period
Final Project Charter School Submission of Project Progress and Budget Narrative	Track BOT attendance at board development and training	Final Project Progress and Budget Narrative	
<i>Performance Measure (3D): One hundred percent (100%) of CSP funds awarded to charter schools will be accounted for on the final performance report at the end of the grant period.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
Annual Charter school submission of Project Progress Fiscal Narratives	Track charter school grant expenditures on CAFE System	Excel Spreadsheet Authorizer Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	Office of Grants Management and Office of Audit Services Review
Annual Charter School Report and Financial Audit (August)	Charter School Project Progress and Budget Narrative	CAFE System to monitor expenditures	CSP Annual Performance Report
End of Grant Project Progress Fiscal Narratives	Final Project Progress and Budget Narrative	Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols	

<i>Performance Measure (3E): None (0%) of the newly funded charter schools will be closed or receive a non-renewal due to fiscal instability.</i>			
The State has a contract with SchoolWorks, an educational consulting group, to conduct comprehensive monitoring renewal visits of each charter school in the third year of its existing charter and to train SEA staff to participate in the review process.	Tracking of staff comments and concerns (as staff from every Department office and Title program participate in these comprehensive reviews) SchoolWorks Comprehensive Monitoring Report Tracking of comments back from charter schools responding to staff concerns based on comprehensive review	Comprehensive Monitoring Renewal Matrix Title Program Matrix Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols Comprehensive Review Interview Protocols	SchoolWorks Comprehensive Monitoring Report (for each Charter School) Title Program Staff Summary Review Reports Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature
Project Objective (4). The SEA and SUNY will distribute information about charter schools, the chartering process, and best practices found in charter schools to teachers, parents, communities and other public schools.			
<i>Performance Measure (4A): In years two and three of the grant period, the number of dissemination grant awards made will be at least two each year.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
The State will award 6 dissemination grants during the grant period.	Track the number of grant applications submitted in each grant period, identifying secondary charter schools initiatives.	Peer Reviewers Completed Scoring Rubric	Project Director analysis of applications reviewed and outcome
Sub-Grantee annual project performance report	Track the questions submitted by the public to a dedicated email address and post responses on website to assist all developers	Excel database for tracking application, priorities, and sub-grantee data	Final Compilation of Annual Performance Reports emphasis on qualitative feedback regarding the impact of these projects on the educational practices of the recipient schools or teachers following project conclusion.

Sub Grantee final project performance report	Track the peer review scoring rubrics and input quantitative and qualitative data into database.	CAFE System to monitor expenditures	
	Track the final number of charter schools awarded funds at the end of each grant period. Track the number of grants awarded.	Site Visit Fiscal and Program Monitoring Protocols Annual surveys of recipient schools, or teachers	
<i>Performance Measure (4B): By the end of the grant period, ten articles will be written by the SEA highlighting charter school best practices.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
In the second and third year of the grant period, the SEA will highlight charter school best practices in the SED Newsletter.	Qualitative feedback regarding the impact of these projects on the educational practices of the recipient schools or teachers following project conclusion.	Surveys of recipient schools or teachers regarding the impact of the dissemination projects.	Compilation of dissemination data from all sub-grantees describing the dissemination efforts and impact on recipients.
Sub-Grantee annual project performance report		Sub Grantee annual project performance report	Highlight best practices on the State Education Department's web page.
Sub-Grantee final project performance report		Sub Grantee final project performance report	Annual Report on the Status of Charter Schools to the Regents, Governor, and State Legislature

<i>Performance Measure (4C): By year two of the grant period, 100% of New York State public schools and BOCES will have been provided a copy of the charter schools' guide.</i>			
Benchmarks	Data Collection	Methods/Instruments	Analysis/Reporting
The State will prepare a draft guide about charter schools in October 2009 with a special emphasis on secondary schools.	The guide will address: charter school requirements in terms of how charter schools are created, governed, and financed; curriculum and instruction; discipline; education of special populations; admissions/enrollment; and student achievement data; etc. Common questions over the years from parents, community, and teachers will be addressed throughout guide.	Excel database for tracking questions to address Survey instruments from parents and communities	The Department will publish a guide focused on basic charter school questions. The guide will include a survey soliciting information about the impact of the guide with an emphasis on secondary schools.
The SEA will send draft guide to stakeholders-- various school communities and parent groups for readability and content in November 2009.		Site Visit Fiscal and Monitoring Visits Comprehensive Monitoring Visit Feedback from Parent, Teacher, or Community	
The SEA will approve final approval in May 2010. The SEA will print the guide and disseminate guide in July 2010.			

Project Narrative

Other Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **7785-Mandatory_Final_Other_Attachments_for_USDOE.pdf**

OTHER ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: NYSED and SUNY MOA..... Page 2

Attachment B: Project Director’s resume..... Page 9

Attachment C: Report Manager’s resume..... Page 15

Attachment D: Grants Manager’s resume..... Page 19

Attachment E: SUNY’s CSI VP for School Fiscal Accountability’s resume.. Page 25

ATTACHMENT A: Memorandum Of Agreement

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT by and between the New York State Education Department and the State University of New York

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the New York State Education Department (SED) applied for and received federal funds from the United States Department of Education (USDOE) to achieve the objectives described in SED's application submitted March 14, 2005 and approved by USDOE in August 2005 as Award Number U282A050007;

WHEREAS, one of the objectives contained in the application is a collaboration between SED and the State University of New York (SUNY) to coordinate charter school activities;

WHEREAS, SED and SUNY desire to work cooperatively to achieve the coordination of charter school activities;

WHEREAS, SED will make available to SUNY a portion of its allocation of funds from USDOE for this purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, in order to define their respective roles and responsibilities in the administration of the federal funds described herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. SED shall provide SUNY with federal grant funds as detailed in Appendix A, by sub allocation through normal State procedures, as approved by the Office of the State Comptroller, upon execution of this agreement.
2. Consistent with applicable federal laws and regulations, the fiscal administration and disbursement of these funds shall be made by SUNY. SUNY will provide information regarding all disbursements to SED in a format to be determined by SED (see Appendix C).
3. SUNY shall implement a structure for coordinating charter school program efforts in the State and conduct related activities in accordance with the budget and work plan, attached as Appendix A and Appendix B. SUNY may conduct all or a portion of the activities set forth in the budget and work plan through the Research Foundation of the State of New York.
4. On or before May 15, 2006, SUNY shall provide to SED a written report documenting the progress made in achieving the objectives described in the approved work plan. The format shall be prescribed by SED. SED shall be responsible for preparing and submitting all required State and federal reports in connection with the federal grant authority described in paragraph 1.

5. During the period this MOA is in effect, SUNY shall retain possession of any equipment purchased from funds made available to SUNY pursuant to this agreement. Upon termination of this agreement, SUNY may request in writing the continued use of such equipment when filing its final programmatic report. SED shall not unreasonably withhold its consent for continued use of such equipment. SUNY shall return to SED any equipment for which continued use is not sought or dispose of such equipment in accordance with SED instructions.
6. In the event that funds become unavailable, SED shall terminate this agreement by notifying SUNY in writing immediately and the MOA shall terminate upon the later of receipt of such written notification or the date of unavailability of federal funds. SED shall be obligated to fund SUNY only for the allowable expenditures made and permissible obligations incurred by SUNY until such time as written notice of termination is received by SUNY from SED or until such time as federal funds become unavailable, whichever is later.
7. All records related to SUNY performance under this agreement shall be preserved and made available to officials, including but not limited to auditors employed or retained by SED, the Division of the Budget, the Office of the State Comptroller, their authorized representatives, and appropriate officials from the federal government for a period of six years after the final use of funds provided under this agreement.
8. The term of this agreement shall be deemed to have commenced on August 1, 2005 and shall terminate on July 31, 2008 subject to annual review and revision of the budget and work plan attached as Appendix A and Appendix B.
9. Any funds not obligated by SUNY prior to the termination of this agreement shall be returned by SUNY to SED through normal State procedures.
10. This agreement may be reviewed periodically, and may be amended in writing with the consent of all parties hereto.

The foregoing is accepted and agreed to by:

..... Date Theresa Savo Deputy Commissioner for Operations and Management Services New York State Education Department
..... Date Daniel Sheppard Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business State University of New York

Appendix A: MOA Budget

Budget Memorandum of Agreement Public Charter Schools Program August 1, 2005 through July 31, 2008

Up to 50 percent of the funds for services and expenses shall be sub-allocated to the State University of New York (SUNY) related to its conduct and participation in the federal Public Charter Schools grant program authorized by ESEA Title V, Part B, Charter Schools Programs, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

This includes:

Up to 2.5 percent of the total budget for administrative expenses associated with the federal charter school grants program:

- Up to 5 percent of the total budget for dissemination subgrants (or contracts) to eligible applicants to disseminate best practices.
- Up to 50 percent of the total budget, **minus amounts reserved for administrative expenses and dissemination subgrants (or contracts)**, for planning and implementation subgrants (or contracts) to eligible applicants to plan and implement charter schools in accordance with the federal charter school grants program.

Appendix B: MOA Work Plan

CHARTER SCHOOLS PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM **August 1, 2005 through July 31, 2008**

Work Plan

The Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY) will collaborate with the State Education Department (SED) to award charter school planning and implementation grants to eligible recipients under the award of the federal Public Charter Schools Program in the State, and will conduct related activities in accordance with the following work plan.

GOAL 1: By 10/14/05 THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SED) SHALL DEVELOP THE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES TO BE USED FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GRANT, IN COLLABORATION WITH THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK (SUNY).

Objective 1.1: Agreement shall be reached regarding processes and procedures.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Representatives from SUNY and SED shall meet to review the Request for Proposals (RFP) as developed by SED.
2. Similar review and award procedures will be developed by SUNY consistent with the federal program. "Similar" is defined as meaning:
 - 2.a. the format for the RFP shall be determined by SED, in consultation with SUNY. Any deviations in the format subsequently desired by SUNY will require the prior consent of SED;
 - 2.b. the information requested in the RFP shall be determined by SED, in consultation with SUNY. Any deviations in the information requested by the RFP as subsequently desired by SUNY will require the prior consent of SED;
 - 2.c. the review and rating procedure for each application shall be determined by SED, in collaboration with SUNY.

1. Objective 1.2: SUNY will develop a plan and a proposed administrative budget for the implementation and management of that portion of the grant that is sub-allocated to it.

ACTIVITIES:

1. SUNY shall collaborate with SED to develop its plan for implementation and oversight of the sub-allocation consistent with federal guidelines, including plans for the use of funds provided for administration. Such plan must be approved by SED and shall include, but not be limited to:
 - 1.a. a description of all proposed administrative costs for each year of the grant award;

1.b. a description of all sub-grant review and award procedures, including person(s) responsible for such activities;

1.c. a timeline for the on-site monitoring of all PCSP sub-awards; and

1.d. any other information required by SED.

2. A monitoring protocol shall be developed by SUNY and presented to SED for its approval.

2. Objective 1.3: The RFPs will be disseminated to all appropriate parties.

ACTIVITIES:

1. SUNY and SED shall put their RFPs up on their respective web sites.
2. SUNY and SED shall mail their RFPs to all of their respective current charter school applicants, approved charter schools, and interested others.
3. SED shall provide a copy of its RFP to the Chancellor of the New York City Schools and to the New York State School Boards Association.

GOAL 2: SUNY AND SED SHALL COMMENCE REVIEW PROCEDURES

Objective 2.1: All applications received prior to January 1, 2006 from eligible applicants shall be reviewed and rated by SUNY and SED.

ACTIVITIES:

1. The review of applications shall commence within ten (10) days of receiving applications.
2. Applicants shall be informed of their award status in writing within ten (10) days of such determination being made.

Objective 2.2: Review of applications and awarding of grants shall continue on an annual basis.

ACTIVITIES:

1. **All applications shall be reviewed and award determinations made.**
2. **Applicants will be informed in writing of their award status within ten (10) days of such determination being made.**
3. **Applicants shall be informed that all PCSP funds must be committed by 5:00 p.m. on July 31, 2008.**

GOAL 3: BY AUGUST 1, 2006, ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO SED FROM SUNY AS AN END-OF-YEAR REPORT.

Objective 3.1: An end-of-year fiscal and programmatic report shall be submitted.

ACTIVITIES:

- 1. SUNY shall submit all required information regarding expenditures and activities to SED. Such reports shall be in a format prescribed by SED (see Appendix C). Copies of each approved application (including the budget) and related correspondence regarding all subgrant awards must be provided as a part of the report.**
- 2. Grant awards and administrative costs shall be separate and itemized.**
- 3. The end-of-year report will be due to SED by August 1, 2006, and on each subsequent August 1 immediately following the end of each grant year.**
- 4. SED shall prepare and submit all required end-of-year reports for the United States Department of Education.**

Objective 3.2: Monitoring and oversight reports shall be submitted.

ACTIVITIES:

- 1. SUNY and SED shall conduct monitoring and oversight of each grant that it awards.**
- 2. SUNY shall provide SED with reports of such monitoring and oversight, regarding the use of funds by the applicants.**
- 3. Nothing in this MOA shall prohibit SED from also conducting such monitoring of PCSP grants awarded by SUNY.**

Appendix C: MOA End-Of-Year Report

END-OF-YEAR REPORT DATA ELEMENTS

For the Grant Period of
August 1, 2005 Through July 31, 2008.

Directions:

Grants

For each grant award made to eligible applicants under the Public Charter School Program (PCSP), please provide the following information:

- name of charter school/other eligible applicant that received the award;
- the type of grant award made (i.e., planning only, implementation only, planning and implementation, dissemination);
- the total grant award period (may be multi-year);
- the total amount of the award; and
- the amount of the award broken out by grant year of the duration of the grant period.
See attached table as an example.

For each grant award made, please provide a copy of the approved operating budget and budget narrative for the grant year being reported (analogous to SED's FS-10), as well as copies of all related correspondence (e.g., award letters).

Administration

The report must also include all administrative costs incurred by the Trustees of the State University of New York and the Charter Schools Institute. These must be itemized as follows:

Total Direct Costs

- personal services, including professional and non-professional salaries;
- non-personal services, including supplies, equipment, purchased services including consultants' fees, travel costs; and
- fringe benefits.

Total Indirect Costs

- administrative overhead (itemized)

ATTACHMENT B: PROJECT DIRECTOR'S RESUME

DARLENE M. MENGEL, Ph.D.

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Supervisor of Educational Programs
New York State Education Department

4/6/00 – present

Major Responsibilities:

1. oversight and coordination of all day-to-day aspects of the Public Schools Choice Program office.
2. supervision of professional and support staff
3. development of proposed policy
4. the development of guidelines and provision of technical assistance relating to charter schools
5. review of charter school applications
6. monitoring and oversight of established charter schools
7. management of the federal Public Charter School Program grant
8. management of the State Magnet Schools grant
9. management of the State's portion of the State Stimulus Fund
10. preparation of reports and other documents for the Governor, the Board of Regents, the Commissioner of Education, the New York State Legislature, and others
11. coordination of efforts within the Department relative to charter schools
12. coordination of efforts with other charter entities

Associate in School Improvement
New York State Education Department

12/12/96 – 4/5/00

Major Responsibilities:

1. oversight and coordination of all day-to-day aspects of the charter school program
2. the development of guidelines and provision of technical assistance relating to charter schools
3. the development of guidelines and provision of technical assistance relating to shared decision-making
4. provide information and assistance to parents, schools, BOCES, and

Darlene M. Mengel, Ph.D. (page 2)

- interested others regarding education law, rules, and regulations
- 5. provide information and technical assistance regarding the various facets of school reform efforts in New York State

Early Intervention Program Specialist

6/13/96 - 12/11/96

New York State Department of Health
Bureau of Child and Adolescent Health

Major Responsibilities:

1. the development of policy, guidelines, and/or regulations relating to interagency relations, reimbursement policies, policy guidance documents, and service guidelines
2. to provide support to various Advisory Councils (e.g., Early Intervention Coordinating Council, Interagency Committee)
3. to conduct evaluations of various aspects of the Early Intervention Program
4. assist with the coordination, development, and dissemination of Part H applications across New York State
5. to assist with the development and management of the Part H budget for New York State
6. to prepare the Performance Report and other program reports
7. to work on special projects as requested
8. to provide guidance and input to other Units in the Department, as requested

Associate in Educational Planning and Evaluation

New York State Education Department

11/9/88 - 6/12/96

Major Responsibilities:

1. managed a statewide program of Adult Centers for Comprehensive Education and Support Services (ACCESS)
2. developed and provided training and technical assistance to school districts, BOCES, parent groups, board of education, and interested others regarding a wide variety of school reform initiatives (e.g., restructuring K-12, assessment, shared decision-making)
3. program development, implementation and evaluation
4. grants management and review
5. conducted high school re-registration reviews
6. responded to issues and concerns relating to educational law, regulation, and/or policy as raised by school districts, BOCES, parents, and other regarding preK-12 education

Darlene M. Mengel, Ph.D. (page 3)

Elementary Principal

7/1/87 - 11/8/88

Brittonkill Central School
Troy, New York

Major Responsibilities:

1. daily supervision and administration of the building, programs, students, and personnel
2. budgeting, scheduling, program development
3. staff and student supervision
4. interacting with the community

Assistant Superintendent

7/1/86 - 11/8/88

Brittonkill Central School
Troy, New York

Major Responsibilities:

1. Chairperson of the Committee on Special Education
2. Chairperson of the Special Education Department (staff hiring, supervision, and evaluation; program development and evaluation)
3. development and management of the Gifted/Talented Education Program
4. management of the Compensatory Education Program
5. district-wide evaluation (including the Comprehensive Assessment Report)
6. grant-writing and management
7. liaison with community services and agencies
8. interacting with the community

Itinerant Specialist

7/1/85 - 6/30/86

Rensselaer-Columbia-Greene BOCES
Castleton, New York

Major Responsibilities:

1. acted as Special Services Coordinator for Brittonkill Central School four days per week (see above)
2. assisted a BOCES Coordinator of Handicapped Education one day per

Darlene M. Mengel, Ph.D. (page 4)

week with scheduling of itinerant services, program development, and program monitoring

Director of Special Education

9/1/84 - 6/30/85

Schoharie Central School
Schoharie, New York

Major Responsibilities:

1. Chairperson of the Committee on the Handicapped
2. Chairperson of the Special Education department (including staff hiring, supervision, and evaluation; program development and evaluation)
3. student discipline
4. budgeting and scheduling
5. liaison with parents, the community, and other services/agencies

School Psychologist

9/1/82 - 6/30/84

South Glens Falls Central School
South Glens Falls, New York

Major Responsibilities:

1. conduct psychoeducational evaluations with students
2. consult with parents, teachers, district staff, and other personnel
3. appointed to the Committee on the Handicapped

Itinerant School Psychologist

9/1/79 - 6/30/82

Albany-Schoharie-Schenectady BOCES
Albany, New York

Major Responsibilities:

1. conduct psychoeducational evaluations with students in four districts
2. consult with parents, teachers, district staff, and other personnel
3. chairperson of three Committees on the Handicapped

Darlene M. Mengel, Ph.D. (page 5)

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Ph.D. in Educational Administration State University of New York at Albany	December 1995
C.A.S. in Educational Administration State University of New York at Albany	May 1984
C.A.S. in School Psychology State University of New York at Albany	May 1979
M.S. in Educational Psychology State University of New York at Albany	August 1978
B.S. in Psychology State University College at Geneseo	May 1975

CERTIFICATIONS HELD

School District Administrator - permanent
School Psychologist - permanent

DISSERTATION

A Comparison of Novice and Experienced School Board Members' Reasons for Seeking Office and Their Beliefs About Their Roles, Responsibilities, and Scope of Authority in New York State.

PAPERS PRESENTED

How Much Do School Board Members Know About Their Roles, Responsibilities, and Scope of Authority in New York State? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeast Educational Research Association, October 25-27, 1995, Ellenville, New York

REFERENCES

(b)(6)
Mr. James C. Viola
Executive Director
Office of School Improvement and Community Services
New York State Education Department
475 EBA
Albany, New York 12234
518-474-4817

Ms. Jean C. Stevens
Associate Commissioner
Office of Instructional Support and Development
New York State Education Department
875 EBA
Albany, New York 12234
518-474-5915

Other references available from:
The University at Albany
Career Development Center
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
518-442-5515

ATTACHMENT C: REPORT MANAGER'S RESUME

VICKIE A. SMITH-MOYO, MSW

EDUCATION

- | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1982-1983 | Syracuse University | Syracuse, NY |
| ▪ | <i>Master of Social Work—Whitney M. Young Scholar</i> | |
| 1978-1982 | Syracuse University | Syracuse, NY |
| ▪ | <i>Bachelor of Social Work</i> | |
| 2007- present | Concord Law School (Kaplan University) | California |
| ▪ | <i>First Year Law Student in JD Program</i> | |

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 2005-present | NYS Education Department | Albany, NY |
| | <i>Associate in the Office of Public School Choice Programs</i> | |
| ▪ | Liaison for charter schools and magnet schools in the Capital Region and Long Island responsible for providing technical assistance. Interact with other SED offices to ensure charter schools have the information and resources related to all aspects of school operations. | |
| ▪ | Review charter school applications, proposed charters, proposed changes to existing charters, and renewal applications. Review and approve magnet school applications. | |
| ▪ | Conduct site visits to all Regents-authorized charter schools at least twice annually and at least once yearly to all non-Regents authorized charter schools. | |
| ▪ | Participate in the formal comprehensive monitoring of all charter schools as required, and act as lead reviewer for charter schools in assigned area. | |
| ▪ | Act as one of two office liaisons responsible for interacting with USDOE to prepare the grant application, the annual and final performance reports, and attend required USDOE conferences related the federal Charter School Project Grant Program. | |

2003-2005 NYS Education Department Albany, NY

Associate in Bilingual Education

- Communicate State Laws, Commissioner's Regulations and Federal NCLB Title III guidelines regarding limited English Proficient students to school districts, public schools, charter schools, non-public schools, teachers and parents
- Review and Approve Comprehensive State Plans and NCLB Title III Funding Applications
- Design data collection and monitoring instruments
- Conduct monitoring visits
- Conduct literature reviews for scientifically based studies and programs regarding the education of limited English proficient students
- Prepare data and develop State and federal reports

2000-2002 College of St. Rose Albany, NY

Adjunct Faculty-School of Social Work

- Taught undergraduate course on child abuse and maltreatment
- Maintain a class of 30 students majoring in social work and other majors
- Incorporate a variety of teaching approaches for difficult subject matter

1995-2003 NYS Education Department Albany, NY

Associate in Research and Evaluation

- Develop policy research plans and designs
- Design data collection instruments
- Train & support field staff to conduct on-site interviews and document review
- Conduct literature searches and reviews
- Analyze data and develop reports

1990-1995 NYS Education Department Albany, NY

Associate in Intercultural Relations and Multicultural Education

- Investigated civil rights/discrimination complaints from school communities
- Prepared reports of findings and recommendations
- Provided training and support to schools on how to address underlying issues involving intercultural relations
- Monitored small incentive school grants for the development of programs to facilitate improved relations in identified school communities

1988-1990 NYS Education Department Albany, NY

Assistant in Equity and Access Programs-Office of Higher Education

- Reviewed contracts/budgets of colleges/universities receiving grants to increase minority student participation in higher education
- Monitored written program plans and conducted annual visits to program sites
- Organized bidders conference/training seeking to participate in initiative

- Founder's Day Speaker, National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., (Staunton, VA Chapter), 1985
- Outstanding Young Women of America Award, 1983

ATTACHMENT D: GRANTS MANAGER'S RESUME

BARBARA JEAN MOSCINSKI

EXPERIENCES:

- **NYS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, Albany, NY (6/06-Current)**
 - **Associate in Education Improvement Services, Public School Choice Programs (11/07-Current)**
 - ✓ Liaison to Charter Schools in the Rochester and Syracuse areas
 - ✓ Provide technical assistance to charter schools
 - ✓ Review and approve funding applications for charter schools
 - ✓ Interpret Article 56, in consultation with Office of Counsel
 - ✓ Participate in comprehensive monitoring and site visits for charter schools
 - ✓ Manage state and federal grant activities
 - **Assistant in Education Improvement Services, Public School Choice Programs (6/06-11/07)**
 - ✓ Liaison to Charter Schools in the Rochester and Syracuse areas
 - ✓ Provide technical assistance to charter schools
 - ✓ Review and approve funding applications for charter schools
 - ✓ Interpret Article 56, in consultation with Office of Counsel
 - ✓ Participate in comprehensive monitoring and site visits for charter schools
 - ✓ Review Magnet School grants

- **KELLY SERVICES INC., Albany, NY (4/05-6/06: Part-time)**
 - **Senior Reader, Measured Progress Regional Assessment Office at Rensselaer Technology Park**
 - ✓ Read and evaluated responses to non-multiple choice questions in Reading, Mathematics, Writing and Science (grades 3 – 11)
 - ✓ Assigned scores to responses according to rubrics
 - ✓ Set read behinds and reviewed embedded questions set for the readers
 - ✓ Coached readers on adjacent and discrepant responses
 - ✓ Completed reports on reader rates and other required information
 - ✓ Provided input for the improvement of the scoring process

- **OCM BOCES, Syracuse, NY (9/97-10/04)**
 - **Educational Consultant, Student Support Services Center (1/04-10/04)**
 - ✓ Wrote and Managed the development of the drafts of Creating Tobacco-Free Healthy Schools: Tips for Success

- **Educational Consultant, Mid-State Coordinated School Health Network (3/00-6/03)**
 - ✓ Designed, Created, and Managed the CSHN Resource Room, including a Microsoft ACCESS database of over 1600 entries
 - ✓ Co-Developed and Wrote the Health Careers resource guide
 - ✓ Developed and Wrote A Middle-School Resource Guide for an Alcohol and Drug-Free Life
 - ✓ Developed and Wrote An Elementary Resource Guide for a Tobacco-Free Life

- **Educational Consultant, Regional School Support Center (10/02-2/03)**
 - ✓ Wrote an 84-page booklet highlighting quality picture books correlating to specific skills and topics in ELA K-12, for use by Syracuse CSD teachers
 - ✓ Wrote a 50-page booklet highlighting quality picture books correlating to the seven key ideas in Mathematics K-12, for use by Syracuse CSD teachers

- **Educational Consultant, Special Programs (Spring/Summer 2000)**
 - ✓ Co-Wrote the *Drug-Free Communities Support Program Grant* awarded to OCM BOCES for the period during 10/1/00-9/30/03, and funded by the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

- **Coordinator, Goals 2000: Shared Decision Making (9/97-6/99)**
 - ✓ Coordinated the development and delivery of statewide workshops, including meetings with regional shared decision making liaisons to offer the workshops on curriculum, assessment, and the standards, especially in ELA and MST
 - ✓ Developed and Wrote an interactive CD-ROM for SDM teams to become adept at using a variety of research-based quality problem-solving strategies; and to reinforce the teams' involvement in issues related to raising standards
 - ✓ Developed the agenda and Co-Wrote the script for a teleconference focusing on the biennial review of CR100.11, and improving student achievement.
 - ✓ Chaired and Coordinated the statewide advisory committee's activities
 - ✓ Reviewed the NYSED website for SDM and Recommended updates
 - ✓ Coordinated the development, production, and distribution of SDM resource materials, including revising the SDM Resource Manual
 - ✓ Developed the concept for 3 newsletters and Coordinated their production
 - ✓ Developed the concept for the statewide conference and Organized the event
 - ✓ Monitored the budget and Wrote necessary reports
 - ✓ Acted as a liaison with NYSED representatives regarding grant activities

- ✓ Developed a Power Point presentation highlighting available SDM resources

■ **CONTACT COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC., Syracuse, NY (9/01-1/02)**

• **Educational Consultant**

- ✓ Reviewed existing PPYD (Partners for Positive Youth Development) resource room procedures, Recommended revisions, Created the new structure, and Organized the resources
- ✓ Co-Wrote a Baldwinsville CSD grant to obtain safe and drug-free schools' monies

■ **AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION, Syracuse, NY (4/01-12/01)**

• **Educational Consultant**

- ✓ Developed and Wrote the draft A Tobacco Cessation Guide for Health and Human Service Professionals for clinicians in Onondaga County

■ **CAPITAL REGION BOCES, Albany, NY (Summer 2001)**

• **Educational Consultant, Capital Region Coordinated School Health Network**

- ✓ Developed and Wrote a preliminary listing of drug prevention and school safety programs; and a preliminary listing of resources to be used as a reference for drug prevention and school safety activities, both in order to begin implementation of the Principles of Effectiveness consistent with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program

■ **NYS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, Albany, NY (1/87-4/95)**

• **Assistant in Education Improvement Services, Mid-State School Support Services Team (1/95-4/95)**

- ✓ Managed and Coordinated staff development, parent involvement, and technology integration projects and activities for the SED Mid-State team and the Syracuse CSD
- ✓ Delivered presentations on technology integration in the classroom
- ✓ Participated in regional planning activities

• **Assistant in Education Improvement Services, Syracuse Field Services Team (11/92-1/95)**

- ✓ Chaired the team's staff development, and technology integration subcommittees
- ✓ Co-ordinated regional activities for three SED field services teams
- ✓ Reviewed grants and proposals
- ✓ Managed technology integration, parent involvement, and staff development activities
- ✓ Participated in Syracuse CSD's site-based planning for technology use in schools
- ✓ Managed the team's procedural and clerical operations

- ✓ Acted as a member of the Elementary, Middle, Secondary & Continuing Education Technology Cabinet
 - ✓ Acted as a liaison to the Syracuse CSD's Research, Evaluation & Technology Office, Staff Development Office, and Parent Involvement Office
- **Assistant in Educational Planning and Evaluation, Bureau of Technology Applications (11/88-11/92)**
 - ✓ Managed the Youth At-Risk Electronic Clearinghouse, including delivering regional training workshops on e-mail, computer-based conferencing, and database search and retrieval; developing a training package; conducting monthly meetings; delivering presentations; developing the database and conferencing content; and writing articles for the bureau's newsletter
 - ✓ Reviewed school proposals focusing on technology initiatives
 - ✓ Managed the Secondary School 1995 Partnership (a Data General, SED, BOCES, and selected secondary schools' multimedia and international communications pilot), including conducting meetings; coordinating classroom technology integration efforts with school personnel; developing the international component; developing evaluation components; and recommending classroom project ideas
 - ✓ Managed the *Compact for Learning* technology focus group activities
 - ✓ Co-Managed the development and distribution of SED's Computers in Schooling manual
 - ✓ Previewed and Recommended software for a software preview guide
 - **Elementary, Secondary, Continuing Education Specialist, Division for Program Development (1/87-11/88)**
 - ✓ Coordinated the development of the original manuscript and field test editions of the Design and Drawing for Production syllabus, including conducting meetings for pilot teachers, SED staff, and the design team; and developing the evaluation instruments for the pilot
 - ✓ Managed the development, implementation, and evaluation of the statewide Staff and Curriculum Development Network, including designing a template for a training manual; organizing meetings for the executive committee and regional reps; developing procedures for curriculum and content bureaus to follow for training the regional reps; and participating in the executive committee meetings
- **HELPLINE DENTAL OFFICE SERVICES, Woodland Hills, CA (Fall 1986)**
- **Systems Training Consultant, East Coast**
 - ✓ Delivered management software training sessions to dental and support staff
 - ✓ Provided customer support
- **COMPU*TECH EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, Pasadena, CA (9/84-5/86)**
- **Training Coordinator/Teacher: Grades 3-8, Adults**

- ✓ Chaired the Curriculum Evaluation Committee, including writing a report on the teachers' concerns and recommendations
- ✓ Coordinated the Apple Software Evaluation Project
- ✓ Acted as a member of the Teacher Competency, Teacher Manual Revision, and Early Childhood Program Committees
- ✓ Coordinated and Delivered monthly staff training sessions
- ✓ Interviewed, Trained, Observed, Evaluated and Supervised teachers
- ✓ Organized nationwide teacher development efforts
- ✓ Taught BASIC programming, LOGO, and word processing

■ **WATERFORD-HALFMOON UFSD, Waterford, NY (9/83-6/84)**

• **Chapter I Assistant Reading Teacher: Grades 1-6**

- ✓ Developed, Implemented, and Evaluated instructional programs
- ✓ Incorporated Computer Assisted Instruction in individual reading lessons
- ✓ Taught BASIC programming as an Adult Education course (Spring 1984)
- ✓ Provided remedial reading lessons to individuals and groups
- ✓ Assisted with the evaluation and testing of individuals
- ✓ Tested kindergarten students incoming to the district

■ **EAGLE HILL SCHOOL, Hardwick, MA (Summer 1983)**

• **Teacher: Learning Disabled Students: Ages 8-16**

- ✓ Administered and Interpreted standardized tests
- ✓ Wrote IEPs and summary reports
- ✓ Taught Writing Skills, Reading and Language Arts

■ **ST. JUDE'S SCHOOL, Wynantskill, NY (9/81-6/82)**

• **Teacher: Grade 4**

■ **ALL SAINTS' SCHOOL, Buffalo, NY (9/80-6/81)**

• **Teacher: Grade 3**

Continuing Education Units:

- 1/27/99 - HTML, Level I - 6 hours
- 7/07/98 – Microsoft PowerPoint 97/Windows - 5 hours
- 5/22/98 - Windows 95, Level I - 5 hours
- 6/15/93 - The Americans with Disabilities Act: "It's the Law" - 3 hours
- 4/11/89 - Parenting & Parent Education, Changing Families, Critical Concerns and Building Strengths - 1 credit
- 2/03/84 - The Child with Learning Disabilities: Medical, Psychological, and Educational Aspects - 1 credit

CERTIFICATION:

- 9/01/83 - NYS Permanent Teaching Certificate: Grades N-6

EDUCATION:

■ HARVARD UNIVERSITY, Cambridge, MA (9/82-6/83)

- Ed.M.: Human Development
 - ✓ Coursework in Reading, Child Development, and Interactive Technology
 - ✓ Phi Delta Kappa - Harvard Chapter

■ DAEMEN COLLEGE, Amherst, NY (9/76-12/79)

- B.S.: Elementary Education N-6 (Elementary Education/Reading)
 - ✓ Summa Cum Laude, Kappa Delta Pi, Gamma Epsilon Sigma

ATTACHMENT E: SUNY'S CSI VICE PRESIDENT FOR SCHOOL FISCAL
ACCOUNTABILITY'S RESUME

WILLIAM J. LAKE

PROFILE

Senior manager of nationally recognized charter school authorizer with experience in issues related to school start-up, operations and renewal. Strong finance background and entrepreneurial spirit. Solid team building and leadership skills. Outstanding analytical skills, strong writer, clear communicator and effective presenter.

EXPERIENCE

Vice President for School Fiscal Accountability

2006 to present Charter Schools Institute of the
State University of New York

Overall responsibility for creating and maintaining the Institute's strategic plan—and tactical implementation of that plan—as to charter schools' fiscal performance and financial controls. Directs the Institute's monitoring of and assistance to schools as well as assisting the Institute in determining appropriate policies and procedures in regards to charter schools and administration of state and federal grant programs.

Developed a *Fiscal Accountability Handbook* that lays out the expectations related to financial accountability and to familiarize charter schools authorized by the State University Trustees with the purposes, procedures, and products of its financial oversight processes.

Established and implemented federal grant monitoring procedures and revised state grant procedures to increase transparency, target funding and improve efficiency in administration.

Responsible for fiscal review of applications, assessment of fiscal soundness of schools on an ongoing basis, but especially when program changes are proposed and at renewal. Writes renewal report sections concerning fiscal benchmarks and future fiscal and facility plans.

Director of School Fiscal and Regulatory Accountability

2003–2006 Charter Schools Institute of the
State University of New York

Responsible for overseeing the fiscal and regulatory affairs of charter schools authorized by the State University of New York. Developed a *Reference Guide for Audits of Charter Schools* aimed at school leaders

and board members that is updated annually.

Set-up system to track and analyze quarterly and annual fiscal information including budgets. Provided fiscal review and analysis of new and renewal charter applications. Wrote renewal report sections concerning fiscal soundness and future fiscal and facility plans.

Associate Auditor

1996–2003 Office of Audit Services
New York State Education Department

Developed a database to track the receipt of annual audit reports, including federal Single Audits, and designed and implemented a review protocol for such reports. Established review checklist to determine compliance with reporting standards (GASB-34).

Served as auditor-in-charge of financial related audits of local education agencies, including federal and state grant recipients. Led audits of Building, Transportation, and Employment Preparation Education Aid. Assessed internal controls, including controls and procedures related to procurement and information technology.

Senior Auditor

1990–1996 Office of Audit Services
New York State Education Department

Conducted financial related audits of local education agencies.

Transportation Audit Specialist

1988–1990 Office of Audit Services
New York State Department of Transportation

Conducted audits of municipalities and for-profit companies that contracted with the Department.

Accountant

1986–1988 Ashmere Manor Nursing Home
Hinsdale, Massachusetts

Responsible for all accounting and budgeting activities, helping to ensure internal controls were implemented and employee benefit management.

SMALL BUSINESS
EXPERIENCE

Partner

1996–2000 Hobtop Partners
Pittsfield, Massachusetts

Co-founder and operator of a small apparel business. Primary responsibilities were financial management and reporting, logistics related to show participation and tax return preparation.

EDUCATION

Siena College, Loudonville, NY
B.B.A., Accounting 1985, Passed CPA Exam, Fall 2001

CERTIFICATION

- Certified Government Financial Manager

MEMBERSHIPS
AND
AFFILIATIONS

- Advisory Board Member, National Association of Charter School Authorizers, Charter Authorizer Standards and Evaluation Project 2007
- Member, Association of Government Accountants (AGA)
- Consultant (State Representative) to the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants Public School Committee (2002 to present) Contributor, *Reference Manual for Audits of School Districts*
- Peer reviewer for the Federal Department of Education Charter Schools Program, State Education Agency Grants, 2007 Voluntary School Choice Programs, 2007

PRESENTATIONS

- Helping Charter Schools Build Fiscal Capacity, National Association of Charter School Authorizers Annual Conference, planned October 2007
- Breaking Up Is Hard To Do (School Closure), National Association of Charter School Authorizers Annual Conference, planned October 2007
- Charter Schools Issues and Outlook, Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, March 2007
- Nuts and Bolts of School Closure, National Association of Charter School Authorizers Annual Conference, October 2006
- Getting Your Financial Reports Right, New York State Charter School Association Annual Conference, March 2006
- Making a Compelling Case, Grant Writing from an Authorizers Perspective, New York State Charter School Association Annual Conference, March 2006
- Taking Care of Business, Evaluating Financial Performance, National Association of Charter School Authorizers, October 2005

Budget Narrative

Budget Narrative

Attachment 1:

Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **2217-Mandatory_Final_USDOE_Budget_Narrative.pdf**

New York State Education Department
FY2011 Application for Grants Under the Charter School Program
 (CFDA Number: 84.282A)
Budget Narrative – Section A

Budget Narrative Instructions: Provide an itemized budget breakdown narrative, by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B of the ED 524 form. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated. If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, this information is to be completed by your Business Office. Specify the estimated amount of the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied and the total indirect expense. Please indicate which costs are included and which costs are excluded from the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied. Provide other budget explanations or comments deemed necessary.

Table 1: NYSED Budget Request, August 1, 2008 through July 31, 2011

ED524 Budget Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Description of Costs
1. Personnel – Section A	\$0	\$40,000	\$52,000	\$92,000	Federal Funds will supplement salaries of staff (9.90 FTE's) that work directly on the charter school programs in years 2 and 3. The position titles comprising the 9.90 FTE's are listed in Section B, Budget Category 1 of ED Form 524.

ED524 Budget Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Description of Costs
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$18,212	\$23,676	\$41,888	<i>Fringe benefits for the above personnel are based on the NYSED's current fringe benefits rate of 45.53%.</i>
3. Travel	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,800	\$30,800	<i>Total, see details below.</i>
	\$2,600	\$2,400	\$3,000	\$8,000	<i>2.00 FTE's to Annual CSP Project Directors Meetings.</i>
	\$6,000	\$6,200	\$6,400	\$18,600	<i>4.00 FTE's to Annual Regional/National Charter School Conferences (e.g., NACSA)</i>
	\$1400	\$1400	\$1400	\$4,200	<i>Travel to monitor and review charter schools.</i>
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
5. Supplies	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,839	\$12,839	<i>Administrative office supplies</i>
6. Contractual/Grants	\$7,866,323	\$8,585,666	\$6,318,218	\$22,770,207	<i>Total, see details below.</i>
	\$500,000	\$700,000	\$600,000	\$1,800,000	<i>Dissemination Grants</i>
	\$5,566,666	\$7,566,666	\$5,533,318	\$18,666,650	<i>Planning, Program Design and Implementation Grants:</i> <i>Year 1 32 new grants (22 new Charter Schools opening in September 2008 plus 10 new charter schools as per Objective 1)</i> <i>Year 2--10 new grants</i> <i>Year 3 10 new grants</i>

ED524 Budget Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Description of Costs
	\$1,450,000			\$1,450,000	Continuing Grants made during previous CS award.
	\$172,657	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$422,657	Consultants to perform the comprehensive monitoring and review (SchoolWorks)
	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$50,000	\$300,000	Evaluator per selection criteria (vi).
	\$42,000	\$34,000	\$25,000	\$101,000	Curriculum Consultant to review the curriculum component of all initial and renewal charter school applications(for a finding of educational soundness per NYS Education Law § 2852 (2) (b)
	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$9,900	\$29,900	External peer reviewers for grants
7. Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
8. Other	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$90,000	Funds in the "Other" category pertain to the administrative costs of the Charter School Institute of the SUNY Board of Trustees. Costs for SUNY include a partial salary (20%) of one SUNY employee and related administrative costs of travel, supplies and postage.
9. Total Direct Costs	\$7,910,323	\$8,687,878	\$6,439,533	\$23,037,734	Lines 1 - 8.

ED524 Budget Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Description of Costs
10. Indirect Costs		\$9,360	\$12,168	\$21,528	<i>Total indirect costs based on the NYSED's approved indirect cost rate of 13.4% for federal (restricted) programs. An additional 10% was added to this rate to cover the costs of phones, postage, Xerox, IT chargeback's for a total of 23.4% to be charged to the federal program. This rate is applied to line 1, Personnel in Section A.</i>
11. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Costs	\$7,910,323	\$8,697,238	\$6,451,701	\$23,059,262	Lines 9 - 11

New York State Education Department
FY2011 Application for Grants Under the Charter School Program
 (CFDA Number: 84.282A)
Budget Narrative – Section B

Budget Narrative Instructions: Provide an itemized budget breakdown narrative, by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B of the ED 524 form. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated. If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, this information is to be completed by your Business Office. Specify the estimated amount of the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied and the total indirect expense. Please indicate which costs are included and which costs are excluded from the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied. Provide other budget explanations or comments deemed necessary.

Table 1: NYSED Budget Request, August 1, 2008 through July 31, 2011

ED524 Budget Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Description of Costs
1. Personnel – Section B	\$687,235	\$667,852	\$677,088	\$2,032,175	For each year of the three years of the grant award period, State funds will support a total of 9.90 FTE staff positions that work directly on the charter school programs. The 9.90 FTE's consist of the following position descriptions Project Director, Report Manager, Grants Manager, Lead Reviewers, Data Staff and a Support Staff.

ED524 Budget Categories	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Description of Costs
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
3. Travel	\$10,000	\$11,800	\$11,300	\$33,100	Costs for any additional travel as may be required for the monitoring and review of schools not budgeted under section A.
4. Equipment	\$2316	\$1,792	\$0	\$4,108	Costs for equipment will be covered by state general funds.
5. Supplies	\$4000	\$4000	\$4,000	\$12,000	Costs for administrative office supplies to support grant administration.
6. Contractual	\$145,343	\$176,000	\$310,100	\$631,443	Consultants to perform the comprehensive monitoring and review (SchoolWorks), curriculum consultant, evaluator and external peer reviewer will be partially covered by State Funds.
7. Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	No costs budgeted not applicable.
8. Other					No costs budgeted
9. Total Direct Costs	\$848,894	\$861,444	\$1,002,488	\$2,712,826	Lines 1 - 8.
10. Indirect Costs	\$68,724	\$66,785	\$67,709	\$203,218	Total indirect costs is 10% of Budget Category 1 (Personnel Services) to cover the costs of phones, postage, Xerox, IT chargeback's.
11. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	No costs budgeted.
Total Costs	\$917,618	\$928,229	\$1,070,197	\$2,916,044	Lines 9 - 11