

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/18/2014 01:43 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U282N150009)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	27
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	87
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Students with Disabilities		
1. CPP 1	5	2
Sub Total	5	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
English Learners		
1. CPP 2	5	2
Sub Total	5	2
Total	110	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Schools National Leadership - 2: 84.282N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U282N150009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The national significance of the proposed project.

(ii) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

(iii) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant describes a feasible dissemination plan that will make training and resources accessible to project participants and other authorizers in the state. Conference presentations, online access to products and networking are appropriate ways to share outcomes and products (p21-22). The use of a newly formed state advocacy group, conference presentations, and information shared with local school boards, universities and school districts are appropriate to disseminate project outcomes and effective practices (p4, 35). The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of issues and effective strategies for California is clear. The project will involve extended training, will uniquely address the needs of California authorizers, and will create products and data systems to standardize practice across the state.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not adequately justify the project's national significance. The inclusion of majority California-based members on the advisory committee, specific findings that will apply predominately to the California charter school landscape, local activities (i.e., Boot Camp, Master Classes, regional/state leaders guiding implementation) and primarily California participants in the majority of project activities indicate a relatively narrow focus (p3-4, 33). The narrative provides only a general indication of how the project's focus and anticipated products will be applicable to non-California charter authorizers through inclusion of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers as a third party consultant and their insight on national issues, and the inclusion of generic authorization problems that may be national in scope (p3, 32-35; e77). However, the project does not specifically detail how non-California authorizers will be able to use/modify project outcomes/products or the likelihood of non-California stakeholder interest in the project's online courses/training and resource library (p19-23).

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 27

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1 (c)).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to discuss how its proposed project addresses the absolute priority to which the applicant has responded.

(iv) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

Strengths:

The applicant provides quantitative benchmarks for project performance measures. The presence of quantitative benchmarks ensures that project performance will have a standard against which to judge progress. Quantitative benchmarks will also likely facilitate project evaluation. The applicant demonstrates strong theory through a structured logic model and asserts that improvements to the authorizing process will likely cause improvements in charter school operation and outcomes (p4, 36). The intended project represents an exceptional approach to the priority given that extended training for authorizers, statewide authorizer data collection and state-specific strategies for improving authorization process represent novel and needed improvements to authorization in California (p8, 29-31). The project's focus on multiple components of charter authorization and planned standardization of processes and data clearly indicate the intent to impact authorizer capacity at the state level. Knowledgeable authorizers with systems and data collection protocols that hold schools accountable for academic outcomes is clearly articulated as an outcome for the project and represents a strength of the proposal.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly connect the impact of planned activities to improvements in achievement of students as measured against rigorous standards. The intent to impact achievement without a clearly articulated path to improvement, in light of academic standards, weakens the narrative. Moreover, the narrative states that there is a lack of evidence connecting authorization to improved school performance (p58) and that authorizing has only an indirect effect on academic outcomes (p37). These assertions further weaken the applicant's assertions regarding project outcomes. There is also limited text describing the rigorous academic standards referred to in the narrative or how improvements in student achievement will be measured.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, the Secretary considers:

(i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The applicant states the intent to ensure employment diversity through targeted outreach (i.e., job database, journals, local job fairs) (p41). The combination of these efforts and the diversity of the workforce in the target area will likely ensure that persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented are available for project positions. The project director's .75 FTE allocation is appropriate. She has extensive experience providing direct and indirect services to charter school. A strength of the proposal is that the project director has already taken the lead in establishing an informal network of authorizers in the state (p38). Her relationship with current authorizers, knowledge of the authorizing process and the history of authorizing in the state will likely facilitate initial project development activities (p42).

Additional key personnel, representing other charter school stakeholders (i.e., local districts and advocacy groups), are also appropriate to serve on the project (p38-39). Their combined expertise will benefit the project, given that activities will address concerns that emanate from their locales and trainings will engage representatives from their districts and charter support groups. The inclusion of key project personnel on the advisory board is also a strength of the proposal in that it encourages buy-in and ensures project development is informed by participants and local stakeholders (p45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The management timeline is appropriately detailed and aligns quarterly targets and activities with persons responsible, and milestones (p e123-e125). Use of an appropriately detailed timeline ensures accountability and timely delivery of intended services. Monthly leadership meetings and quarterly advisory committee meetings are appropriate for a project providing focused services to small, regional authorizers participating in the project (p26, 46, 48). The presence of an organizational chart clearly articulates lines of direct report and accountability (p44). Outreach by regional leaders into their local authorizing community will allow input into project operation and development. Selected advisory board members represent varied organizations and viewpoints, which increases the likelihood that project activities and products are widely applicable (p45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well- implemented, produce evidence of promise (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe how evaluation activities will contribute to research and the knowledge base in the field regarding the project s focus area.

Strengths:

The applicant intends to use appropriate methods of evaluation to determine if the project meets its objectives. The use of objective performance measures with quantitative benchmarks ensures that findings are appropriately measured against a pre-determined standard. The project will produce quantitative (i.e., ANOVA, pre/post assessments, surveys) and qualitative data (i.e., interviews, focus groups, observations), which are appropriate for the project involving professional development/training cohorts and strategy implementation (p50-57). The use of objective data sets and an experienced evaluator increases the likelihood that the evaluation will yield valid and reliable performance data on project outcomes (p49). The narrative also clearly addresses the likelihood of evidence of promise given the intent to conduct a quasi-experimental study on project implementation and changes in authorization practices (p50).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Students with Disabilities

1. This priority is for projects of national significance and scope that are designed to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities and increase charter schools' enrollment of

students with disabilities, as well as improve achievement (including student achievement and student growth) and attainment (including high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities in charter schools, through one or more of the following activities:

1. Developing strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities and increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities, and improve student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.
2. Disseminating promising practices for increasing equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities; increasing charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities; and improving student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.
3. Promoting collaborative activities between charter schools, non-chartered public schools, and key special education stakeholders designed to improve student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.

Strengths:

The applicant addresses this priority through its intent to general intent to create strategies and tools to increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities. The intent to include special education topics and a cadre of special education experts as a distinct component of professional development and the development of curriculum that addresses this population is reflected in the narrative (p20-23). The narrative and logic model also clearly establishes the intent to improve achievement for students as an overall goal of the project (p36-37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide adequate detail regarding the curriculum for students with disabilities. It is not clear if the project will yield stand-alone special education curriculum/modules or if modules/units/strategies will be integrated into the project's larger focus on charter school authorizing (p20-21). Also, stating that the development of targeted training will be a focus of the project without including adequate detail regarding how this will take occur (i.e., development of strategies and tools, frequency of special education training beyond annual conference) weakens the application (p 20-23).

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - English Learners

1. This priority is for projects of national significance and scope that are designed to increase equitable access to charter schools for English learners and increase charter schools' enrollment of English learners, as well as improve academic achievement (including student achievement and student growth) and attainment (including English proficiency, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates) for English learners, through one or more of the following activities:

1. Developing strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for English learners; increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners; and improve student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

2. Disseminating promising practices for increasing equitable access to charter schools for English learners; increasing charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners; and improving student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

3. Promoting collaborative activities between charter schools, non-chartered public schools, and key English learner stakeholders designed to improve student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for

English learners.

Strengths:

The applicant seeks to increase participant capacity by integrating strategies and tools that provide a focus on English learners. The intent to include English learner experts in professional development and the creation of curriculum to address diversity indicate the intent to improve both access and service delivery (p20-23). A focus on improving student achievement for English learners is a focus of the project, as verified in the narrative and logic (p36-37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide adequate information about how it intends to provide specific resources and training for charter operators serving English learners. More detail is needed to determine if noted products are going to be stand-alone resources or components of the larger authorization process proposed by the applicant. The lack of detail regarding English learner resources weakens this section of the narrative (p 20-23).

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/18/2014 01:43 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2014 11:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U282N150009)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Students with Disabilities		
1. CPP 1	5	1
Sub Total	5	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
English Learners		
1. CPP 2	5	1
Sub Total	5	1
Total	110	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Schools National Leadership - 2: 84.282N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U282N150009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The national significance of the proposed project.

(ii) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

(iii) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

Strengths:

The proposed program includes components that are of national significance. The applicant plans to address four concerns with charter school authorization: non-renew charter school contracts, charting approval processes (including denial rates and rationale), limited school oversight by authorizers, and monitoring schools. The applicant considers the application review process and monitoring to be of national significance. These topics impact student outcomes and charter school leaders need to receive information and training about the topics. The applicant clearly presented the import and national significance of the proposed program.

PAGE #: 3 - 6

The applicant plans to share the results of the proposed project with others. Specifically, the applicant plans to disseminate the results of the proposed project by partnering with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers to develop the CARS Net training curricula, create a resource library, present at national conferences, and attending regional and national networking events. These dissemination methods are suitable to reach a wide variety of school and authorizer leaders. The plan also includes sharing information in multiple formats. Other districts and agencies will be able to apply the information and strategies to other charter schools.

PAGE #: 12 – 15

The proposed project will increase knowledge and understanding of educational problems and issues. The applicant stated that the information generated during the grant funding cycle would be transferrable to other states and charter authorizers. The strategies planned include curricula, monitoring software, models, and data collection and analysis.

PAGE #: 22

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1 (c)).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to discuss how its proposed project addresses the absolute priority to which the applicant has responded.

(iv) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

Strengths:

The applicant presented clear goals, objectives, and outcomes. The specified and measurable goals include developing a charter network, increasing authorizer quality, collecting and analyzing data pertaining to small authorizer practices in California, and disseminating the results nationally. Each goal includes specific, measurable, and quantifiable objectives. Examples of the quantifiable objectives include: recruited at least 50% of small authorizers by the end of year one, 80% of small authorizers will participate in at least one event by the end of the grant period, and at least 50% of authorizers will complete Boot Camp Training by the end of the grant period. The applicant presented a clear project design, which is supported by well-defined goals and objectives.

PAGE #: 27 - 29

The applicant used theory and a logic model to support the project design. The CARS Net Logic Model includes the mission, assumption, priorities, inputs, outputs, and outcomes. Specific items referenced in the logic model include federal funding (input), Boot Camp (outputs), and data collection software implementation (outcomes). Evaluation and continuous feedback are also included in the model.

PAGE #: 36

The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to charter schools. The project design includes the following strategies: training, providing professional development sessions, creating a curriculum, providing ongoing authorizer support, and sponsoring annual conferences. Providing ongoing authorizer support is an exceptional program because it includes a consistent and long-term method to support authorizers. The applicant discussed how the proposed project will address absolute priority #2 (improving accountability).

PAGE #: 29 - 35

The proposed project includes services that may lead to improvements in student achievement based on rigorous academic standards such as training authorizing professionals. It is somewhat likely that the proposed project design will advance student achievement.

PAGE #: 37

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Weaknesses:

The applicant limited improving academic achievement and rigorous academic standards to training authorizing professionals. However, the applicant did not make a clear case to link the training to the academic standards. Providing training does not automatically impact rigor. The applicant did not clearly describe the type of training staff members and teachers would receive. The quality of the project design in terms of addressing rigor is not clear.

PAGE #: 37

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 27

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

In addition, the Secretary considers:

(i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The applicant presented the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director. The project director will possess the following qualifications, training, and experience: charter school management and authorization, research, curriculum, and publications. With more than a decade of experience authorizing charter schools, the project director is well suited for the position. Additional skills and experiences that could enhance the proposed project include publishing reports about the authorization process and experience expanding charter school networks. The qualifications, training, and experience are suitable to carry out the proposed project.

PAGE #: 38

The applicant presented the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key personnel: faculty and advisory board members. The faculty will possess the following qualifications, training, and experience: leadership training, policy development, and management. Advisory board members will possess the following qualifications, training, and experience: management, charter school leadership, and program evaluation. The qualifications, training, and experience are suitable to carry out the proposed project.

PAGE #: 38 - 41

The applicant addressed the extent to which employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability will be encouraged.

PAGE #: 41

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant presented a clear and detailed management plan. The management plan includes timelines, responsibilities, and milestones. Examples of the tasks include, but are not limited to, developing the curriculum, convening monthly meetings, providing training, and collecting data. The plan is comprehensive because it includes tasks associated with the stated goals and outcomes and staff interaction. The milestones are assigned by quarter.

PAGE #: 46 - 47

The applicant plans to receive feedback for the proposed project. Convening an advisory board, developing regional leadership teams, implementing data collection software system, and using social media are ways in which the applicant will gather and use the view of stakeholders to inform the operations of the proposed project. The applicant provided a list of advisory board members along with the agency they represent and their areas of expertise. The agencies (Chico USD, Santa Clara County Office of Education, and Los Angeles USD) and areas of expertise (non-classroom based charters, authorizing boards, and charter law) will be an asset to the proposed project. The management plan includes specific means of ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

PAGE #: 48 - 49

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well- implemented, produce evidence of promise (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on

relevant outcomes.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe how evaluation activities will contribute to research and the knowledge base in the field regarding the project's focus area.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes clear objective performance measures. The applicant plans to assess the intended outcomes using qualitative and quantitative data such as observation, document review, event attendance, and evaluation results. The data collected is directly linked to the stated outcomes and will advance knowledge of charter school management and leadership.

PAGE #: 52 - 54

The evaluation plan for the proposed program, if well-implemented, will produce evidence of promise. The evaluation plan includes formative and summative data collection, routine reporting to stakeholders, and implementing strategies. The evaluation plan is based on Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM) with a focus on identifying discrepancies in performance and expectations.

PAGE #: 50 - 51

The evaluation plan for the proposed project will provide valid and reliable performance data. The evaluation plan will measure the proposed outcomes. The evaluation plan includes using t-tests and analysis of variance to analyze data, administering surveys, and using triangulation. The evaluation plan will contribute to knowledge in the proposed project's focus area.

PAGE #: 57 - 58

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Students with Disabilities

- 1. This priority is for projects of national significance and scope that are designed to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities and increase charter schools' enrollment of students with disabilities, as well as improve achievement (including student achievement and student growth) and attainment (including high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities in charter schools, through one or more of the following activities:**
 - 1. Developing strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities and increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities, and improve student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.**
 - 2. Disseminating promising practices for increasing equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities; increasing charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities; and improving student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.**
 - 3. Promoting collaborative activities between charter schools, non-chartered public schools, and key special education stakeholders designed to improve student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.**

Strengths:

The applicant will include experts in the field of students with disabilities as faculty or to provide training. Experts will also be available to present workshops during annual conferences.

PAGE #: 23

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a clear or detailed plan regarding how the experts would use their skills, knowledge, and experience to improve student outcomes for students with disabilities. Additionally, the applicant did not address specific strategies, promising practice, or collaboration with other education stakeholders as it pertains to students with disabilities.

PAGE #: 25

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - English Learners

1. This priority is for projects of national significance and scope that are designed to increase equitable access to charter schools for English learners and increase charter schools' enrollment of English learners, as well as improve academic achievement (including student achievement and student growth) and attainment (including English proficiency, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates) for English learners, through one or more of the following activities:

1. Developing strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for English learners; increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners; and improve student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

2. Disseminating promising practices for increasing equitable access to charter schools for English learners; increasing charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners; and improving student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

3. Promoting collaborative activities between charter schools, non-chartered public schools, and key English learner stakeholders designed to improve student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

Strengths:

The applicant will include experts in the field of English Language Learners as faculty or to provide training. Experts will also be available to present workshops during annual conferences.

PAGE #: 23

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a clear or detailed plan regarding how the experts would use their skills, knowledge, and experience to improve student outcomes for English Language Learners. Additionally, the applicant did not address specific strategies, promising practice, or collaboration with other education stakeholders as it pertains to English Language Learners.

PAGE #: 25

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/17/2014 11:51 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2014 10:45 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U282N150009)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	20
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Students with Disabilities		
1. CPP 1	5	1
Sub Total	5	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
English Learners		
1. CPP 2	5	1
Sub Total	5	1
Total	110	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Schools National Leadership - 2: 84.282N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U282N150009)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The national significance of the proposed project.

(ii) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

(iii) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant seeks to establish a regional authorizing body which could be replicable nationally for small authorizers lacking capacity/resources. All materials developed will be online and open source, promoting the national significance of this project. (page 3)

Connects leading research (about best practice for charter authorizing) to issues of local capacity and proposes a structure that can serve as a national model. (pages 7 -8) Applicant addresses transferring California based project to the national stage, and how that transfer will be possible. (page 22) The planned project will contribute to the national understanding of effective strategies related to authorizer capacity.

Dissemination plans offer robust and multiple pathways to connect: web-based and in person, national and regional. (page 21)

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1 (c)).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to discuss how its proposed project addresses the absolute priority to which the applicant has responded.

(iv) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

Strengths:

Project includes measurable goals with multi-year objectives to span the length of the grant. (pages 28, 29, 33, 35)
A detailed logic model (page 36) shows the planned impact of this project and that the project is supported by strong theory.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Weaknesses:

Project design never measures the impact on the relationship between authorizer quality and school performance. On page 37, the applicant describes the connection between authorizer practice and school quality as "indirect."
Logic model never ultimately connects this work with higher performing schools, or increases in performance. Thus the likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards is unclear.

This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

In addition, the Secretary considers:

(i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

Key project staff and faculty are identified. Their assigned responsibilities are clear and they bring salient and important experience/expertise to the project. (pages 38 – 41)

Personnel include people with deep local (California) and national experience, including school level experience (leadership and start up), authorizing experience, legal experience, and charter school support/operations experience. (pages 38 – 41) The project director has a long background in charter school work, specifically related to authorizer quality/capacity. (page 38). Key project staff have special education expertise, finance expertise, and deep charter school experience. (page 39)

The applicant makes assurance to seek diverse candidates for key positions, with far reaching advertising and outreach efforts, and attendance at community job fairs (seeking to reflect the diversity of their community in the San Francisco Bay area). (page 41)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The management structures are described in organizational charts on pages 42 and 43, making clear the reporting lines and supervisory structures.

The project proposes an advisory board structure to increase buy-in and knowledge of various issues/dynamics within the state, as well as regional representation. (page 45)

Feedback loops include participants, advisors, and outside authorizers to support continuous improvement. (page 47) The project director appropriately has the majority of the responsibility for collecting and coordinating feedback. (page 48)

The evaluator will assist in collecting information from interviews, surveys, and observations, to support the other feedback structures. (page 49)

Includes a detailed timeline and milestones overview that outlines activities and persons responsible, giving a clear sense of the path forward for this project. (Appendix)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well- implemented, produce evidence of promise (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe how evaluation activities will contribute to research and the knowledge base in the field regarding the project s focus area.

Strengths:

Design includes measurable objectives, measurement tools or methods, and data collection (frequency and data to be collected). (pages 52 -57)

An outside evaluator has been identified and the evaluation planning is well underway. The planned evaluation is rigorous and includes both formative and summative data collection, analysis, and reporting on project outcomes. The evaluation will produce reliable and valid research about the outcomes of this project. (page 49)

The design gives confidence that the evaluation data will be valid and reliable. (page 50 – 51) A quasi experimental design, an interrupted time series, add to the validity of the outcomes and addresses the criteria for evidence of promise.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Students with Disabilities**

1. This priority is for projects of national significance and scope that are designed to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities and increase charter schools' enrollment of students with disabilities, as well as improve achievement (including student achievement and student growth) and attainment (including high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities in charter schools, through one or more of the following activities:

1. Developing strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities and increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities, and improve student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.

2. Disseminating promising practices for increasing equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities; increasing charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities; and improving student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.

3. Promoting collaborative activities between charter schools, non-chartered public schools, and key special education stakeholders designed to improve student achievement, including student growth, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for students with disabilities.

Strengths:

On page 23, applicant writes that this project addresses the competitive priorities.

Experts in special education have been included as training experts.

Applicant will dedicate some of trainings/conferences to sessions that cover ensuring access and improved achievement for students with disabilities. (page 23)

Weaknesses:

Aside from a brief mention early in the application, the proposal does not outline any specific plans to address significant work related to students with disabilities, including access, equity, and increased achievement or attainment for students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - English Learners

1. This priority is for projects of national significance and scope that are designed to increase equitable access to charter schools for English learners and increase charter schools' enrollment of English learners, as well as improve academic achievement (including student achievement and student growth) and attainment (including English proficiency, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates) for English learners, through one or more of the following activities:

1. Developing strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for English learners; increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners; and improve student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

2. Disseminating promising practices for increasing equitable access to charter schools for English learners; increasing charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners; and improving student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

3. Promoting collaborative activities between charter schools, non-chartered public schools, and key English learner stakeholders designed to improve student achievement, including student growth and English proficiency, and attainment (e.g., high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates) for English learners.

Strengths:

On page 23, applicant writes that this project addresses the competitive priorities.

Experts in English learners have been included (to be identified) as training experts.

Applicant will dedicate some of trainings/conferences to sessions that cover ensuring access and improved achievement for English learners (page 23)

Weaknesses:

Aside from a brief mention early in the application, the proposal does not outline any specific plans to address significant work related to students with disabilities including access, equity, and increased achievement or attainment for English language learners.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2014 10:45 AM