

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/12/2014 08:22 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Charter Schools Association (U282N150013)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Students with Disabilities		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
English Learners		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	110	109

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: California Charter Schools Association (U282N150013)

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 project clearly demonstrates national significance of the proposed project. The intent to design an accountability model that can be modified to fit other states and reflects Common Core Smarter Balanced assessments, which is a strength of the application (p9-10). The use of Common Core as a foundation further establishes that the model can be replicated or modified by other states given shared academic standards among the Smarter Balanced consortium schools. Local dissemination strategies are clearly defined in the narrative and involve dissemination of materials through conferences, the applicant group leadership team (i.e., member council) and through the website. In that Smarter Balanced consortium is relatively new, the availability of a resource focused on charter schools will clearly expand the level of understanding of problems and effective strategies around Common Core and its assessment. Dissemination will be advanced through partnerships with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers and National Alliance for Public Charter schools, each which have national impact and membership. The integration of conference presentations, partnerships with other state networks and the use of their website to disseminate information are appropriate delivery methods for the sharing project findings (p12-13).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The project provides clearly worded goals for the project in the application (p17-18, 21-22). The inclusion of numeric benchmarks and clearly identified performance targets are a strength of the proposal in that accountability for performance and deliverables is clearly stated. The project represents an exceptional approach to the priority given that it seeks to create a new accountability model based on the Smarter Balanced assessment. Applicability to a nationwide initiative, multiple authorizers and regional/national models is a strength of the proposal (p17). Processes described in the narrative will likely facilitate local and regional capacity to integrate Common Core standards and assessments into the authorization process. There is evidence of strong theory given the inclusion of clearly articulated logic model and a clearly articulated rationale for the project (p8).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 30

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 employ persons representing diverse communities (p45). The project director has the relevant training and experience needed to guide this project. She has experience in accountability initiatives, research, and grant management. She is also a current staff member in the application organization, which will facilitate access to available resources to support the project (p45). Her experience working with the primary target group of authorizers is also a strength of the proposal in that she is aware of specific authorizer needs regarding the integration of Common Core and Smarter Balanced assessments, the proposed project's focus (p e201). The .25FTE allocation assigned to the project director is appropriate given supports provided by other key personnel in critical project areas, including the director of research's involvement in developing accountability frameworks (p46). Other key project personnel are also qualified to support the project. Among slated personnel, the project will have access to expertise in accountability, research/evaluation, school leadership, and LEA authorizing processes (p 46-47). The varied skills and talents among intended project personnel and their knowledge of organizational resources is a strength of the application.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly indicate how the hiring process will encourage 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. While employment decisions will be nondiscriminatory, a description of employment recruitment/advertising strategies may have provided needed clarity.

Reader's Score: 9

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 uses project benchmarks that are stated using quantitative terms. The integration of quantitative benchmarks will likely facilitate project management and assessment of project progress (p17-18, 20-22). The management timeline is appropriately detailed and aligns monthly targets and activities with persons responsible, and milestones. A detailed timeline facilitates accountability and increases the likelihood of timely delivery of intended services (p50-52). The narrative also provides a clear description of how it will ensure feedback and continuous improvement. The use of project advisory board, state working group/Member Council and executive team involvement will likely ensure that routine meetings provide project staff with regular updates on progress toward development and dissemination of the framework (p49; e140).

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 proposed methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures linked to project outcomes. Guiding questions and quantitative objectives reflect the purpose for the project and will likely yield quantitative and qualitative (i.e., survey, document analysis, focus groups/interviews) (p58-59). The applicant clearly details the likelihood that the evaluation will, if well- implemented, produce evidence of promise. The applicant intends to conduct a quasi-experimental study capable of meeting What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations (p56). Methods of evaluation will likely provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes through the use of quantified data measures and the intent to triangulate qualitative data collected to measure project outcomes.

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 intends to address strategies and tools that increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities, and improve student achievement through integration of a special education indicator as a minimum criteria for project participation (p3). The development of a standardized process for accountability framework that specifically addresses achievement of students with disabilities as measured by student achievement/growth and graduation/college enrollment rates, is evidence of best practice. Capacity building will also be enhanced by the integration of the applicant's special education report/map resource that connects schools with special education contractors. The inclusion of enrollment in accountability decisions also indicates the intent to advance strategies involving equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities (p6-7). National significance is demonstrated by the sharing of this framework with other schools using Smarter Balanced assessments (p3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

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 increase charter schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English learners through a specific criteria indicating improved student achievement/growth and also graduation and college enrollment (p5-6). The explicit integration of a distinct criteria involving English learner student achievement is a strength of the application in that the indicator goes beyond availability of services to academic student performance and growth. Performance goals for English learners are also explicitly listed among project outcomes, which ensure that performance for this population is linked to project performance. The inclusion of enrollment in accountability decisions also indicates the intent to advance strategies involving English Learner equitable access to charter schools (p6-7).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/12/2014 08:22 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/05/2014 02:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Charter Schools Association (U282N150013)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Students with Disabilities		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
English Learners		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	110	109

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: California Charter Schools Association (U282N150013)

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. Examples of the national significance of the proposed project include the following: implementing the Common Core Standards, regional impact of charter school expansion in the state, and developing national charter school standards. The applicant plans to ensure curriculum alignment with the Common Core Standards, which is a recent national concern. The applicant clearly presented the import and national significance of the proposed program.

PAGE #: 9 - 10

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 submitting information for the Portrait of the Movement report, preparing an annual accountability report, and publishing information on the website. In addition to other education leaders, the applicant mentioned the efforts to inform parents about the program in the dissemination plan. The dissemination plan includes sharing the results of the project in multiple formats and with various stakeholders, including parents. Other districts and agencies will be able to apply the information and strategies to other charter schools.

PAGE #: 10 - 12

The proposed project will increase knowledge and understanding of educational problems and issues. The proposed project will address the student achievement gap among charter schools and reverse the trend; collect, analyze, and report data about charter school authorization policies and practices; publish accountability reports, and circulate the accountability framework.

PAGE #: 12 - 16

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The applicant presented clear goals, objectives, and outcomes. The specified and measurable goals include draft a charter school accountability model based on Common Core assessments, increase the percentage of charter schools in the top quartile of performance by five percentage points each year, and decrease the percentage of charter schools in the bottom quartile of performance by two percentage points each year. English Language Learners and students with disabilities are specifically referenced in the objectives. The applicant presented a clear project design, which is supported by well-defined goals and objectives.

PAGE #: 17 - 18

The applicant used theory and a logic model to support the project design. The applicant developed a logic model for developing an accountability model aligned with Common Core. The logic model includes resources; activities; outputs; and short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes. Specific components of the logic model include project staff (resources), data collection (activities), create accountability model (outputs), and disseminate model to SBAC states (outcomes). The logic model and theory is applicable to the proposed project.

PAGE #: 8

The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to charter schools. The project design includes the following strategies: new accountability framework; engaging authorizers, charter schools, and experts; connecting to CCSA's Member Council; and advancing online resource availability. The applicant discussed how the proposed project will address absolute priority #2 (improving accountability).

PAGE #: 2, 24 - 27

The proposed project includes services that will lead to improvements in student achievement based on rigorous academic standards. Examples of the services included in the proposed project include, but are not limited to, implementing the new accountability model, including prior academic success in the application renewal process, and adapting monitoring processes. It is likely that the proposed project design will advance student achievement.

PAGE #: 27 - 30

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

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: doctorate degree, charter school organization management, and school development and support team member. The project director will devote 25% professional time to the project. Leading accountability and research charter school initiatives and developing a first of its kind accountability framework are specific skills and experiences that would benefit the proposed project. The qualifications, training, and experience are suitable to carry out the proposed project.

PAGE #: 45 - 46

The applicant presented the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key personnel: director of research, managing director of achievement and performance management, and senior analyst. The director of research will possess the following qualifications, training, and experience: published author, assessment and accountability experience, and education consultant. The managing director of achievement and performance management will possess the following qualifications, training, and experience: research, program planning and implementation, classroom and leadership roles in schools, and accountability. The senior analyst will possess the following qualifications, training, and experience: achievement and performance management, data analysis, and long-term research project. The qualifications, training, and experience are suitable to carry out the proposed project.

PAGE #: 46 - 47

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly address 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 #: 46 - 47

Reader's Score: 9

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, monthly meetings, develop authorizer portfolio analysis reports, launch website, and sponsor webinars. The management plans includes tasks aligned with the stated goals and objectives and how project staff will work together. The plan clearly outlines the activities completed each year of the grant cycle.

PAGE #: 50 - 53

The applicant plans to receive feedback for the proposed project. The applicant will gather and use the view of stakeholders to inform the operations of the proposed project in multiple forms such as convening an advisory board, soliciting feedback from university faculty, meetings with project staff members, and CCSA Board of Directors. The management plans includes specific means of ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

PAGE #: 53

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 survey results, track progress, and monitor authorization decisions. The applicant will collect and review quantitative data annually and qualitative data quarterly. The data collected is directly linked to the stated outcomes and will advance knowledge of charter school management and leadership.

PAGE #: 54 - 58

The evaluation plan for the proposed program, if well-implemented, will produce evidence of promise. The evaluation plan includes formative and summative evaluations, connection to stated goals and objectives, and quasi-experimental design strategies. The applicant specifically references English Language Learners and students with disabilities in the

PAGE #: 54 - 56

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 statewide data and use of triangulation. The evaluation plan will contribute to knowledge in the proposed project's focus area.

PAGE #: 56 - 60

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 plans to develop strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for students with disabilities. Specifically, the applicant plans to implement an accountability framework, publish an annual Portrait of the Movement report, and analyze and collect data. Students with disabilities are consistently referenced throughout the project. The strategies and tools mentioned support increasing the schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve students with disabilities.

The applicant plans to develop Special Education Local Planning Areas to connect authorizers in the same geographic area. The applicant also plans to recognize teachers, schools, and authorizers who successfully serve students with disabilities. To disseminate the promising practices, the applicant plans to sponsor web-based training and convene an advisory board. Based on the information presented, it is likely that the applicant will share the information with other authorizers and charter school leaders.

PAGE #: 4 - 5

To promote collaborate activities between charter schools and key education stakeholders, the applicants plans convene an advisory board and implement a second-look review process for research projects.

PAGE #: 3 - 5

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 plans to develop strategies and tools to increase equitable access to charter schools for English Language Learners. Specifically, the applicant plans to implement an accountability framework, publish an annual Portrait of the Movement report, and analyze and collect data. The strategies and tools mentioned support increasing the schools' capacity to recruit, enroll, and serve English Language Learners.

PAGE #: 5 - 7

The applicant plans to develop English Language Learners Local Planning Areas to connect authorizers in the same geographic area. The applicant also plans to recognize teachers, schools, and authorizers who successfully serve English learners. To disseminate the promising practices, the applicant plans to sponsor web-based training and convene an advisory board. Based on the information presented, it is likely that the applicant will share the information with other authorizers and charter school leaders.

PAGE #: 5 - 7

To promote collaborate activities between charter schools and key education stakeholders, the applicants plans convene an advisory board and implement a second-look review process for research projects.

PAGE #: 5 - 7

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/05/2014 02:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2014 10:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Charter Schools Association (U282N150013)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
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	100
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Students with Disabilities		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
English Learners		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	110	110

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: California Charter Schools Association (U282N150013)

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:

Since the new accountability being proposed by the applicant is built on Common Core State Standards and the SBAC assessment, the framework should be widely transferrable and relevant nationally. (page 9)

Applicant has recruited at least one national partner (NACSA) that will assist in national dissemination and making sure that the tools are nationally applicable/relevant. (page 10)

Dissemination plans are robust within the state: applicant already has a dissemination network, an annual accountability report, data to support authorizer decisions like approval, renewal and closure, webinars and regional meetings, and conference presentations.(page 11-12)

There is also a member council made up of individual charter schools that oversees the applicant's ongoing work. (page 12)

Project includes planned opportunities for technical assistance and support of similar organizations nationally. (page 13)

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:

Application includes measurable goals (pages 17-19) and establishes baseline data, where possible, and validity measures. (page 20 -21)

Application includes performance targets that are specific and give a clear understanding of the project design. (pages 21-22)

A logic model is included (page 8) and is based on prior logic model that produced good results for the applicant. (page 23)

Project design includes sophisticated technical work to develop the framework but also engagement, and change management to achieve buy in and shared ownership of the framework. (page 24, 26)

Application includes discussion of data validation to ensure the accuracy of the model and quantitative analysis. (page 26 - 27)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 30

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 project director and key staff all possess knowledge, relevant expertise, and many strengths based on prior experience and achievements. (pages 45 – 47). Relevant experience includes assessment, accountability, ad school performance research/background, program evaluation, and leadership of large scale projects.

Applicant addresses the need and vision to recruit applications for employment from underrepresented groups including race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability, (page 45) including commitment to reflecting their state diversity demographics and making accommodations for people with disabilities.

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:

Applicant has established a project leadership team with key personnel, and roles for each member are described along with their FTE status. (pages 47 – 48) The team will meet monthly to review progress towards project objectives. In addition, the applicant will establish a project advisory board to include national and regional representation to guide the project work and provide feedback. (page 49)

Applicant has a broad and diverse set of mechanisms for collecting feedback from many different perspectives, and regarding many different aspects of the project. The project team will gather this feedback at frequent and regular intervals, and has built into the project design time for various iterations of the framework. (page 53)

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:

Evaluation will be conducted by highly qualified external evaluators. (page 60)

Applicant includes a solid detailed discussion of project objectives and evaluation methods to be used. (pages 58 – 59)

The goals and accompanying objectives strongly reflect the logic model, and are ambitious. (pages 58 – 59)

The evaluation addresses the competitive priorities of English learners and students with disabilities. (page 59)

The evaluation design is likely to produce valid and reliable results that advance the field. The evidence of promise was strong and impactful.

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:

Project will address students with disabilities within the accountability framework to be created and implemented. The focus of framework will be enrollment and achievement. (pages 3-4)

The applicant includes plans to disseminate promising practices related to special education service delivery options, for higher quality. (page 4)

The applicant regularly disseminates information about special education from staffing and allocation information to best practices and uses multiple vehicles: website, webinars, and trainings. (page 5)

The outcomes for students with disabilities are included in the logic model. (page 8)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

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:

Project will address English learners within the accountability framework to be created and implemented. The focus of framework will be growth and achievement, including high school graduation and college enrollment. (pages 5-6)

The proposal includes strong plans to disseminate promising practices related to recruitment and enrollment of English learners, and best practices for instruction and achievement. (page 7)

Applicant regularly disseminates information about English learners from staffing and allocation information to best practices and uses multiple vehicles: website, webinars, and trainings. (page 5)

The outcomes for English learners are included in the logic model. (page 8)

Weaknesses:

Not addressed

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/19/2014 10:46 AM