

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2014 02:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Illinois Network of Charter Schools (U282N150010)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	28
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	23
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	79
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	89

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Charter Schools National Leadership - 1: 84.282N

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Illinois Network of Charter Schools (U282N150010)

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 project, a collaboration between INCS and NJCSA, will leverage the network of the Alliance to make an impact nationally. Through its model and program, charter schools will be able to benefit from the proposed talent recruitment strategies and pipeline to increase their ability to serve SWD and ELL students. Additionally, the state leaders council (in 2016) and quarterly convening will ensure that information is shared beyond that annual conference.

Weaknesses:

The proposal clearly addresses factors 1 & 3 but it lacks additional information about how information will be disseminated through various channels to achieve national significance (pg. e40-42). It is unclear if the Alliance will be an equal partner as it relates to implementing, executing and being held accountable to ensuring that this project will be make a national impact (e.45). As designed, the project goals will not achieve national significance as it is focused on the involvement of participating states only (pg. e45-46).

Reader's Score: 28

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 design provides some research that supports its theory. Its two systems, The Charter Acceleration Cooperative and Talent Pipeline Accelerator, is an exceptional approach to addressing the priority (e23-24). The logic model is clear and should produce measurable results (e. 137).

Weaknesses:

For non-members and Non-NJ/IL schools, these resources/knowledge system will not be accessible to them (e47). The application lack information about the CSO identification and selection process (e47).

Reader's Score: 23

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 team is comprised on an experienced team of charter school support professionals that have significant experience in working with charter schools nationally. The proposed project director has the adequate skills and experience to manage this project along with the head and Chief of Staff for NAPCS.

Weaknesses:

This section does not address encouraging applications from underrepresented groups. .

Reader's Score: 8

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 detailed plan provides activities that are aligned to goals and objectives to the project.

Weaknesses:

The project plan's timeline lacks specific information on how long it will take to accomplish each task during each quarter. Additionally, some tasks should be completed prior to the launch of the project such as 2015 Quarter 1 - "develops initial workplan" (pg. e66). Each task should include the name of the assign manager for the point organization. As outlined in their resumes (e63, 111-131), most of the key personnel currently work full-time for their respective organizations. The application should include more information about how much of their time will be devoted to this project to determine if there are enough labor resources allotted to this project. The objective/activity referenced "at least 20 percent of chartering states" (e69) and the implementation of "eight charter communities" (e54) are unclear in its possible connection or alignment to the project's goals. Additional information about the methods of feedback collection is needed to support this management plan (e71-72).

Reader's Score: 10

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:

This sections meets all three subelements. The hiring of the independent evaluator who is reputable and highly qualified will lead to producing valid and reliable data on the project's outcomes. There is a variety of quantitative and qualitative data (pg. e78).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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:

This section has addresses this priority by creating two program/models that addresses all three activities. The application featured comparison data on the city vs. state level to show an area of need (e25-26). The shared services through the co-op model and talent recruitment program will indirectly support a charter school's capacity to serve SWDs.

Weaknesses:

This section has no weaknesses.

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:

This section has addresses this priority by creating two program/models that addresses all three activities. The plan's goal of targeting ELLs is very clear and well-developed. The shared services through the co-op model and talent recruitment program will indirectly support a charter school's capacity to serve ELLs.

Weaknesses:

This section has no weaknesses as this application does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/19/2014 02:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 11/25/2014 03:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Illinois Network of Charter Schools (U282N150010)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	30
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	23
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	11
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	82
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	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Charter Schools National Leadership - 1: 84.282N

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Illinois Network of Charter Schools (U282N150010)

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 uses diverse methods of dissemination including the State Leaders Council and individual state CSO conferences. This provides some redundancy that can be effective in reaching the intended audience (pp e40-42).

The applicant builds a strong case around its assertion that charter schools cannot "go it alone" (p. e34). The project objectives have strong potential to increase knowledge and understanding of educational problems, issues or effective strategies .

Weaknesses:

"The project's partners anticipate that economies of scale related to new and more effective teacher pipelines to charter schools will take root nationally" (p. e45). The applicants case for national recognition and replication could be strengthened by active examples of how this project will drive those processes.

Reader's Score: 30

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:

Goal #3 (p. e56) is clearly measurable, and its achievement will have a definite impact.

The project leverages economies of scale through shared services by using a co-op model (pp. e27,28) and Talent Pipeline Accelerator (pp. e30-32).

It is likely that services provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in student achievement (pp. e46-48).

Weaknesses:

It seems that goal #1 (p. e45) could be measured more effectively by statements that go beyond "... will each implement." This section would have been strengthened if the applicant would have included a way to measure the increased number of highly effective teachers.

There are some references to teacher preparation, but it seems "heavy" in the placement of already prepared teachers. This section would have been strengthened by additionally including a goal building on the number of students who strive to become teachers of SWD and ELL (pp. e56-57).

Reader's Score: 23

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:

Quarterly meetings with the NAPCS key personnel (p. e58) and the staff of INCS and NJCSA provide a strong team that is highly qualified and experienced (p. e57). This indicates a deep commitment from this important partner.

The project director brings relevant training and experience to this project through his work with INCS and the state of Georgia.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address the extent to which it 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.

Reader's Score: 8

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:

Timelines and milestones are clearly defined with reasonable expectations for ramping up participation in co-op and TPA projects (pp. e65-68).

The management plan provides quarterly meetings to review and update project objectives and timelines (p. e67).

Weaknesses:

This section would be improved if the applicant had broken its "point organization" responsibilities down into individual names or titles (65-70). This would add a sense of ownership and provide the reviewer evidence of deeper preparation and commitment.

Reader's Score: 11

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 methods of evaluation will produce reliable quantitative and qualitative data (p. e75).

The evaluation process contains detail on specific processes and procedures to obtain data (p. e54-56), building a strong case for validity and reliability.

The logic model presented may present evidence of promise through the correlational study of teacher supply and training

and retention (TPA Logic Model p. 1). The external evaluator should be able to help with implementation methods to meet this standard.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 data tables (pp. e25,26) reflect the need to increase equitable access for students with disabilities.

The Charter Acceleration Cooperative model (p. e26) provides collaborative activities for key special education stakeholders.

The Talent Accelerator Pipeline is an effective strategy to increase schools' capacities to recruit, enroll and serve SWD.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 data tables (pp. e27, 28) reflect the need to increase equitable access for English language learners.

Increasing the supply of qualified teachers and improving the efficiency with which they are employed and shared (p. e29) are effective strategies to increase equitable access for ELL as well as student achievement, growth, English proficiency and attainment.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 11/25/2014 03:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 12/03/2014 02:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Illinois Network of Charter Schools (U282N150010)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	30
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	86
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	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Charter Schools National Leadership - 1: 84.282N

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Illinois Network of Charter Schools (U282N150010)

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 identified the needs of the proposed project that in general, charter schools have limited pool of teacher talent qualified to serve ELL and SPED students. In addition, the applicant provided a report published in 2010 that district schools in 15 different states receive over 25% more funding per pupil than their charter counterparts, which served as evidence of less funding obtained in charter schools (p.e.12-13). As a result, charter schools have limited resources to provide quality education to all students especially ELL and SPED students. The proposed project is expected to develop network solutions by establishing new pipeline of high-capable teachers to attract teachers teaching in charter schools; and allowing charter schools joining together to share the services of teachers that is sustainable for charter schools. The proposed project demonstrated national significance by partnering with the national level organizations such as the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools, to impact 500, 000 students in eight states and raises the percentage of certified ELL and SPED teachers in their respective states by 20% over the three year grant project (p.e.18). The applicant intends to collaborate with broader charter including additional charter support organizations (CSO) to disseminate knowledge and learnings about the project through summit, conferences, publications, and quarterly convening (p.e40-41). The collaboration activities with the partners were clearly described.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the factor that how the proposed project would contribute to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

Reader's Score: 30

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 clearly identified three goals and objectives to achieve through the proposed project over the three year grant period. The outcomes are specified and measurable under each goal such as "By the end of Year Three of the proposed three-year grant period, the project partners aim to share and implement project programming in at least six additional chartering states with a total charter population of at least 500,000 students" (p.e45-46).

A logic model of the activities is provided (p.e137). The activities are tied to the outcomes.

The project proposed to collaborate through a shared system of recruiting and retaining high-quality instructors especially ELL and SPED instructors to increase economies of scale, for the benefit of charter schools in Illinois, New Jersey, and other charter communities across the nation (p.e18). Networking and collaboration are proven strategies to share and utilize existing resources more effectively.

It is expected to lead to improvements in the achievement of students by being able to share and utilize qualified teacher resources within the network (p.e31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provided limited information and explanations that how the proposed project would lead to improvements in the achievement of students other than a system sharing approach to utilize existing human resources more effectively (p.e31).

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 resume of the project director provided sufficient evidence of extended qualification and experiences in the field including co-authored publications (p.e59-60). Other key project personnel demonstrated their achievement and qualification in taking the responsibility of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to address the criteria of encouraging 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.

Reader's Score: 8

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 provided a management plan that time period, activity, and point organization responsible were clearly described. For example, in Year 1 Quarter 1, Project partners convene initial planning meeting to review project objectives and timeline and establish work plan for Year 1 (p.e65-66).

It is noted that the proposed project will strengthen the ability of charter schools to attract and retain high-qualified, certified teachers. All participating schools are expected to provide feedback to charter support organizations for continuous improvement (p.e.71).

Weaknesses:

The applicant expects the participating partners to provide feedback but the application lacked procedures to ensure that would occur.

Reader's Score: 13

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 provided adequate information of performance measures for each objective, which are clearly related to the expected outcomes. The description of quantitative and qualitative data to be collected is evident in the application (p.e73-76).

The applicant provided the detailed explanation to ensure the validity and reliability of data collection (p.e78).

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:

It is evident that the applicant did thorough research and provided sufficient information to propose the project. The strategies included implementing the Charter Acceleration Cooperative model to improve the special education staffing situation for charter schools and through the Talent Accelerator Pipeline program to recruit qualified staff to meet the needs of individual school with a goal of increasing student academic achievement (p.e24-27). The description was clear and detailed addressing the criteria.

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:

It is evident that the applicant did thorough research and provided sufficient information to propose the project. The strategies included implementing the Charter Acceleration Cooperative model to improve the ELL education staffing situation for charter schools and through the Talent Accelerator Pipeline program to recruit certified staff to meet the needs of schools with a goal of increasing student academic achievement (p.e27-29). The description was clear and detailed addressing the criteria.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 12/03/2014 02:12 PM