

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/15/2010 10:05 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation, Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	28
Sub Total	30	28
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	25
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	22
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	23
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	17
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	28
Sub Total	150	115
Total	210	168

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2010 84.282A - 2: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation,
Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - (i) CSP contribution to student achievement

1. The contribution the charter schools grant program will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged and other students to achieve State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicant to provide a description of the objectives for the SEA's charter school grant program and to explain how these objectives will be fulfilled, including steps taken by the SEA to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school grant program and how the SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State.

Strengths:

Strengths

The CSP grant long term goals are to increase the number of high-quality charter schools in Michigan, increase student achievement, and continue to close the achievement gap, especially with at-risk and secondary schools students, bolster Michigan charter schools' long-term fiscal and operational stability, and to provide stronger vehicles for information sharing, training and support. (p. 0-6). This includes opening between 74-92 new charter schools over five years, including ten new schools of excellence.

The state will focus on opening new high-quality charter schools in the Detroit area, which is a low performing District. (p. 14)

The state will require schools that receive incentive funding for at-risk or secondary programs to include assessment and evaluation plans and programs. (p. 14)

The state plans to recruit high-quality charter school developers with proven programs. (p. 15)

The state will hold monthly meetings with sub-grantees. These meetings will allow for information sharing and support, and will serve as professional learning communities. (p. 16)

The applicant includes an outcome measure that projects that 100% of new schools will make AYP. This is a very ambitious goal. (p. 15)

The application has a clear plan for incentivizing developers to create schools that target at risk or secondary student populations. (p. 17)

The state will create a task force to address secondary school performance. (p. 18)

The state has a plan to assist charter governing boards to select ESPs in an effective and appropriate manner. (p. 20)

The state has a strong plan to communicate information related to the CSP program. (p. 24)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The data presented on page 10 shows charters are performing at a lower level than traditional public schools, which puts into question the capacity of charter schools assist educationally disadvantaged students. (p. 10)

The applicant states the goal of opening between 74-92 new schools in the abstract, but projects an increase of 42 overall in Outcome 1.1. It is not clear if the increase of 42 overall takes into account projected closures. (p.14)

Outcome 1.2 is a process measure and does not include any measure of actual schools opening. (p. 15)

Reader's Score: 28

Selection criteria - (ii) Flexibility afforded by State law

1. The degree of flexibility afforded by the SEA to charter schools under the State's charter school law.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a description of how the State's law establishes an administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering agency and exempts charter schools from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools.

The Secretary also encourages the applicant to include a description of the degree of autonomy charter schools have achieved over such matters as the charter school's budget, expenditures, daily operation, and personnel in accordance with their State's law.

Strengths:

Strengths

Charter schools have complete budgetary and administrative flexibility. (p. 38)

Charters are self-governing public entities that are permitted to contract with outside providers if they choose. (p. 39)

The state law provides for multiple authorizers.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Exemption from collective bargaining only applies to charters that use an ESP. (p. 39)

The state has a cap on the number of university authorized charter schools.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - (iii) Number of high-quality charters created

1. The number of high-quality charter schools to be created in the State.

Note: The Secretary considers the SEA's reasonable estimate of the number of new charter schools to be authorized and opened in the State during the three-year period of this grant.

The Secretary also considers how the SEA will inform each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and ensure that each charter school in the State receives the school's commensurate share of Federal education funds that are allocated by formula each year, including during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant proposes to open between 74-92 new schools, which is an ambitious goal.

Charter schools are considered their own LEA and receive federal funding. The state has strong processes in place to ensure that schools receive their commensurate share of federal funding, including the requirement that charters are required signatories on federal funding applications to the state.

The state plans to open ten new schools of excellence. (p. 40)

Charter schools that are in the lowest 5% will be closed. (p. 41)

A common master calendar has been created to assist charter administrators anticipate and prepare for federal grant opportunities. (p. 26)

Regional assistance is made available to assist with federal funding issues. (p. 27)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant places a great amount of focus on the Detroit area, even though there are other areas that would benefit from charter growth.

There is a cap on the number of charters.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - (iv) Quality of the management plan

- 1. 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 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.**

Note: In addition to describing the proposed objectives of the SEA charter school grant program and how these objectives will be fulfilled, the Secretary encourages applicants to provide descriptions of the steps to be taken by the SEA to award subgrant funds to eligible applicants desiring to receive these funds, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for assistance, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant provides a clear and detailed management plan that addresses all of the projected outcomes and related activities. The plan demonstrates that the applicant has the capacity to implement each of the activities listed, and to

achieve the outcomes projected.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The management plan lists outcome 4.3; however, the application does not include an outcome 4.3. (p. 47)

The plan does not include any information on the peer review process that will be used to determine if applications are high-quality. The lack of information on a peer review process makes it difficult to assess the capacity of the applicant to fund high quality schools that will lead to increased student achievement.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - (v) Authorizer accountability

- 1. The SEA's plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include providing authorized public chartering agency staff with training and assistance on planning and systems development, so as to improve the capacity of those agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.**

Strengths:

Strengths

The state has a checklist for performance contracts between charters and sponsors. (p. 49)

The application includes plans to conduct assurances and verification site visits to authorizers to ensure appropriate level of oversight, with technical assistance if needed. (p. 45)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The application does not include any plans to encourage the over 500 potential authorizers that are not authorizing charter schools. The application indicates that the authorizers with the most potential have the least amount of participation (p. 12), but does include a plan to tap into this source of potential growth.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - (vi) Dissemination activities

In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA:

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA,

(a) the quality of the dissemination activities.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including a description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant has revised its dissemination processes in response to West Ed report. (p. 50)

The state has defined success, and uses student achievement data to determine eligibility. (p. 50)

The applicant will use preference points to target the most sought after practices. (p. 51)

The state will develop dissemination programs that will also confer a benefit to the sub-grantee, which will incentivize participation. (p. 51)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The application does not include any information on the peer review process to be used to select dissemination sub-grantees.

Reader's Score: 12

2. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204 (f)(6) of the ESEA,

(b) the likelihood that those activities will improve student academic achievement.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

The state will use the statewide conference as a dissemination platform. (p. 50)

The state has plans to increase dissemination efforts through quarterly newsletters and a clearinghouse. (p. 52)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Sub Question

The application does not include any information on the peer review process to be used to select dissemination sub-grantees.

The application does not include any outcomes related to improvements in capacity or student achievement related to dissemination grants. There is no mechanism to determine if the dissemination grants are having an impact.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - (vii) Quality of the 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 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.**

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a strong evaluation plan in the application narrative and to use that plan, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period. The Secretary encourages the applicant to design the plan so that it includes (a) benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and (b) outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. In its plan, we encourage the applicant to identify the individual and/or organization that will serve as evaluator and to describe the qualifications of the evaluator. We also encourage the applicant to describe in its application, the evaluation design, indicating: (1) the types of data that will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) the methods that will be used; (4) the instruments that will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

Strengths

The state will conduct periodic reviews of grant related records and materials, with the findings submitted to the external evaluator. (p. 53)

The external evaluator will provide periodic reports to the state for review.

The activities of the external evaluator will assist the state in determining if their activities and strategies are yielding the desired results. For example, the evaluator will determine the effectiveness of the monthly meetings.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the monthly meetings and workshops will be based on participant feedback. (p. 56)

Reader's Score: 28

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/15/2010 10:05 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/05/2010 04:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation, Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	28
Sub Total	30	28
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	22
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	28
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	26
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	24
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	30
Sub Total	150	130
Total	210	188

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2010 84.282A - 2: 84.282A

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation,
Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - (i) CSP contribution to student achievement

1. The contribution the charter schools grant program will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged and other students to achieve State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicant to provide a description of the objectives for the SEA's charter school grant program and to explain how these objectives will be fulfilled, including steps taken by the SEA to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school grant program and how the SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Charter schools are a significant part of the state of Michigan's plan to turn around its economy. State policy makers have prioritized limited state resources for supporting the growth of charter schools in the state's most economically depressed areas. In particular, there are goals for the city of Detroit to have charter schools replacing the chronically failing schools. While charter school achievement levels lag state achievement levels as measured on tests of state academic standards, charter school achievement surpasses the achievement of students in traditional schools in their immediate vicinity. Michigan has high goals for academic achievement and graduation rates for its charter schools.

Michigan will give priority and provide incentive funding to programs serving at-risk and/or secondary students within high need communities (page 16).

Michigan has four objectives for its CSP grant program that align with the goals of the Federal Charter Schools Grant Program. Each objective has clear activities with measurable outcomes and benchmarks of progress toward the goal of high quality charter schools being supported from inception through application to an authorizer, successful implementation and dissemination of their successful practices.

Michigan will form a charter school performance task force that will help identify structures, tools and resources to support and improve all charter schools in general, and secondary schools in particular. This task force will include members from the charter school community, as well as those from the private, non-profit and foundation communities.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The legislative restrictions on new charter schools outside of Detroit limit the expansion of charter schools in new areas.

Many of the "new" charter schools can only happen if current charters are revoked due to the cap.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection criteria - (ii) Flexibility afforded by State law

1. The degree of flexibility afforded by the SEA to charter schools under the State's charter school law.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a description of how the State's law establishes an administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering agency and exempts charter schools from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools.

The Secretary also encourages the applicant to include a description of the degree of autonomy charter schools have achieved over such matters as the charter school's budget, expenditures, daily operation, and personnel in accordance with their State's law.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Charter schools are given flexibility and autonomy in all areas from academic programs to finances to contracts with employees (page 12). Charter schools are not required to participate with the MPSERS program which is costly. Specifically, if a charter school contracts with an ESP it is exempted from collective bargaining agreements (page 39).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - (iii) Number of high-quality charters created

1. The number of high-quality charter schools to be created in the State.

Note: The Secretary considers the SEA's reasonable estimate of the number of new charter schools to be authorized and opened in the State during the three-year period of this grant.

The Secretary also considers how the SEA will inform each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and ensure that each charter school in the State receives the school's commensurate share of Federal education funds that are allocated by formula each year, including during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Michigan anticipates 74-92 new charter schools with the majority of them in Detroit. This would increase the overall number by 10-15% (page 41).

Charter schools in Michigan are LEAs and receive information and technical assistance from the Michigan Department of Education identical to regular school districts. This includes support from the MDE's Office of Field Services for all Title and NCLB funding. Workshops are provided for all LEAs regarding drawing down these funds.

Regarding Federal Part B funding, the state reviews regional plans for providing special needs services and no funding flows without the MDE's approval. Charter schools can object to the plan.

The MDE and Michigan charter school association announce federal grant opportunities.

Michigan has a clear plan for ensuring that charter schools receive their commensurate Title I funding at start up and if there is significant expansion (greater than 50 students) by requiring reporting 120 days in advance. For cases under 50 there is no notice required.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

Some of the new charter schools will be "reprocessing" of charter schools due to charter schools closures. The absolute number of active charter schools will not increase at a tremendous rate.

The cap on charter schools makes it difficult to have growth in the number of charter schools sufficient to meet the currently expressed needs.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - (iv) Quality of the management plan

- 1. 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 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.**

Note: In addition to describing the proposed objectives of the SEA charter school grant program and how these objectives will be fulfilled, the Secretary encourages applicants to provide descriptions of the steps to be taken by the SEA to award subgrant funds to eligible applicants desiring to receive these funds, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for assistance, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

There are clear objectives, activities, responsible staff, timelines, milestones and measurable outcomes listed. The Public School Academies Program is housed in the MEA's division responsible for supporting schools' efforts toward improving student academic achievement which should increase the access of charter school staff to support from the MEA.

The resumes of the staff and consultants indicate that they are qualified to fulfill the responsibilities listed and familiar with the charter schools of Michigan.

The sub-grant announcements and application packets are clear and helpful for potential grant applicants. The rubrics are concise and helpful for both writing and reviewing.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

While peer reviewers are mentioned in the list of inputs the peer review process isn't explained in the narrative (page 55).

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - (v) Authorizer accountability

- 1. The SEA's plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include providing authorized public chartering agency staff with training and assistance on planning and systems development, so as to improve the capacity of those agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Michigan has a robust community of charter school authorizers. The MDE has developed an assurance and verification system and asks authorizers to "assure" the state how they oversee eighteen critical factors which include reporting and revocation/non-renewal (page 49).

The MEA has focused this grant cycle on improving the quality of charter school groups who apply to authorizers.

The MEA conducts regular visits to charter school authorizers "to ensure appropriate levels of ongoing charter school oversight and provide technical assistance if needed (page 20).

Michigan has a strong accountability mechanism in place to ensure that charter schools are consulted regarding special needs services and funding (page 34).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

There aren't activities specified to improve the capacity of authorizing agencies to authorize, monitor and hold accountable charter schools.

Reader's Score: 26

Selection Criteria - (vi) Dissemination activities

- 1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA:**

Reader's Score: 24

Sub Question

- 1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA,**

- (a) the quality of the dissemination activities.**

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including a description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Charter schools will "qualify" to participate in dissemination grants. MDE defines "best practice as a practice that meets all three of the following criteria: 1) the practice is based on current research, 2) the practice includes the latest knowledge and technology, and 3) use of the practice has proven successful across diverse student populations" (page 30).

The sub-grant announcement, application and scoring rubric are thorough and helpful.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The narrative lacks a description and timeline for the sub-grant award process and dissemination activities. While the state lists activities it will do to disseminate best practices, it isn't clear how the sub-grantees will disseminate their results.

Reader's Score: 12

2. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204 (f)(6) of the ESEA,

(b) the likelihood that those activities will improve student academic achievement.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

The state is committed to replicating best practices in current charter schools and has a clear description of what makes a school eligible to apply for the grant: "The state will fund dissemination projects that demonstrate proven strategies for improving performance; establish partnerships between high- and low-performing charter schools and/or traditional LEAs, and/or enrich current research involving the improvement of student performance and academic achievement" (page 22).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Evidence of previous successful transmission of best practices that had impacted student achievement would have strengthened the response.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - (vii) Quality of the 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 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.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a strong evaluation plan in the application narrative and to use that plan, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period. The Secretary encourages the applicant to design the plan so that it includes (a) benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and (b) outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. In its plan, we encourage the applicant to identify the individual and/or organization that will serve as evaluator and to describe the qualifications of the evaluator. We also encourage the applicant to describe in its application, the evaluation design, indicating: (1) the types of data that will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) the methods that will be used; (4) the instruments that will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and effective strategies for replication in other

settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Michigan has two components to their external evaluation. One focuses on "ongoing review and reporting of the state's progress toward its grant objectives" (page 56). The other is focused on comparing "student achievement in the state's charter schools" (page 56). Both components involve qualified and experienced evaluators. Participation rates for MEA activities, student achievement data, charter school contracts and participant feedback will all be part of the data collected (page 56).

The evaluation description is thorough and covers the objectives, performance measures and efficacy of the MEA in fulfilling these. The reports that the MEA will receive will "Assess progress and likelihood of completion for each of the benchmarks and activities in the management plan and recommend any adjustments that seem warranted.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/05/2010 04:33 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2010 05:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation, Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	17
Sub Total	30	17
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	22
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	15
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	22
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	8
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	30
Sub Total	150	97
Total	210	144

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2010 84.282A - 2: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation,
Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - (i) CSP contribution to student achievement

1. The contribution the charter schools grant program will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged and other students to achieve State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicant to provide a description of the objectives for the SEA's charter school grant program and to explain how these objectives will be fulfilled, including steps taken by the SEA to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school grant program and how the SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant successfully describes objectives for the SEA's charter schools grant program. Activities described within the application clearly articulates steps the SEA will take to achieve the 4 objectives. The applicant has established clear objectives, activities, and priorities that target educationally disadvantaged and other students in achieving State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards. Incentive funding (p. 37) will be provided to programs that target at-risk and/or secondary students within high need communities. Specific student achievement result targets are included (p14-26). The SEA already provides adequate outreach to charter schools and authorizers regarding the CSP grant program. The applicant has detailed a plan for future outreach efforts to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's grant program. These activities include press releases, personal communication, and monthly e-newsletters (p 24).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 30

Selection criteria - (ii) Flexibility afforded by State law

1. The degree of flexibility afforded by the SEA to charter schools under the State's charter school law.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a description of how the State's law establishes an administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering agency and exempts charter schools from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools.

The Secretary also encourages the applicant to include a description of the degree of autonomy charter schools have achieved over such matters as the charter school's budget, expenditures, daily operation, and personnel in accordance with their State's law.

Strengths:

Strengths

The State's charter school law allows charter schools to act in every way as any other public schools district. Charter schools have complete budgetary and administrative flexibility (p 38). Unlike non-charter LEA's, charter schools have the ability to contract with outside providers for the services of instructional and administrative personnel (p. 39).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant does not describe the administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering agency. Only minimal detail was provided for exemptions charter schools have from significant State or local rules that inhibit flexible operation and management.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - (iii) Number of high-quality charters created**1. The number of high-quality charter schools to be created in the State.**

Note: The Secretary considers the SEA's reasonable estimate of the number of new charter schools to be authorized and opened in the State during the three-year period of this grant.

The Secretary also considers how the SEA will inform each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and ensure that each charter school in the State receives the school's commensurate share of Federal education funds that are allocated by formula each year, including during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant provides a very detailed description of how charter schools are informed about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and assurance that charter schools receive their commensurate share of federal funding. MDE considers all charter schools their own LEA in terms of federal funding. This ensures they receive their federal funding according to formula directly from the granting agency. (p 28) Substantial efforts are made through a consolidated application, notices sent to LEA's, and website postings to notify charter schools of their eligibility of federal funds. Grant application workshops are also conducted as an informational tool. (p26-27).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant's estimate of 74-92 charter schools to be authorized over the 5 year grant period is highly ambitious. The applicant has not provided adequate data and support to enforce such a number.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - (iv) Quality of the management plan**1. 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 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.**

Note: In addition to describing the proposed objectives of the SEA charter school grant program and

how these objectives will be fulfilled, the Secretary encourages applicants to provide descriptions of the steps to be taken by the SEA to award subgrant funds to eligible applicants desiring to receive these funds, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for assistance, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

The management plan was sufficient to meet the objectives of the proposed project. Activities, timelines, milestones, staff assignments are all detailed and reasonable to meet the objectives of the program.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address the steps to be taken to award subgrant funds to eligible applicants. The applicant also did not provide a description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for assistance, timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - (v) Authorizer accountability

1. The SEA's plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include providing authorized public chartering agency staff with training and assistance on planning and systems development, so as to improve the capacity of those agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant provides a description on the way Michigan law hold charter authorizers accountable. The applicant states "Michigan law explicitly states that authorizers are responsible to ensure that public school academies they authorize follow local, state and federal laws. Failure of an authorizer to ensure compliance is subject to direct sanction from the SPI" (p 49)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant does not provide a description of technical assistance to improve the capacity of public chartering agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - (vi) Dissemination activities

1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA:

Reader's Score: 8

Sub Question

1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA,

(a) the quality of the dissemination activities.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including a description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant provides a description of the steps the SEA has taken in response to West Ed's monitoring visit to ensure dissemination subgrantees are providing detailed responses to Section 5204(b)(4 and 5). Only schools achieving at least 70% student proficiency and demonstrating financial stability are invited to apply. (p 50)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant does not fully describe the steps to be taken to award these funds to eligible applicants. A description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination and the timelines for awarding such funds was not included in the response.

Reader's Score: 8

2. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204 (f)(6) of the ESEA,

(b) the likelihood that those activities will improve student academic achievement.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

None

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

A response to 6b was not included.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - (vii) Quality of the 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 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.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a strong evaluation plan in the application narrative and to use that plan, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period. The Secretary encourages the applicant to design the plan so that it includes (a) benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and (b) outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. In its plan, we encourage the applicant to identify the individual and/or organization that will serve as evaluator and to describe the qualifications of the evaluator. We also encourage the applicant to describe in its application, the evaluation design, indicating: (1) the types of data that will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) the methods that will be used; (4) the instruments that will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant provides a very complete, comprehensive evaluation plan. The plan is highly appropriate to shape the development of the project from beginning to end. The plan requires an outside evaluator working in conjunction with internal staff to achieve a series of outputs and outcomes which will clearly guide the state in achieving project goals and objectives. (p52-60)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 30

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/13/2010 05:18 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/16/2010 11:13 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation, Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	22
Sub Total	30	22
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	20
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	24
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	26
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	22
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	28
Sub Total	150	120
Total	210	167

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2010 84.282A - 2: 84.282A

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation,
Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - (i) CSP contribution to student achievement

1. The contribution the charter schools grant program will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged and other students to achieve State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicant to provide a description of the objectives for the SEA's charter school grant program and to explain how these objectives will be fulfilled, including steps taken by the SEA to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school grant program and how the SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State.

Strengths:

Strengths

Applicant will replicate strong models with Schools of Excellence program. SOE permitted in districts with graduation rate below 75% for prior three years so will target educationally disadvantaged children. Retain 10% of funding to specifically target at risk children. Legislation requires closure of lowest performing 5% of charter schools. Good outreach programs to communicate program to teachers, parents and communities.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

University authorizers remain capped at 150 schools. Some inconsistencies in activities. E.g. applicant plans to issue 100 planning grants to Michigan's strongest developers. Yet only 52 schools currently score > 60% proficient in reading and math (p37). Inconsistency between Outcome 1.1 which shows growth of 42 charters and later outcomes targeting two times as much growth.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection criteria - (ii) Flexibility afforded by State law

1. The degree of flexibility afforded by the SEA to charter schools under the State's charter school law.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a description of how the State's law establishes an administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering agency and exempts charter schools from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools.

The Secretary also encourages the applicant to include a description of the degree of autonomy charter schools have achieved over such matters as the charter school's budget, expenditures, daily operation, and personnel in accordance with their State's law.

Strengths:

Strengths

State law grants considerable flexibility to charter schools and permits use of EMO's and CMO's to operate charter schools. Through use of CMO's charters are not required to participate in the Michigan State Pension system and offer a wide variety of compensation and benefit packages. Charters are free to locate anywhere in the state. Charters in Michigan have LEA status and obtain own school codes from the MDE.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Cap limitation of 150 on university granted charters. Schools of Excellence are excepted from the overall cap, however they are limited to 10 new schools.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - (iii) Number of high-quality charters created**1. The number of high-quality charter schools to be created in the State.**

Note: The Secretary considers the SEA's reasonable estimate of the number of new charter schools to be authorized and opened in the State during the three-year period of this grant.

The Secretary also considers how the SEA will inform each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and ensure that each charter school in the State receives the school's commensurate share of Federal education funds that are allocated by formula each year, including during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly.

Strengths:

Strengths

2 cyber charters to be authorized as well as 10 new Schools of Excellence plus up to 10 conversions of quality charter schools to SOE status. Federal funding flows directly to charters. Lowest quality charters to be closed.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

List of total Possible New Michigan Charter Schools is overly optimistic. Thirty charters are shown as being available due to other possible closures. Yet with 20 being closed under RTTT it is unlikely that this many would be available. 10 Vacant Urban High Academy charters are listed as being available for Detroit yet this authorization is several years old and has not produced any new school yet. Therefore it is unlikely to produce that many new charters, especially with the new SOE charters.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - (iv) Quality of the management plan

1. **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 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.**

Note: In addition to describing the proposed objectives of the SEA charter school grant program and how these objectives will be fulfilled, the Secretary encourages applicants to provide descriptions of the steps to be taken by the SEA to award subgrant funds to eligible applicants desiring to receive these funds, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for assistance, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

Activities are tied to objectives. Clear plan with activities to reach all objectives. Objectives are in line with purposes of the CSP.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Not all Milestones match up with Objectives. Under Planning and Implementation activity objective is to "Work to recruit high-quality developers..." with a milestone of 10 high-quality programs. Under "Other Activities" the milestone is one per year for a total of 5. Most timelines are Ongoing even though corresponding Milestone provides a specific date for completion.

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - (v) Authorizer accountability

1. **The SEA's plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include providing authorized public chartering agency staff with training and assistance on planning and systems development, so as to improve the capacity of those agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.**

Strengths:

Strengths

A network of established practices has been developed to provide consistency of authorizer practices. MDE has developed and uses a list of 18 critical factors to be performed by authorizers. Failure to perform these functions leads to sanctions by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Charter school performance reports are required to be prepared annually. Lowest performing 5% of charters to be identified and published by MDE. SPI may suspend the power of authorization if an authorizer does not provide required information to the MDE.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 26

Selection Criteria - (vi) Dissemination activities

1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA:

Reader's Score: 22

Sub Question

1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA,
 - (a) the quality of the dissemination activities.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including a description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

Dissemination grants focused on activities that achieve good academic outcomes. Only stable charter schools with high proficiency achievement may apply for dissemination grants. Dissemination takes place at an annual School Improvement Conference to obtain more and shared exposure to all LEA's. Bonus points provided to applications demonstrating success with academically underachieving students.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No peer review or other process presented to score and evaluate applications.

Reader's Score: 12

2. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204 (f)(6) of the ESEA,
 - (b) the likelihood that those activities will improve student academic achievement.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

Strengths

Applicant targets specific types of dissemination grants that support replication of successful charter schools and

Sub Question

allow for research to support achievements and make them available to others.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No rubric provided for evaluation of grants to demonstrate success in improving academic achievement.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - (vii) Quality of the 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 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.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a strong evaluation plan in the application narrative and to use that plan, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period. The Secretary encourages the applicant to design the plan so that it includes (a) benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and (b) outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. In its plan, we encourage the applicant to identify the individual and/or organization that will serve as evaluator and to describe the qualifications of the evaluator. We also encourage the applicant to describe in its application, the evaluation design, indicating: (1) the types of data that will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) the methods that will be used; (4) the instruments that will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

Strengths

Based on using an objective outside evaluator to perform evaluations or, if evaluation is performed internally to audit the internal findings. Short and medium term outcomes are identified so changes can be made if activity isn't accomplishing stated objective. Evaluation calendar to be established with periodic (3X per year) reviews. Evaluations closely tied to grant objectives. Dissemination grants to be evaluated as well as planning and implementation sub-grants. Outside evaluator identified and is well qualified.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 28

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/16/2010 11:13 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/09/2010 09:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation, Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	29
Sub Total	30	29
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	19
Sub Total	30	19
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	25
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	25
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	25
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	21
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	30
Sub Total	150	126
Total	210	174

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2010 84.282A - 2: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Michigan Department of Education -- Office of Education Improvement & Innovation,
Public School Academy Program (U282A100003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - (i) CSP contribution to student achievement

1. The contribution the charter schools grant program will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged and other students to achieve State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicant to provide a description of the objectives for the SEA's charter school grant program and to explain how these objectives will be fulfilled, including steps taken by the SEA to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school grant program and how the SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

The objectives and related activities outlined are specific, measurable and aligned with targeting the academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged students.

35 of the 42 new charter schools in Michigan will be located in Detroit. (page 14, outcome 1.1)

The proposal provides additional incentives with expected achievement benchmarks for educationally disadvantaged students (page 14, paragraph 3).

The application states as an objective that 100% of new charter schools will meet AYP (page 15, outcome 1.3).

The state will retain up to 10% of funding for schools that are targeting at-risk secondary pupils and half of that funding will be provided to schools that reach performance targets. (page 16, outcome 2.1, bullet 1)

Outcome 2.3 sets an expectation of 3% annual increase in the performance of charter school students (page 18).

There are extensive plans for providing information about the grant program.

(providing quarterly state and regional workshops to inform interested school developers with at least 100 attendees (page 15, paragraph 2), website updates (page 14, last paragraph)).

The application provides significant detail about how best practices will be disseminated.

Subgrantees are required to participate in workshops and training (page 15, bullet 4).

A Charter School Performance task Force will meet quarterly to identify tools and resources to improve charter schools (page 18, outcome 2.4, bullet 1).

Best practices in fiscal management of charter schools will be disseminated (page 21, outcome 3.4, bullet 1).

Strong learning communities of subgrantees will be developed, which can leverage support of best practices by holding monthly meetings (page 23, outcome 4.2, bullet 1).

Best practices will be distributed through an e-newsletter, online webcasts, and a web-based clearinghouse (page 23, outcome 4.2, bullet 2).

Individual teachers are identified as a group to which information about the program will be provided (page 24, paragraph 2).

Subgrantees will post information about practices they recommend (page 31, paragraph 2).

MDE publications contain promising practices sections targeting authorizers and charter schools (page 31, paragraph 2).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The application does not state a control group to which the performance of funded schools may be compared. (page 17, outcome 2.2)

The application does not discuss the current achievement levels of students in charter schools.

Reader's Score: 29

Selection criteria - (ii) Flexibility afforded by State law

1. The degree of flexibility afforded by the SEA to charter schools under the State's charter school law.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a description of how the State's law establishes an administrative relationship between the charter school and the authorized public chartering agency and exempts charter schools from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools.

The Secretary also encourages the applicant to include a description of the degree of autonomy charter schools have achieved over such matters as the charter school's budget, expenditures, daily operation, and personnel in accordance with their State's law.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Charters are considered LEA's for federal funding purposes. (page 28, paragraph 2)

In addition to the LEA, colleges may authorize charter schools. (page 36, paragraph 2)

Charter schools have the ability to contract with outside service providers. (page 39, paragraph 1)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The exception from collective bargaining only applies to charter with an ESP (page 39).

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - (iii) Number of high-quality charters created

1. The number of high-quality charter schools to be created in the State.

Note: The Secretary considers the SEA's reasonable estimate of the number of new charter schools to be authorized and opened in the State during the three-year period of this grant.

The Secretary also considers how the SEA will inform each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and ensure that each charter school in the State receives the school's commensurate share of Federal education funds that are allocated by formula each year,

including during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

The increase of 10% to 15% of the number of charter schools in the next three to five years is reasonable (page 41, paragraph 2).

Charter Schools are provided with the same information about federal programs as provided to the LEA's through the MDE website and MEGS (page 27, paragraphs 3 and 4).

The application goes beyond providing information about federal grants to providing highly quality training on state and federal regulatory requirements (page 20, bullet 2) and support for developing sound fiscal practices such as monthly meetings and data analysis (page 21,outcome 3.3, bullets 3 and 4).

MDE ensures federal funding for charters that are new or expanding by conducting a special data collection each year (page 29, paragraph 2).

Charter Schools receive their own MEIS codes, allowing them to directly draw down on federal funds (page 38, last paragraph).

The SEA is closing charter schools that are listed in the bottom 5% of all schools in the state (page 40, last paragraph).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

There exists a cap on the number of charters, although the application does not specify how close the state is to the cap. (page 35, paragraph 3).

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - (iv) Quality of the management plan

- 1. 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 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.**

Note: In addition to describing the proposed objectives of the SEA charter school grant program and how these objectives will be fulfilled, the Secretary encourages applicants to provide descriptions of the steps to be taken by the SEA to award subgrant funds to eligible applicants desiring to receive these funds, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for assistance, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

The management plan consistently aligns grant objectives with deadlines, quantifiable process and outcome measures, defined responsibilities, and milestones. For example, the PSAP will monitor qualifying programs so that they reach student achievement levels that are 5% higher than the standard measures which will be reported annually by 6/30 (page 43, row 3).

The resumes of the consultants indicate a capacity to support the plan.

The peer review process is described (page 5).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

Objectives are not clearly aligned with activities in management plan (page 42).

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - (v) Authorizer accountability

- 1. The SEA's plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include providing authorized public chartering agency staff with training and assistance on planning and systems development, so as to improve the capacity of those agencies to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Michigan State Law requires authorizers to ensure charter schools are following local, state and federal laws. (page 49, paragraph 3)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

There are no plans to encourage the authorizers in the state to begin authorizing schools.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - (vi) Dissemination activities

In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA:

Reader's Score: 21

Sub Question

Sub Question

1. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204(f)(6) of the ESEA,
 - (a) the quality of the dissemination activities.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including a description of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

The SEA defines success as reaching at least 70% proficiency rather than having charter schools self-identify best practices. (page 50, paragraph 3)

Charter schools are asked to partner with external, university-quality researchers. (page 50, last paragraph)

Timeline is described in the management plan (pages 43-44)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

Peer review process is not described. (pages 50-52)

The external evaluator's role does not include analyzing student outcomes. (pages 50-52)

Reader's Score: 13

2. In the case of SEAs that propose to use grant funds to support dissemination activities under section 5204 (f)(6) of the ESEA,
 - (b) the likelihood that those activities will improve student academic achievement.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to describe the steps to be taken by the SEA to award these funds to eligible applicants, including descriptions of the peer review process the SEA will use to review applications for dissemination, the timelines for awarding such funds, and how the SEA will assess the quality of the applications.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

The SEA standardizes the venue for sharing best practices so that charter schools may assemble high-quality, data-based practices. (page 50, last paragraph)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

Activities are not aligned with student outcomes. (pages 50-52)

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - (vii) Quality of the 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 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.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to include a strong evaluation plan in the application narrative and to use that plan, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period. The Secretary encourages the applicant to design the plan so that it includes (a) benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and (b) outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning or other important outcomes for project participants. In its plan, we encourage the applicant to identify the individual and/or organization that will serve as evaluator and to describe the qualifications of the evaluator. We also encourage the applicant to describe in its application, the evaluation design, indicating: (1) the types of data that will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) the methods that will be used; (4) the instruments that will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Internal and external evaluations are described specifically and aligned with objectives and outcomes, explicitly state types of data tracked, instruments, how the data will be analyzed and when reports will become available pages 53-57).

The evaluators at Stanford and Michigan are described with details and are qualified to undertake the evaluation (page 56)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

None noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/09/2010 09:03 PM