

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2010 04:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	28
Sub Total	30	28
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	28
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	25
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	22
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	15
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	20
Sub Total	150	110
Total	210	163

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

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

NHCSP will provide priority points for schools that propose to work with at-risk students and provide additional funding. (p.17)

State already has several secondary schools that are serving at-risk students. (p.18)

The application includes an ambitious AYP goal. (p19)

The application includes plans to broadcast via paper and electronic means to inform all NH residents, charter schools, districts, colleges, libraries, and other non-profit community organizations of the availability of CSP funds. (p.23)

There are several publications that highlight charter school options (p. 23)

The state has undertaken competency based learning reform, and included charter schools. (p.24)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No plan for outreach in regards to the priority points and additional funds- if the plan is to incentivize, potential developers need to know prior to submitting an application.

No outreach plan associated with increasing the number of schools.

For objective three (3), there are no performance measures associated with actual improvements in academic achievement. (p. 20)

Reader's Score: 25

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 application indicates a strong state law with an automatic exemption from state laws and rules. (p. 25)

New Hampshire law includes a provision for direct funding of schools from the state. (p.25)

Each charter school governing board approves it owns budget. (p27)

The daily operations of charter schools are overseen by the school director (p. 27)

Trustees have complete authority for selecting, hiring, and firing charter school personnel. (p. 28)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The state law includes a prohibition against more than governing board members serving on multiple boards. (p. 26)

Reader's Score: 28

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 goal associated with the number of new charter schools is very ambitious, and although the number seems small, comparatively it seems appropriate.

Strong outreach approach regarding federal funds, including direct mailings, email distribution lists, and monthly meetings. (p.29)

The application includes a plan for grant funding workshops. (p.29)

New Hampshire has strong state laws on federal funding. (p.30)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The application did not detail any mechanisms that are currently to ensure schools receive the funds or any plans to develop and implement such a mechanism or process.

Reader's Score: 28

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 number of staff (2) seems appropriate to carry out the proposed activities. (p.35)

Staff will develop a detailed work plan using the management plan and logic model included in the application. (p. 40)

The peer review process includes training on both federal and state charter school law, and program priorities and objectives.

The plan includes monthly meetings with charter developers. (p. 43)

The application includes monthly reporting requirements. (p. 44)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No explanation of the scoring system to be used for grant reviews. Application indicates that applications are scored to determine approval or disapproval, but does not include any information on what constitutes a passing score. This makes it very difficult to assess if the state has a plan to control for quality. (p. 43)

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

The applicant has plans to attend monthly meeting with authorizers to provide support and technical assistance. (p. 47)

State report from authorizers, summarizing their activities, and the performance of their charter schools are required. (p. 48)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The application discusses the program evaluation completed by the Charter School advisory Committee, but does not include any plans to address the findings. (p. 49)

The application contains no plans around authorizer accountability outside of what the Department is already doing.

The application does not include any objectives related to improving capacity of authorizers.

Reader's Score: 22

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: 15

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 plans to broadcast the availability of funds across the state. (p. 50)

The application includes priority for partnerships between high quality schools and those schools or districts in need of improvement, as defined by ESEA. (p. 50)

The timeline for RFP and fund dispersal is appropriate. (p. 50)

Application includes a good set of criteria, including need statement, backup data supporting the need, goals that are aligned with the needs, and project activities. (p. 51)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The application does not include any indication as to scoring system to be used when assessing the quality of applications.

Replication section is unclear.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

The application includes priority for partnerships between high quality schools and those schools or districts in need of improvement, as defined by ESEA. (p. 50)

Weaknesses:

The budget does not support quality dissemination activities. Application proposes a total of 15 dissemination activities (3 per year), which will result in dissemination subgrants of approximately \$40,000 each. Difficult to see

Sub Question

how this little bit of funding will support necessary activities.

The are no student achievement outcomes associated with this objective.

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 qualifications for the eventual evaluator are strong and appropriate. (p. 53)

Performance measure 2d is a unique measure. (p. 56)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

AYP is the only student achievement data used for objective one (1). (p. 55)

Performance measure for objective two does not require any growth or improvement, only meeting or exceeding statewide averages. This assumes statewide improvement. (p. 56)

No interim data analysis for performance measure 2a. This makes it difficult to determine if mid-course corrections are needed. (p.56)

There are no student achievement outcomes for objective 3. (p. 56)

No timelines for interim reports by evaluator.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2010 04:26 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	26
Sub Total	30	26
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	16
Sub Total	30	16
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	26
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	6
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	28
Sub Total	150	110
Total	210	152

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

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 application provides priority funding for charters that target disadvantaged students in chronically low performing districts. (p 10, paragraphs 2 and 3 and page 17, paragraph 1)

Charter high schools have a high enrollment of former high school drop outs (34%) but the drop-out rate of these schools is lower than the state average. (page 10, paragraph 4)

Charters attain a higher rate of AYP (81.81%) than district schools (44.27%). (page 11, chart)

Parents and the public are informed through public service announcements such as newspapers, online publications, and television. (page 23, paragraph 1)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

There was no timeframe for dissemination. (page 21)

Reader's Score: 26

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

Provisions of the law permit charter school boards of trustees to operate as a non-profit corporation, acquire real property, receive and disburse funds, make contracts, and solicit and manage grants and gifts allow charters autonomy in financial operations. (page 8, paragraph 1)

Charter schools are assured further autonomy by state law allowing charters to be exempt from all regulations except those relating to anti-discrimination, state and federal health and safety standards, compulsory attendance laws, and annual student assessments. (page 8, paragraph 2)

Weaknesses:

There is cap of 20 charters that can be authorized by the SEA. (page 7, paragraph 1)

Flexibility of charter school leadership is hampered by the requirement that all charter school employees be considered public employees for the purposes of collective bargaining. (page 28, last paragraph)

Reader's Score: 16

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 SEA ensures that charter schools are informed about federal funds by postings on the state website, sending direct mailings to all eligible applicants, sending notices on email distribution lists, and a calendar of deadlines for federal programs sent to all schools. (pages 12-13)

The state disburses federal funds directly to charter schools (page 13, paragraph 2)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The SEA does not appear to have the capacity to open 20 charters in five years when only 12 have opened in seven years (Abstract, p e0, paragraphs 3 and 4)

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

Peer review process and training is specified in the application. (page 42, paragraph 1)

The plan includes specific time lines and measurable goals and activities supporting the objects and driving student achievement (page 37)

Responsibilities of staff are explicitly stated (pages 36-46)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The capacity to implement the plan may be hampered by staffing only two FTE's for nineteen activities. (p 35, paragraph 3)

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

There is a state committee that oversees charter schools and charter authorizers that issues an annual report. The committee is independent, as it is chaired by the chair of the Education Department of the University of New Hampshire. (page 48, paragraph 4)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The Charter School Advisory Committee has only an advisory capacity to direct authorizers. (page 47)

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: 6

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 time line for the activities was clearly outlined. (pages 37-39)

The peer review process is described with detail. (page e41)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The manner in which quality would be assessed is not described. (page e52)

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 6

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 given.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

The application lacked specifics on how successful programs would be replicated. (page e52)
The impact for the dissemination activities on student achievement was not clear. (pages 37-39)

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 qualifications for the external evaluator are appropriate. (page e52)

Performance measures are linked with precision to objectives. For example, performance measure 1c, "at least 85% of charter schools will meet AYP," supports the objective of increasing the number of high quality charter schools. (page 55)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

AYP is the only achievement data measured. (pages 55-58)
There are no timelines for interim reports (pages 55-58).

Reader's Score: **28**

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/05/2010 04:28 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

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	26
Sub Total	30	26
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	28
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	25
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	22
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	16
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	25
Sub Total	150	116
Total	210	170

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

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

New Hampshire clearly specifies four objectives that are aligned with the Charter Schools Program State Educational Agency Grant (pages 19-21). There is a clear statement of the desire to support educationally disadvantaged students, especially those in rural NH (page 17). The activities to be funded and their performance measures are listed several times in the application. New Hampshire has cultivated a communication network and plans to use the NHDOE website to inform teachers, parents and communities of the opportunities afforded by the charter school grant program (page 23). The NHDOE has already highlighted charter schools as schools of choice in two documents and has distributed these documents in public schools and libraries and on the web (page 23).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

Even though there is evidence that students who have dropped out of school or are at risk of dropping out are being recruited to charter schools and actually graduating from high school, it isn't clear how the program intends to find the students and their parents.

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: The application cites code regarding the independence of charter schools and their legal standing in the state. Charter schools have autonomy regarding budget, curricula, salaries, contracts and employment. The schools can employ up to 50% non-certified teaching staff (pages 24-28).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES: Monthly required reports may be overly burdensome and bureaucratically demanding.

Reader's Score: 26

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 stated goal of twenty new charter schools shows an aggressive position in expanding charter school accessibility for students across the state (page 29). The application includes descriptions for how all federal funding sources and opportunities will be made known to charter schools. Seeing federal funds beyond Title I and IDEA listed explicitly indicates a thoroughness and commitment to equity for all students. Timeliness for adjustments is also addressed (pages 29, 30).

The State's position that special services are provided by the "home district" of the students ensures uninterrupted services for students.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

There isn't a clear definition of "high quality" in the application process. While the application and the rubric are provided, there isn't a minimum score listed.

Reader's Score: 28

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 application includes explicit responsibilities for staff and timelines for activities and milestones in accomplishing the stated objectives (pages 36-46).

The staff is highly qualified to manage a large project and has experience with the statewide community needs of New Hampshire.

There are clear statutory and regulatory requirements for the staff with regards to reporting and monitoring and the mechanisms are already in place to do so (page 44, 45).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES: There are several milestones that are difficult to measure: "partnerships created between charter schools" (page 37), "Program evaluation completed and refinements to dissemination program made" (page 39), and "Program evaluation completed, refinements made" (page 40).

It isn't clear how the NHCSP will follow their prioritization while using rolling application dates (page 43).

As the number of charter schools increase, it isn't clear how the NHCSP will be able to meet all of the needs for technical assistance for all of the charter schools. Especially challenging will be the increase in number of reports received every month to which the NHCSP will have to respond with critical feedback and technical assistance.

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:

The NHCSP has established the practice of monthly meetings with local authorizers and built a rapport (page 47). The NHCSP has taken a proactive position in working with local authorizers and taking advantage of the charter school statute changes of 2009 to simplify and streamline the application process (pages 46, 47). It also provides workshops for authorizers.

The Charter School Advisory Committee has a diverse and well-informed membership and does an annual program evaluation and assists in policy development (page 49).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

It seems that the role of monitoring and holding charter schools accountable rests more with the NHCSF than with the individual authorizers.

There doesn't seem to be any authority in the Charter School Advisory Committee to cause changes in authorizers.

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: 16

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 respondent provided a copy of the application for the sub-grant.

There will be a funding priority given to replication activities.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

While funding priority is to be given to replication activities, there are no other acceptable activities listed.

The respondent doesn't provide a description of a peer review process, a rubric for evaluating the applications or a cutoff score for determining eligibility for the sub-grant.

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.

Sub Question

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 replication of successful programs in NH with peer mentoring seems very likely to result in improved student academic achievement.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

There isn't an emphasis on disseminating best practices to the charter school community in general or to the traditional schools in the state.

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

Three of the objectives listed by the NHCSP have performance measures that include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the goals of the Charter Schools Program State Educational Agency Grant. These include the number of charter schools started each year, percentages of charter schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress, percentages of charter schools meeting or exceeding statewide average assessment scores, graduation rates for charter schools exceeding the statewide average every year, and percentage of charter schools open three years or longer remaining financially viable (page 55-58).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

"85% of charter school students will meet or exceed personally established goals set by students themselves that are measurable and recorded in the annual report of their charter schools" seems like a low number for student set goals

(page 56). Performance Measures 3 c and 4 rely on self-reporting "increased knowledge and awareness" as measures of effectiveness (pages 57, 58). These measures also only require 80% of participants to self-report an increase.

Reader's Score: 25

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/05/2010 04:28 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
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	25
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	20
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	22
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	30
Sub Total	150	117
Total	210	167

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

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

Program objectives, activities and performance measures well defined (p18-22.) Program provides additional support for districts classified as a District in Need of Improvement by allowing grant size to be increased by an additional 10%. Grant information dissemination plan is outlined however no time frame is specified. Data is presented to show that charters are significantly outperforming districts in meeting AYP.

Weaknesses:

20 new schools over 5 years appears optimistic given the current cap of 20 schools authorized by the State Board. Pending bill would raise the cap but it has not passed yet. Priority is to educationally disadvantaged students yet the performance measure requires only 25% of new schools to meet this target.

Reader's Score: 25

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 independent of their LEA except for special education and have programmatic and governance flexibility. Funding is provided directly to charter schools by the State. Only 50% of teachers must be certified and employees are not bound by district contracts. Employees are at will. Charters participate directly in state information database.

Weaknesses:

Special Education not independent of LEA. Charters do not appear to be their own LEA for federal funding purposes.

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

Plan in place using multiple strategies to reach out and inform of planning and implementation grant program. Charter schools receive a proportionate allocation of federal funding.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

20 new charters over 5 years is unrealistic given pipeline and history.

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

Management plan is comprehensive detailing specific activities, responsibilities , resources required and milestones tied to each program objective. Sub-grant funding amounts vary for different types of proposed charter school. Peer review process used for scoring.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Staffing of 2 fte's appears insufficient to design, implement and complete all 19 activities listed in the management plan. (p35-39)

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

New Hampshire has an alternative authorizer in the State Board of Education with the possible development of the New Hampshire University system.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Program evaluation and reporting is performed by a Charter School Advisory Committee comprised of education community professionals with possible conflicting interests and not permanent staff.

Reader's Score: 20

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

5% of grant funding to be used for dissemination sub-grants conducted through a competitive bidding process directed at charter schools with over 3 years of operation. Specific application review criteria have been created with priority given to applications replicating successful programs or support the start up of new charter schools. Workshops will be held on dissemination grant writing.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 15

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

Priority will be given to replication of successful programs. Applicant to provide data to demonstrate prior success.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No plan presented on how success of dissemination will be measured or evaluated.

Reader's Score: 7

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

Specific performance measures stated with data measurement collection, method of evaluation and analysis/reports required. Peer review process used for scoring.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: **30**

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
(i) CSP contribution to student achievement		
1. Student achievement	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
Selection criteria		
(ii) Flexibility afforded by State law		
1. Flexibility	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Selection Criteria		
(iii) Number of high-quality charters created		
1. Number of schools	30	28
(iv) Quality of the management plan		
1. Management plan	30	26
(v) Authorizer accountability		
1. Authorizer accountability	30	26
(vi) Dissemination activities		
1. Dissemination activities	30	20
(vii) Quality of the evaluation		
1. Evaluation	30	25
Sub Total	150	125
Total	210	177

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Hampshire Department of Education -- Department of Education, Instruction
(U282A100001)

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 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. The state awards the highest priority to schools that propose to increase academic achievement of students who are at greatest risk of not meeting challenging state academic standards or completing high school (p 17). The applicant has provided a description of the SEA's charter school grant program. The applicant has provided specific activities and performance measures for each objective (p19-22). The applicant has described steps taken by the SEA to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school grant program. These steps include public service announcements in newspapers, online publications, and PEG television stations (p 23)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address how the SEA will disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State.

Reader's Score: 25

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 applicant has clearly demonstrated how the State's charter school law empowers New Hampshire charter school boards of trustees with great educational, fiscal and social freedom. In 2006 the State took steps to further encourage flexibility by changing the way charter schools receive funding (p 25).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

A more detailed description of how the State's law establishes an administrative relationship between the charter schools and the authorized public chartering agency would have strengthened the response.

Reader's Score: 27

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's estimate of 20 charter schools to be authorized during the life of the grant is reasonable. 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. Some methods of outreach are posting announcements on the NHDOE website, sending direct mailings to all eligible applicants, using email distribution lists, and monthly meetings held with charter school director (p29).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant provides the law citations for the distribution of Federal funding (p 30). However, the applicant does not address how the SEA ensures the charter schools receive their commensurate share of Federal funds.

Reader's Score: 28

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. The applicant provides a clear description of the peer review process which will include at least 3 reviewers per application (p 42)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

It is unclear from the response how the milestones will be used to assess project progress (p36 -41).

Reader's Score: 26

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 of technical assistance provided to state and local authorizers. Monthly meetings are held regularly between the authorizers and NHCSP staff. During these meetings new academic approaches as well as public policy issues are addressed (p 47). Authorizers are held accountable through the submission of an annual report which summarizes authorizing activities as well as performance of its authorized schools (p 48).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

In regards to the annual report, the applicant states that "this information is then verified independently through the NHDOE Bureau of Accountability and Assessment and the NHCSP office" (p 48), the applicant does not indicate how this information is used to provide technical assistance to the authorizers.

Reader's Score: 26

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: 20

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 describes the steps to be taken to award these funds to eligible applicants. These steps include an RFP and review of submitted RFP's by an external review process (p 50). Review criteria are very specific in determining the quality of applications. Criteria include the needs to be addressed by the project, qualitative and quantitative information that supports the needs, goals, results and benefits of each goal, project activities and how they will accomplish the goals of the project, time line, and budget (p 51).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The response could be strengthened by providing more detail pertaining to the RFP process.

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 applicant provides a description of the external review process, which includes orientation to both federal and state charter law (p 50).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The response could have been strengthened by providing a direct link to the likelihood that dissemination activities will improve student academic achievement.

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

The applicant provides a comprehensive evaluation plan that includes objectives, performance measures, benchmarks, data collection, methods and instruments, and analysis and reports(p 55 - 58). The plan is highly appropriate to shape the development of the project from beginning to end. The minimum qualifications set for the evaluator are strong and appropriate to the project.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

AYP is the only student achievement data set to be collected. A more diverse collection of data would benefit the evaluation. Performance measures included in the plan are not requiring growth of the program as a whole.

Reader's Score: 25

Status: Submitted

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