

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2015 11:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oregon Department of Education (U282A150014)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
State-Level Strategy		
1. State-Level Strategy	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Policy Context for Charter Schools		
1. Policy Context	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Selection Criteria		
Past Performance		
1. Past Performance	10	7
Quality of Plan to Support Ed. Dis. Students		
1. Ed. Dis. Students	15	9
Vision for Growth and Accountability		
1. Growth and Accountability	10	9
Dissemination of Information and Best Practices		
1. Dissemination	10	6
Oversight of Public Chartering Agencies		
1. Oversight of Authorizers	15	12
Management Plan and Theory of Action		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	10
Sub Total	80	63
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes		
1. CPP 1	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Competitive Preference Priority		
Authorizer other than LEA or Appeal Process		

1. CPP 2

	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	120	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SEA Panel - 5: 84.282A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Oregon Department of Education (U282A150014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - State-Level Strategy

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the State-level strategy for using charter schools to improve educational outcomes for students throughout the State. In determining the quality of the State-level strategy, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA 's CSP activities, including the subgrant program, are integrated into the State s overall strategy for improving student academic achievement and attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates) and closing achievement and attainment gaps, and complement or leverage other statewide education reform efforts;

2) The extent to which funding equity for charter schools (including equitable funding for charter school facilities) is incorporated into the SEA' s State-level strategy; and

3) The extent to which the State encourages local strategies for improving student academic achievement and attainment that involve charter schools, including but not limited to the following:

i. Collaboration, including the sharing of data and promising instructional and other practices, between charter schools and other public schools or providers of early learning and development programs or alternative education programs; and

ii. The creation of charter schools that would serve as viable options for students who currently attend, or would otherwise attend, the State 's lowest-performing schools.

Strengths:

The applicant provides comprehensive detail regarding the state-level strategy and the state's overall four basic purposes for improving student performance. State-wide, four goals pertain to all schools: educational equity through an intensive incubation period for charters in developmental stage, equitable access to professional development for charters within the first three years, to facilitate dissemination of best practices, and to strengthen authorizer quality, all with an end goal of improving student academic achievement and attainment and with a focus on reducing achievement gaps of historically underserved populations. A primary focus of the state strategy is to also reduce exclusionary discipline practices. The plan is detailed and comprehensive in that all goals and supports are strategically focused on improving academic achievement in both charter schools and traditional schools, using the same measures of performance (pp.e28-30).

The applicant's funding strategy provides for charter schools to receive all eligible funds, to access professional development opportunities, and to receive dissemination of best practices. Charter schools have equal access to the same services, goods, and supports as traditional schools including data sharing mechanisms; local LEAs are encouraged to include charters in all programming. This is adequate in terms of equity (pp. e30-31).

The applicant states that charter schools are part of the local LEA's portfolio of services and thus, have access to all services; charter schools are viable options for all families residing within the LEA. Collaboration is encouraged between all schools within an LEA. For instance, many districts provide facilities at a reduced rate or free to charters schools although law does not require this. This is adequate in terms of collaboration (pp. e20-32).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Policy Context for Charter Schools

1. The Secretary considers the policy context for charter schools under the proposed project. In determining the policy context for charter schools under the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The degree of flexibility afforded to charter schools under the State's charter school law, including:

i. The extent to which charter schools in the State are exempt from State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools; and

ii. The extent to which charter schools in the State have a high degree of autonomy, including autonomy over the charter schools budget, expenditures, staffing, procurement, and curriculum;

2) The quality of the SEA's processes for:

i. Annually informing each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and Federal programs in which the charter school may participate; and

ii. Annually ensuring that each charter school in the State receives, in a timely fashion, the school's commensurate share of Federal funds that are allocated by formula each year, particularly during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly; and

3) The quality of the SEA's plan to ensure that charter schools that are considered to be LEAs under State law and LEAs in which charter schools are located will comply with sections 613(a)(5) and 613(e)(1)(B) of IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101, et seq.), title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq.), title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681, et seq.), and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794).

Strengths:

The applicant states autonomy is addressed through state statute (p. e32). Flexibility extends to budgeting, models of instruction, hiring, curricular models, and professional development. This implies a great degree of flexibility for charters not enjoyed by counterparts. This is evidence of autonomy granted to charters only.

The applicant states many state departments ensure charters receive equitable shares of federal monies (p. e33). For example, Oregon charters receive their share of Title 1 dollars. The applicant satisfied that charters receive both timely notification and equitable consideration.

In order to receive federal funds such as Title 1 and Title 2, eligibility is ensured (p. e34). State law prohibits discrimination as per federal guidelines.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specify how the LEA actually communicates with charter schools. More detail regarding communication pathways is needed (p. e33).

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Past Performance

1. The Secretary considers the past performance of charter schools in a State that enacted a charter school law for the first time five or more years before submission of its application. In determining the past performance of charter schools in such a State, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which there has been a demonstrated increase, for each of the past five years, in the number and percentage of high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State;

2) The extent to which there has been a demonstrated reduction, for each of the past five years, in the number and percentage of academically poor-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State; and

3) Whether, and the extent to which, the academic achievement and academic attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates) of charter school students equal or exceed the academic achievement and academic attainment of similar students in other public schools in the State over the past five years.

Strengths:

The applicant states charter schools have increased in volume 186% since 2004, currently enrolling 21,000 children, equaling 14% of all Oregon schools, many of which have become Model Schools with high-poverty populations and attaining high performance. Math performance is of particular note rising from 38.1% proficiency in 2005 to 46.5% proficiency in 2013. During this same timeframe, rural charter school growth was at 44%. The applicant has adequately demonstrated increases in quality (pp. e34-35).

The applicant states that five low performing charter schools performing in the bottom 15% of all state schools were closed. The applicant states reducing low performing charter schools is a key focus, meriting additional scrutiny regarding authorizing practices and decision-making regarding application. The applicant demonstrates a modest reduction in the number and percentage of academically poor performing charters (pp. e35-36).

Sufficient data is provided that demonstrates the academic quality of charter schools as compared to traditional local schools. For instance, charter schools have lower rates of in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions than traditional schools; charters have a higher percentage of schools meeting AYP in three of five years between 2006 and 2011 than district counterparts, and charter performance has exceeded district school math benchmarks. This performance data is significant considering charter schools enjoy higher mobility rates than districts schools. Finally, charter schools are more gender balanced than district schools (pp. e35-37). Comparison data presented by the applicant is compelling.

Weaknesses:

All comparison data should have been limited to the past 5 years as specified and requested (e34-35). More detail and specificity regarding strategies to decrease failing schools and reduce the overall number of failing schools is needed. While the applicant demonstrates recognition of the need to decrease failing schools, little detail is offered about how the applicant will do so. A detailed, specific plan to reduce failing schools proportionate to the total number of charter schools would strengthen this section of the application.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of Plan to Support Ed. Dis. Students

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA 's plan to support educationally disadvantaged students. In determining the quality of the plan to support educationally disadvantaged students, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA' s charter school subgrant program would--

i. Assist students, particularly educationally disadvantaged students, in meeting and exceeding State academic content standards and State student achievement standards; and

ii. Reduce or eliminate achievement gaps for educationally disadvantaged students;

2) The quality of the SEA 's plan to ensure that charter schools attract, recruit, admit, enroll, serve, and retain educationally disadvantaged students equitably, meaningfully, and, with regard to educationally disadvantaged students who are students with disabilities or English learners, in a manner consistent with, as appropriate, the IDEA (regarding students with disabilities) and civil rights laws, in particular, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;

3) The extent to which the SEA will encourage innovations in charter schools, such as models, policies, supports, or structures, that are designed to improve the academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged students; and

4) The quality of the SEA 's plan for monitoring all charter schools to ensure compliance with Federal and State laws, particularly laws related to educational equity, nondiscrimination, and access to public schools for educationally disadvantaged students.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly defines educationally disadvantaged students as being at high risk for the following indicators: being members of underserved populations, identified as having disabilities, at-risk for dropping out/previously dropped out, eligible for free and reduced lunch, homeless, pregnant, and/or identified as an English Language Learner (p. e38). Applicant intends to continue to target these students and their needs and gives priority to previously enrolled students and siblings as a potential recruitment tool. Applicant also intends to follow state legislative decisions. This is reasonable given the needs of the population.

The applicant states the charters in the state do not limit enrollment. A lottery system is used that has special weighting for admitting, enrolling and serving underserved populations, and extends to any combination of race, ethnicity, English proficiency, poverty, gender, orientation, disability, and geographic locale, making attendance attractive as per new state law. This plan is aligned with IDEA, the 504 Act and state statutes (p. e42).

The applicant refers to successful practices that are innovative as being encouraged and as being options beyond traditional school offerings (p. e40). The applicant states three of nine legislative intents address innovation and will be addressed in applications. The intent of the applicant to include innovation is sound.

The applicant states that monitoring of individual schools as well as sub group performance occurs in charters; authorizers provide most oversight. In addition, copies of the charter, audits, and annual reports for the state that detail academic, financial, and organizational practices are all required as well as annual site visits (p. e40; p. e49). This is an adequate plan for monitoring and provides oversight that complies with federal and state laws.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the applicant actually plans to recruit, retain, and serve students from underserved populations. A clear plan to recruit such as providing information sessions, placing advertisements in print publications, and/or providing community outreach to targeted populations would have strengthened this section of the application.

The applicant fails to provide solid examples of innovations used in Oregon charter schools. While successful practices are referenced at several points throughout the application, the applicant offers insufficient detail about the content and scope of innovative practices (p. e40). Presenting specific practices and providing detail about how they are innovative

would have strengthened this section of the application.

The applicant demonstrates a lack of clarity regarding how the SEA ensures the needs of disadvantaged students are met.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Vision for Growth and Accountability

1. The Secretary determines the quality of the statewide vision, including the role of the SEA, for charter school growth and accountability. In determining the quality of the statewide vision, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality of the SEA' s systems for collecting, analyzing, and publicly reporting data on charter school performance, including data on student academic achievement, attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates), retention, and discipline for all students and disaggregated by student subgroup;

2) The ambitiousness, quality of vision, and feasibility of the SEA' s plan (including key actions) to support the creation of high-quality charter schools during the project period, including a reasonable estimate of the number of high-quality charter schools in the State at both the beginning and the end of the project period; and

3) The ambitiousness, quality of vision, and feasibility of the SEA' s plan (including key actions) to support the closure of academically poor-performing charter schools in the State (i.e., through revocation, non-renewal, or voluntary termination of a charter) during the project period.

Note: In the context of closing academically poor-performing charter schools, we remind applicants of the importance of ensuring adherence to applicable laws, policies, and procedures that govern the closure of a charter school, the disposition of its assets, and the transfer of its students and student records.

Strengths:

The applicant reports that every school is rated separately and provides examples of such reports (p. e41; pp. e91-97). In addition, performance and aggregate data are compiled utilizing district reporting mechanisms. Charter authorizers are also required to submit behavioral data such as expulsion rates; applicant provides a sample (p. e102, Appendix E). Also, the applicant is partnering with a regional education lab with a national reputation to compile comprehensive reports. The plan is sound.

The applicant states it intends to “grow” eight charters per year from 2015 through 2018. This is based on the past three years’ 8% growth rate of charters in the state who have demonstrated increased graduation rates and have been in operation five continuous years (pp. e42-43). This is a modest and reasonable plan.

The applicant’s plan also includes feasible measures to support quality schools while monitoring for unsuccessful schools. Only high quality schools who served historically underserved populations of students, who aspire to reduce achievement gaps, and who have been in operation for five years will be funded by the applicant. Finally, the applicant also intends to strengthen authorizer quality through the use of rubrics, ensuring more consistency and a higher degree of rigor (p. e44). Expectations of growth and increased performance make this plan complete.

Weaknesses:

No plan is offered to address failure to meet expectations. For example, should a school potentially experience changes in leadership and subsequently fail to meet expectations for performance, no specificity is provided as to how supports and

sanctions would result (p. e44).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Dissemination of Information and Best Practices

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA's plan to disseminate information about charter schools and best or promising practices of successful charter schools to each LEA in the State as well as to charter schools, other public schools, and charter school developers (20 U.S.C. 7221b(b)(2)(C) and 7221(c)(f)(6)). If an SEA proposes to use a portion of its grant funds for dissemination subgrants under section 5204(f)(6)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7221c(f)(6)(B)), the SEA should incorporate these subgrants into the overall plan for dissemination. In determining the quality of the SEA's plan to disseminate information about charter schools and best or promising practices of successful charter schools, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA will serve as a leader in the State for identifying and disseminating information and research (which may include, but is not limited to, providing technical assistance) about best or promising practices in successful charter schools, including how the SEA will use measures of efficacy and data in identifying such practices and assessing the impact of its dissemination activities;

2) The quality of the SEA's plan for disseminating information and research on best or promising practices used by, and the benefits of, charter schools that effectively incorporate student body diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity and diversity with respect to educationally disadvantaged students, consistent with applicable law;

3) The quality of the SEA's plan for disseminating information and research on best or promising practices in charter schools related to student discipline and school climate; and

4) For an SEA that proposes to use a portion of its grant funds to award dissemination subgrants under section 5204(f)(6)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7221a(f)(6)(B)), the quality of the subgrant award process and the likelihood that such dissemination activities will increase the number of high-quality charter schools in the State and contribute to improved student academic achievement.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes increased oversight and support through the development of model tools. These tools will gather, report, and evaluate charter school data (p. e45). Partnering with a regional education lab assumes disseminating information and research will occur. This is a sound and comprehensive plan.

The applicant states that monthly meetings serve to keep charters and authorizers informed. In addition, a state-wide conference disseminates information and research on promising best practices highlighting successes. The applicant states that data about charters will be widely disseminated and available as well (p. e45).

The applicant's plan to disseminate information and research is well thought out. Partnering with a regional education lab ensures a degree of objectivity and balance. The applicant also references culturally responsive educational practices as part of a balanced plan (pp. e46-47).

The applicant adequately addresses the quality of the sub grant award process; it is likely dissemination activities will increase the number of high-quality charter schools through replication of successful existing models. As replication will be modeled after successful schools, and expansion of successful schools is planned using a performance framework, it is likely these dissemination activities will increase the number of high-quality charter schools (p. e47).

Weaknesses:

No specific mention of what the innovative approaches are; providing details and specifics about how these approaches are innovative would have strengthened this section (p. e45).

The specific inclusion of diversity is not specified (p. e45).

The applicant's plan for including culturally responsive educational practices lacks specificity. No detail about these practices is presented. Citing specific plans, approaches, methods, and/or researchers who investigate and report on student discipline and school climate in relationship to culture, teaching, and learning would have strengthened this section of the application.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Oversight of Public Chartering Agencies

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA 's plan (including any use of grant administrative or other funds) to monitor, evaluate, assist, and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies. In determining the quality of the SEA' s plan to provide oversight to authorized public chartering agencies, the Secretary considers how well the SEA' s plan will ensure that authorized public chartering agencies are --

1) Seeking and approving charter school petitions from developers that have the capacity to create charter schools that can become high-quality charter schools;

2) Approving charter school petitions with design elements that incorporate evidence-based school models and practices, including, but not limited to, school models and practices that focus on racial and ethnic diversity in student bodies and diversity in student bodies with respect to educationally disadvantaged students, consistent with applicable law;

3) Establishing measureable academic and operational performance expectations for all charter schools (including alternative charter schools, virtual charter schools, and charter schools that include pre-kindergarten, if such schools exist in the State) that are consistent with the definition of high-quality charter school as defined in this notice;

4) Monitoring their charter schools on at least an annual basis, including conducting an in-depth review of each charter school at least once every five years, to ensure that charter schools are meeting the terms of their charter or performance contracts and complying with applicable State and Federal laws;

5) Using increases in student academic achievement as one of the most important factors in renewal decisions; basing renewal decisions on a comprehensive set of criteria, which are set forth in the charter or performance contract; and revoking, not renewing, or encouraging the voluntary termination of charters held by academically poor-performing charter schools;

6) Providing, on an annual basis, public reports on the performance of their portfolios of charter schools, including the performance of each individual charter school with respect to meeting the terms of, and expectations set forth in, the school 's charter or performance contract;

7) Supporting charter school autonomy while holding charter schools accountable for results and meeting the terms of their charters or performance contracts; and

8) Ensuring the continued accountability of charter schools during any transition to new State assessments or accountability systems, including those based on college- and career-ready standards.

Strengths:

The applicant states that a Model Charter Application is being piloted (p. e47). This will likely achieve consistency through what the applicant terms "evidence-based, data-driven models." The new application appears comprehensive.

A diverse student body within charters is targeted by the applicant. This is in accordance with the State Department of Education and NACSA (p. e47). This soundly addresses underserved populations, the focus of Oregon's grant proposal (p. e47).

The framework aligns with state standards. Measureable academic and operational performance expectations for all charter schools are aligned with current state law (p. e48). This is adequate.

Charter schools are monitored annually and during the duration of the grant period; additional evaluation of charter schools is proposed (pp, e48).

The applicant's plan to assess schools using objective and verifiable measures addresses school quality. Academic achievement is the primary focus. Compliance is expected (p. e-49).

The applicant states that charter schools are monitored annually, and this is required of all charter application documents. Expected student performance is reported on an annual basis as a means of measuring results. This includes annual performance reports, financial audit reports, observations from site visits, and a review which will be compiled and disseminated in planned comprehensive reports (pp. e-49-50).

The applicant states that model tools are being developed. These tools are intended to protect autonomy and facilitate partnerships between schools and sponsors. This includes adequate methods of prescribing consequences for poor performing charter schools (p. e-50).

All charters participate in the Oregon Assessment System, the state's high stakes assessment (pp. e50-51). All schools administer the tests. Any new assessments will be administered across the board for consistency and equity.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate what was learned from the pilot application. Knowing feedback about the pilot in terms of strengths and weakness would have strengthened this section of the application (p. e47).

Implementation of the pilot may reveal issues not addressed. This should at least be considered (p. e48). As this has not yet occurred, implementation of monitoring tools developed for the pilot may reveal issues not addressed (p. e50).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Management Plan and Theory of Action

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and the project 's theory of action. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project s theory of action, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality, including the cohesiveness and strength of reasoning, of the logic model (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) and the extent to which it addresses the role of the grant in promoting the State-level strategy for using charter schools to improve educational outcomes for students through CSP subgrants for planning, program design, and initial implementation; optional dissemination subgrants; optional revolving loan funds; and other strategies;

2) The extent to which the SEA' s project-specific performance measures, including any measures required by the Department, support the logic model; and

3) The adequacy of the management plan to --

i. Achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including the existence of clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and

ii. Address any compliance issues or findings related to the CSP that are identified in an audit or other monitoring review.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to propose a comprehensive management plan and theory of action for assessing the achievement of the objectives, including developing performance measures and performance targets for its proposed grant project that are consistent with those objectives. The applicant should clearly identify the project-specific performance measures and performance targets in its plan and should review the logic model application requirement and performance measures section of this notice for information on the requirements for developing those performance measures and performance targets consistent with the objectives of the proposed project. The applicant may choose to include a discussion of the project-specific performance measures and targets it develops in response to the logic model requirement when addressing this criterion.

Strengths:

A logic model is presented by the applicant. Specific, measurable goals are addressed by the model's inputs, outputs, and outcomes. Midterm, short term, and long term outcomes are specified clearly. The applicant provides educational background and qualifications of project director and project manager (pp. e51-52; e55-60).

The applicant includes three project-specific performance objectives (p. e53-54). A timeline is also provided. This framework addresses the proposed logic model thoroughly and is comprehensive in nature.

The management plan is adequate in that it is aligned, thorough, and comprehensive. It is sophisticated in its specificity of inputs and outputs. In addition, outcomes are provided around clear and convincing impact (pp. e53-60).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the SEA 's charter school subgrant program, including the extent to which the project design furthers the SEA' s overall strategy for increasing the number of high-quality charter schools in the State and improving student academic achievement. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality of the SEA' s process for awarding subgrants for planning, program design, and initial implementation and, if applicable, for dissemination, including:

i. The subgrant application and peer review process, timelines for these processes, and how the SEA intends to ensure that subgrants will be awarded to eligible applicants demonstrating the capacity to create high-quality charter schools; and

ii. A reasonable year-by-year estimate, with supporting evidence, of

a) the number of subgrants the SEA expects to award during the project period and the average size of those subgrants, including an explanation of any assumptions upon which the estimates are based; and

b) if the SEA has previously received a CSP grant, the percentage of eligible applicants that were awarded subgrants and how this percentage related to the overall quality of the applicant pool;

2) The process for monitoring CSP subgrantees;

3) How the SEA will create a portfolio of subgrantees that focuses on areas of need within the State, such as increasing student body diversity or maintaining a high level of student body diversity, and how this focus aligns with the State-Level Strategy;

4) The steps the SEA will take to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA' s charter school subgrant program; and

5) A description of any requested waivers of statutory or regulatory provisions over which the Secretary exercises administrative authority and the extent to which those waivers will, if granted, further the objectives of the project.

Strengths:

The applicant states that 15 planning sub grants, 16 implementation sub grants and 11 dissemination sub grants are proposed over life of grant (p. e71). A peer review panel is proposed consisting of readers with wide expertise and various backgrounds. Timelines are presented that appear reasonable.

A yearly competitive process has been proposed by the applicant with grants due at beginning of 2015-16 school year. The applicant states that planning sub grants are \$500,.000.00; implementation sub grants range from \$250,000.00 to \$450,000.00 and dissemination sub grants are from \$50,000.000 to \$200,000.00 (p. e71).

The applicant's current proposal addresses previous experience, three years of successful implementation contingent on successful annual reviews (p. e64). A comprehensive monitoring plan is proposed. The applicant states it possesses the capacity to manage efficiently based on experience of project personnel. Detailed, specific, and thorough guidelines have been developed and proposed; training for all sub grantees is included (pp. e63-68). A list of application requirements is also presented (pp. e73-75).

The applicant states that all reports will be assembled in a portfolio for review and analysis (p. e72). Maintaining a focus on reducing and eliminating achievement gaps is ambitious, but attainable in this reasonable and well-conceived plan.

The Oregon Department of Education intends to widely disseminate information (p. e73). The methods of e-mail, listserv, and presentations to charter schools will all address dissemination.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that all authorized public chartering agencies in the State use one or more of the following:

a) Frameworks and processes to evaluate the performance of charter schools on a regular basis that include--

1) Rigorous academic and operational performance expectations (including performance expectations related to financial management and equitable treatment of all students and applicants);

2) Performance objectives for each school aligned to those expectations;

3) Clear criteria for renewing the charter of a school based on an objective body of evidence, including evidence that the charter school has (a) met the performance objectives outlined in the charter or performance contract; (b) demonstrated organizational and fiscal viability; and (c) demonstrated fidelity to the terms of the charter or performance contract and applicable law;

4) Clear criteria for revoking the charter of a school if there is violation of law or public trust regarding student safety or public funds, or evidence of poor student academic achievement; and

5) Annual reporting by authorized public chartering agencies to each of their authorized charter schools that summarizes the individual school 's performance and compliance, based on this framework, and identifies any areas that need improvement.

b) Clear and specific standards and formalized processes that measure and benchmark the performance of the authorized public chartering agency or agencies, including the performance of its portfolio of charter schools, and provide for the annual dissemination of information on such performance;

c) Authorizing processes that establish clear criteria for evaluating charter applications and include a multi-tiered clearance or review of a charter school, including a final review immediately before the school opens for its first operational year; or

d) Authorizing processes that include differentiated review of charter petitions to assess whether, and the extent to which, the charter school developer has been successful (as determined by the authorized public chartering agency) in establishing and operating one or more high-quality charter schools.

Strengths:

The SEA has adopted a performance framework intended for use by all authorizers developed by NACSA. This framework has been piloted. Professional development around the framework is provided (p. e23). Performance objectives contain rigorous measures of student academic performance (p. e23).

Renewal is specified and contingent on compliance. Financial stability and management is highlighted (p. e24). Charter revocation is clearly specified contingent on student performance and financial concerns (p. e24). A portfolio is created by the SEA that includes charter schools (p. e25).

Weaknesses:

1) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Competitive Preference Priority - Authorizer other than LEA or Appeal Process

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a LEA, or an Appeals Process

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

a) Provides for one authorized public chartering agency that is not an LEA, such as a State chartering board, for each individual or entity seeking to operate a charter school pursuant to State law; or

b) In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, allows for an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Strengths:

1) The applicant states that the school district is the primary authorizer; applicants must first submit to the LEA. The Oregon Board of Education hears appeals. If/when all appeals are exhausted, it is possible that the Oregon Board of

Education will become authorizer. Institutions of higher learning can also provide sponsorship. The applicant states four charters operate under the Oregon Board of Education (p. e27).

Weaknesses:

1) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2015 11:33 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2015 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oregon Department of Education (U282A150014)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
State-Level Strategy		
1. State-Level Strategy	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Policy Context for Charter Schools		
1. Policy Context	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Selection Criteria		
Past Performance		
1. Past Performance	10	8
Quality of Plan to Support Ed. Dis. Students		
1. Ed. Dis. Students	15	10
Vision for Growth and Accountability		
1. Growth and Accountability	10	8
Dissemination of Information and Best Practices		
1. Dissemination	10	7
Oversight of Public Chartering Agencies		
1. Oversight of Authorizers	15	12
Management Plan and Theory of Action		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	10
Sub Total	80	65
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes		
1. CPP 1	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Competitive Preference Pritority		
Authorizer other than LEA or Appeal Process		

1. CPP 2

	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	120	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SEA Panel - 5: 84.282A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Oregon Department of Education (U282A150014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - State-Level Strategy

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the State-level strategy for using charter schools to improve educational outcomes for students throughout the State. In determining the quality of the State-level strategy, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA 's CSP activities, including the subgrant program, are integrated into the State s overall strategy for improving student academic achievement and attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates) and closing achievement and attainment gaps, and complement or leverage other statewide education reform efforts;

2) The extent to which funding equity for charter schools (including equitable funding for charter school facilities) is incorporated into the SEA' s State-level strategy; and

3) The extent to which the State encourages local strategies for improving student academic achievement and attainment that involve charter schools, including but not limited to the following:

i. Collaboration, including the sharing of data and promising instructional and other practices, between charter schools and other public schools or providers of early learning and development programs or alternative education programs; and

ii. The creation of charter schools that would serve as viable options for students who currently attend, or would otherwise attend, the State 's lowest-performing schools.

Strengths:

The applicant provides multiple levels of evidence on how they plan to encourage the creation of charter schools that will serve as options for students in low performing schools. The award will provide funds for bot post and pre-operations schools development, as referenced on page (e-28). They exhibit that equity through an extensive incubation period for these new charter schools, along with what appears to be a quality professional development to facilitate the implementation of new models, along with the dissemination of best practices. This will be accomplished through the oversight already in place with Authorizer staff and ODE staff. They also provide evidence of a thorough quality training and distribution of effective teachers (page e-30), also found in Appendix E.

They will also provide funds to schools that have been open for less then three years, for the purpose of facilitating implementations of their educational models, for the sole purpose of developing educational equity (e-28). And lastly, they provide evidence for strengthening the quality of the authorizer, by providing high quality training and professional development to potential authorizers (e-28).

The candidate does provide evidence that charter schools in Oregon do offer innovative options for families of schools serving disproportionate populations of students that are credit deficient, in poverty, highly mobile, or have previously dropped out of school (e-29). Since many charter schools in Oregon function similar to alternative schools, they are part of the ODE's strategic Plan for eliminating the achievement gap for historically underserved students (e-30).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Policy Context for Charter Schools

1. The Secretary considers the policy context for charter schools under the proposed project. In determining the policy context for charter schools under the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The degree of flexibility afforded to charter schools under the State's charter school law, including:

i. The extent to which charter schools in the State are exempt from State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools; and

ii. The extent to which charter schools in the State have a high degree of autonomy, including autonomy over the charter school's budget, expenditures, staffing, procurement, and curriculum;

2) The quality of the SEA's processes for:

i. Annually informing each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and Federal programs in which the charter school may participate; and

ii. Annually ensuring that each charter school in the State receives, in a timely fashion, the school's commensurate share of Federal funds that are allocated by formula each year, particularly during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly; and

3) The quality of the SEA's plan to ensure that charter schools that are considered to be LEAs under State law and LEAs in which charter schools are located will comply with sections 613(a)(5) and 613(e)(1)(B) of IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101, et seq.), title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq.), title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681, et seq.), and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794).

Strengths:

Charter schools in Oregon do have a great deal of autonomy over budgets, curriculum, hiring, contracting, educational models and professional development, with state statutes providing lists of laws that are then applicable to charter schools (e-32). The ODE will then work collaboratively with charter schools, to ensure they receive their share of state and Federal funds(e-33). There is mention of charter schools working with (page e-33) the Office of Learning, the Education Equity Unit, Federal Title Programs, and Instruction and Assessment. Since the responsibility for IDEA in Oregon lies with the school district in which the charter is located, the districts will retain the additional funds to assure students with disabilities receive services.

The ODE monitors the LEAs in the state of Oregon, to ensure that all state and federal funds go to eligible charter schools (e-33). The ODE provides technical assistance on an ongoing basis. This is important since charter schools do expand after openings, as well as their demographics changing after opening as well (e-33).

Weaknesses:

Page e-32 mentions that while they have the ability to hire all staff and utilize the curriculum and best practices they wish, they may not have complete autonomy over all aspects of the school. Evidence would indicate that in some instances the charter school may still have to contract with the district in order to help supply staff (e-33), staff that may not necessarily

want to work within the charter school environment.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Past Performance

1. The Secretary considers the past performance of charter schools in a State that enacted a charter school law for the first time five or more years before submission of its application. In determining the past performance of charter schools in such a State, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which there has been a demonstrated increase, for each of the past five years, in the number and percentage of high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State;

2) The extent to which there has been a demonstrated reduction, for each of the past five years, in the number and percentage of academically poor-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State; and

3) Whether, and the extent to which, the academic achievement and academic attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates) of charter school students equal or exceed the academic achievement and academic attainment of similar students in other public schools in the State over the past five years.

Strengths:

There is evidence to suggest that an increase in the number of charter schools in Oregon has grown in the last five years. The evidence presented on page e-34 represents the fact that Oregon has grown some 186% between 2004 and 2013. Oregon charter schools also have reasonable proof that they have made improvements on their performance objectives in Math. Scores indicate that those scores have risen, exceeding the 38.1% benchmark in 2005 to 46.5% in 2013. Both of these scores exceeded the traditional schools in their scores.

Some Oregon charter schools have become Model Schools, (high performing in high poverty areas) (e-35). They do provide evidence for closing those schools that are not meeting performance expectations, closing five charters schools at the end of the 2014-15 school year for low performance. Data also indicates that a high percentage of Oregon charter schools more so than Oregon District schools, met the AYP between the years of 2006 and 2011.

Oregon charter schools have also significantly lowered suspension and expulsion rates (e-35). Working with Education Northwest, they have data to support these claims. Some Oregon charters are using innovative programs like Restorative Justice and Positive Behavior Intervention Supports to help in this effort.

Weaknesses:

The data in reference to reviewing the criterion of past performance seems a bit unclear. The applicant mentions that five charter schools were closed in 2014-15, and cited reasons being they fell within the bottom 15% of schools in the state (e-35). They then proceed to state that 14% of the top performing schools in the state in 2013 were charter schools. This is followed by stating that it is disproportionate since charter schools make of 9% of all Oregon schools. It is unclear what the point is they are trying to substantiate (e-36).

While Oregon schools have demonstrated a high degree of competency with improving the academic scores, they have not accounted for how they plan to maintain that proficiency with all the anticipated growth for charters in Oregon (e-35).

Oregon does bring up the fact that the demographics of Oregon students has changed as it pertains to charter school students in the last five years. Those demographics currently reflect a change in the percentages of English Language Learners, that has doubled in the past five years. There is no current evidence to reflect a plan to account for this change

in the number of ELL's into Oregon charter schools (e-36). There appears to be no apparent evidence of Oregon with a substantial improvement in regards to their ELL students. There is mention that Oregon will see increasing successes for all students, but no documentation for a plan (e-37).

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Plan to Support Ed. Dis. Students

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA 's plan to support educationally disadvantaged students. In determining the quality of the plan to support educationally disadvantaged students, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA' s charter school subgrant program would--

i. Assist students, particularly educationally disadvantaged students, in meeting and exceeding State academic content standards and State student achievement standards; and

ii. Reduce or eliminate achievement gaps for educationally disadvantaged students;

2) The quality of the SEA 's plan to ensure that charter schools attract, recruit, admit, enroll, serve, and retain educationally disadvantaged students equitably, meaningfully, and, with regard to educationally disadvantaged students who are students with disabilities or English learners, in a manner consistent with, as appropriate, the IDEA (regarding students with disabilities) and civil rights laws, in particular, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;

3) The extent to which the SEA will encourage innovations in charter schools, such as models, policies, supports, or structures, that are designed to improve the academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged students; and

4) The quality of the SEA 's plan for monitoring all charter schools to ensure compliance with Federal and State laws, particularly laws related to educational equity, nondiscrimination, and access to public schools for educationally disadvantaged students.

Strengths:

Data indicates a 44% increase in charter schools growth since 2005. This plan definitely exceeds the expected state standards. The sub-grant program will require all charters to design and implement specific goals and objectives that are thoroughly covered by those benchmarks. Within those growth plans of charter schools in Oregon is helping to reduce and eliminate exclusionary discipline, programs that serve at risk students of dropping out and models that increase overall graduation rates, and increase the number of students enrolling in post-secondary training program, especially for historically underserved students (e-38). The applicant indicates parameters would need to be met in order to show proof of accomplishment to receive sub-grant funds.

There are clearly defined advantages for the state's disadvantaged students and underserved populations within this plan, as the state will require these new charters to have specific goals and benchmarks to be met and exceeded in order to alleviate achievement gaps for these educationally disadvantaged students.

With the introduction of Senate Bill 820 (e-42), Oregon law will allow charters to add additional weighting in their lotteries to preference students from underserved populations. This should ensure they have a better chance at entering the Oregon Charter school system (e-39). Multiple senate bills have been passed in Oregon since 1999 to help dramatically increase the number of charter schools.

There is evidence to indicate that Oregon hopes to encourage the use of different and innovative learning methods. They

express that this is something they hope to accomplish by offering options to students and families within these charter schools. These are options that are not currently offered to traditional district students (e-40). In order to obtain sub-grants, charters will have to sufficiently identify how they will develop these innovative educational models.

One example of a tool being developed to monitor this would be the Annual Performance Framework and report. This is currently being piloted by charter schools in Oregon. This will indicate to the state if charter schools are in compliance (e-40). This will also give clarification as to the criteria for monitoring these charters. Evidence here should be convincing as this will require reports going to both the ODE and the local LEA.

Weaknesses:

There appears to be little evidence as to how Oregon will implement the applicable legislative bills. There is also minimal evidence on how Oregon plans to admit and enroll those students with equity into their charter schools. There is no evidence to suggest they will undertake an extensive campaign to go out and actively recruit those students.

Currently there is only mention of the "innovative methods" to be used. No examples of this innovation are cited. Clarification with specific examples for these practices would be helpful.

The applicant does not adequately explain how the SEA will ensure that the needs of educationally disadvantaged students are met.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Vision for Growth and Accountability

1. The Secretary determines the quality of the statewide vision, including the role of the SEA, for charter school growth and accountability. In determining the quality of the statewide vision, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality of the SEA' s systems for collecting, analyzing, and publicly reporting data on charter school performance, including data on student academic achievement, attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates), retention, and discipline for all students and disaggregated by student subgroup;

2) The ambitiousness, quality of vision, and feasibility of the SEA' s plan (including key actions) to support the creation of high-quality charter schools during the project period, including a reasonable estimate of the number of high-quality charter schools in the State at both the beginning and the end of the project period; and

3) The ambitiousness, quality of vision, and feasibility of the SEA' s plan (including key actions) to support the closure of academically poor-performing charter schools in the State (i.e., through revocation, non-renewal, or voluntary termination of a charter) during the project period.

Note: In the context of closing academically poor-performing charter schools, we remind applicants of the importance of ensuring adherence to applicable laws, policies, and procedures that govern the closure of a charter school, the disposition of its assets, and the transfer of its students and student records.

Strengths:

Evidence indicates that all Oregon charters are not only separately rated based on the Oregon Report Card, but all that data is disaggregated by race, gender, and special education populations, just as they would be in traditional schools and districts. Oregon also demonstrates a collaborative process in teaming with Education Northwest, a regional applied

research center, to help with the disaggregation of that data.

The number of charter schools has increased dramatically since 1999 and the approval of Senate Bill 100 authorizing the creation of charters in Oregon. The annual average growth rate is approximately 14% a year, currently holding at approximately 130 charter schools in Oregon. They do demonstrate an adequate plan to increase that number from 130 in 2015-16 to 146 in 2017-18. Assuming that the schools have been in service for at least five years, adding 8 schools by the 2017-18 school year does appear to be an attainable plan (e-42-43).

It has been clearly outlined how charter schools in Oregon have outperformed traditional district schools (e-37). Evidence from the math and English scores demonstrates this fact. Examples of lower expulsion rates and higher AYP scores demonstrate this as well. This exemplifies a considerable strength for Oregon schools when the mobility rates of Oregon charter students is taken into consideration, as well as the evidence demonstrated by Oregon charters that they serve a population of students that would otherwise attend alternative high schools, this clearly demonstrates evidence of the capability of these charter schools in Oregon.

Weaknesses:

ODE is working with NACSA on a model application that is rigorous, comprehensive and aligned, but there is no evidence or details to support that claim. There is also no indication of the consequences a school would face if it should fail to meet expectations. There also appears to be little or no discussion surrounding the process for closure if a school fails to meet expectations and all other technical assistance has failed.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Dissemination of Information and Best Practices

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA's plan to disseminate information about charter schools and best or promising practices of successful charter schools to each LEA in the State as well as to charter schools, other public schools, and charter school developers (20 U.S.C. 7221b(b)(2)(C) and 7221(c)(f)(6)). If an SEA proposes to use a portion of its grant funds for dissemination subgrants under section 5204(f)(6)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7221c(f)(6)(B)), the SEA should incorporate these subgrants into the overall plan for dissemination. In determining the quality of the SEA's plan to disseminate information about charter schools and best or promising practices of successful charter schools, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA will serve as a leader in the State for identifying and disseminating information and research (which may include, but is not limited to, providing technical assistance) about best or promising practices in successful charter schools, including how the SEA will use measures of efficacy and data in identifying such practices and assessing the impact of its dissemination activities;

2) The quality of the SEA's plan for disseminating information and research on best or promising practices used by, and the benefits of, charter schools that effectively incorporate student body diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity and diversity with respect to educationally disadvantaged students, consistent with applicable law;

3) The quality of the SEA's plan for disseminating information and research on best or promising practices in charter schools related to student discipline and school climate; and

4) For an SEA that proposes to use a portion of its grant funds to award dissemination subgrants under section 5204(f)(6)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7221a(f)(6)(B)), the quality of the subgrant award process and the likelihood that such dissemination activities will increase the number of high-quality charter schools in the State and contribute to improved student academic achievement.

Strengths:

They have already incorporated a full-time charter schools analyst, as well as a Charter Authorizers Steering Committee, along with annual co-sponsoring charter schools conferences (e-45). They have partnered with Education Northwest to compile data sets on performance and graduation rates.

There is mention that preference will be given to those that have established partnerships with poor-performing districts. They do indicate that the highest preference will be given to those who show evidence of closing achievement and opportunity gaps for historically underserved students.

Oregon has provided evidence that in making the sub-grants available, the ODE will continue to be a leader in facilitating the sharing of innovative and successful approaches in order to expand in number of high performing charter schools in Oregon (e-46). There is evidence indicating that comprehensive plans do exist to share with other schools and districts. There is evidence that closing the achievement gap, increasing the graduation rate, and how this will all be accomplished. Oregon has already demonstrated the ability to show success comparative to their district counterparts, in regards to increasing access to historically underserved students and narrowing the achievement gap as well (e-46).

Weaknesses:

They introduce the fact that sub-grant funds will facilitate the sharing of innovative and successful approaches. There is no evidence to indicate what those approaches or methods will be. They also introduce the idea that Oregon would like to be a lead in facilitating the process of preparing highly skilled authorizers, but again fail to indicate what those practices will include.

While they do sufficiently address sub-grant funds being made available to those charters that have shown comparable success to their district partners (e-45), there does not seem to be sufficient evidence to address ethnic diversity, or the tool that will be used to identify that. While there is mention of "attracting" diverse student populations, creating positive learning environments, narrowing the achievement gap and incorporating culturally responsive educational practices, there is no specific mention of how this will be accomplished, or how issues around that of school discipline or changing schools climate will be addressed.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Oversight of Public Chartering Agencies

The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA 's plan (including any use of grant administrative or other funds) to monitor, evaluate, assist, and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies. In determining the quality of the SEA' s plan to provide oversight to authorized public chartering agencies, the Secretary considers how well the SEA' s plan will ensure that authorized public chartering agencies are --

1) Seeking and approving charter school petitions from developers that have the capacity to create charter schools that can become high-quality charter schools;

2) Approving charter school petitions with design elements that incorporate evidence-based school models and practices, including, but not limited to, school models and practices that focus on racial and ethnic diversity in student bodies and diversity in student bodies with respect to educationally disadvantaged students, consistent with applicable law;

3) Establishing measureable academic and operational performance expectations for all charter schools (including alternative charter schools, virtual charter schools, and charter schools that include pre-kindergarten, if such schools exist in the State) that are consistent with the definition of high-quality

charter school as defined in this notice;

4) Monitoring their charter schools on at least an annual basis, including conducting an in-depth review of each charter school at least once every five years, to ensure that charter schools are meeting the terms of their charter or performance contracts and complying with applicable State and Federal laws;

5) Using increases in student academic achievement as one of the most important factors in renewal decisions; basing renewal decisions on a comprehensive set of criteria, which are set forth in the charter or performance contract; and revoking, not renewing, or encouraging the voluntary termination of charters held by academically poor-performing charter schools;

6) Providing, on an annual basis, public reports on the performance of their portfolios of charter schools, including the performance of each individual charter school with respect to meeting the terms of, and expectations set forth in, the school 's charter or performance contract;

7) Supporting charter school autonomy while holding charter schools accountable for results and meeting the terms of their charters or performance contracts; and

8) Ensuring the continued accountability of charter schools during any transition to new State assessments or accountability systems, including those based on college- and career-ready standards.

Strengths:

There is evidence to suggest that a model application containing the model performance framework currently being piloted in Oregon, will lead to authorizers that have the capacity to create high quality charter schools . Having the pilot already in place, with revisions, indicates a greater sense of efficacy.

By creating model tools that can be adopted, ODE will continue developing and implementing equitable authorizing practices. ODE has adopted a performance model framework currently being piloted. This pilot allows for the recognition of problems (e-47), soundly addresses they are targeting diverse student body, and addressing the underserved populations.

Not only will charter schools be asked for evidence of annual evaluations that all schools are asked to complete, but those charters qualifying for sub-grants will be asked to undertake an additional evaluation addressing how they plan to meet goals and expectations (e-48). Evidence of consequences are listed for those found out of compliance (e-48-49). Oregon law also requires specific performance expectations (e-48), as well as well as the COSA (Charter School Authorizer Steering Committee) (e-48), which helps in refining a set of alternative performance measures for authorizers that need to be adhered to.

Consequences are listed for any charter substantially failing to meet goals and expectations. They will be place on a rigorous plan of improvement or may be defunded. Not meeting the goals and objectives set forth is also grounds for termination of the charter. Evidence of academic achievement to measure school quality must also be demonstrated.

Under Oregon law, charter schools must be evaluated on an annual basis by their authorizers (e-48), including compliance with state and federal laws. Within the charter contracts, authorizers must include sources of academic data as evidence for ongoing renewal and evaluation, as well as clear and measurable performance standards, demonstrating the school's success in fulfilling its' mission in serving disadvantaged students. If the evidence demonstrates that a charter school is not working towards meeting these performance goals and agreements, the sponsor has the authority to make the appropriate renewal decision in denying the renewal. Some of these renewal decisions are made based on the Model Contract (e-50), a model tool developed by the ODE in conjunction with Oregon state authorizers to help in compliance and performance reports.

Reports will be distributed to the general public indicating the financial viability of the school as well as academic

performance reports. These will be submitted to both the local authorizer as well as to ODE. The ODE will hold them centrally for distribution, with the ODE compiling, publishing and distributing the comprehensive collection of these reports (e-50). Failure to do so can result in revocation of the charter. Charter schools will be monitored, and site visits will be conducted annually (e-49-50).

Evidence for charter school autonomy will be accomplished through the development of model tools, in particular, the Model Contract the ODE will use to support all developing charters. There is hope that this will also help facilitate partnerships.

All Oregon charters will be held accountable by being required to participate in Oregon state testing. This includes not only the state assessment, but also the ELPA and Smarter Balance testing. All will be held accountable by placement on the Oregon Report Card. The state recently transitioned to new State standards (e-50-51).

Weaknesses:

Based on the evidence presented, models are still being piloted (e-37). Minimal explanation was offered in terms of what that model framework and what that model application might look like, with more of an explanation needed (e-47).

Evidence was offered as an explanation that would reflect essential requirements for the model applications, as well as evidence based and data driven models. Evidence was also presented that these models are currently being piloted. Providing a sample of these applications would present compelling evidence as to the strength of the applicant's application.

A plan to disseminate the research was offered, with no evidence on how to put into practice. Along with that, a new model contract was revealed as well, that would be customizable to each individual school, with no implementation plan revealed.

Model tools are in the process of being developed, specifically a tool called the Model Contract. There is no current evidence that these tools currently exist. There is also no evidence that Model Contract plan, which will support contracts between charter schools and their authorizers, is in place and ready to use as well.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Management Plan and Theory of Action

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and the project 's theory of action. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project s theory of action, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality, including the cohesiveness and strength of reasoning, of the logic model (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) and the extent to which it addresses the role of the grant in promoting the State-level strategy for using charter schools to improve educational outcomes for students through CSP subgrants for planning, program design, and initial implementation; optional dissemination subgrants; optional revolving loan funds; and other strategies;

2) The extent to which the SEA' s project-specific performance measures, including any measures required by the Department, support the logic model; and

3) The adequacy of the management plan to --

i. Achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including the existence of clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and

ii. Address any compliance issues or findings related to the CSP that are identified in an audit or other monitoring review.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to propose a comprehensive management plan and theory of action for assessing the achievement of the objectives, including developing performance measures and performance targets for its proposed grant project that are consistent with those objectives. The applicant should clearly identify the project-specific performance measures and performance targets in its plan and should review the logic model application requirement and performance measures section of this notice for information on the requirements for developing those performance measures and performance targets consistent with the objectives of the proposed project. The applicant may choose to include a discussion of the project-specific performance measures and targets it develops in response to the logic model requirement when addressing this criterion.

Strengths:

Already present two full time personnel in the charter schools department. New project manager will be hired. Oregon is led by a team member with five years of charter school management. She leads a management team with both oversight experience as well as appeals process experience. Oregon has also formed a partnership with NACSA in order to “apply a national lens” to charter school formation in Oregon. This panel also includes former representatives that have experience drafting legislation to ensure charter school success. This management plan is laid out on pages (e-53-60).

The logic model laid out on page (e-55), is very sound and simple to follow. The model starts with the essential needs to improve the number of quality choices and the needs to disseminate best practices. It then takes into account the staff, expertise and funds needed, placing a priority on collaboration practices amongst staff, teachers, administrators and charter school authorizers throughout Oregon. Finally, they move to outputs, while taking into consideration short term, medium term and long term outcomes.

The proposed adjusting of the staff make it feasible to accomplish all activities and subgrant activities within the proposed timeline (3-55-60). The current timeline has already been adjusted, taking into consideration the financial aspects as well as dissemination of practices. Assurances of the ability to address all compliance issues that may arise, as well as audit issues during the monitoring process have assurances of continual improvement (e-61).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for this section.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the SEA 's charter school subgrant program, including the extent to which the project design furthers the SEA' s overall strategy for increasing the number of high-quality charter schools in the State and improving student academic achievement. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality of the SEA' s process for awarding subgrants for planning, program design, and initial implementation and, if applicable, for dissemination, including:

i. The subgrant application and peer review process, timelines for these processes, and how the SEA intends to ensure that subgrants will be awarded to eligible applicants demonstrating the capacity to create high-quality charter schools; and

ii. A reasonable year-by-year estimate, with supporting evidence, of

a) the number of subgrants the SEA expects to award during the project period and the average size of those subgrants, including an explanation of any assumptions upon which the estimates are based; and

b) if the SEA has previously received a CSP grant, the percentage of eligible applicants that were awarded subgrants and how this percentage related to the overall quality of the applicant pool;

2) The process for monitoring CSP subgrantees;

3) How the SEA will create a portfolio of subgrantees that focuses on areas of need within the State, such as increasing student body diversity or maintaining a high level of student body diversity, and how this focus aligns with the State-Level Strategy;

4) The steps the SEA will take to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA's charter school subgrant program; and

5) A description of any requested waivers of statutory or regulatory provisions over which the Secretary exercises administrative authority and the extent to which those waivers will, if granted, further the objectives of the project.

Strengths:

In the past, Oregon has offered competitive planning grants of up to \$56,000. Upon approval, this would be followed by \$225,000 for implementation funds. From this previous funding, Oregon awarded 235 sub-grants with 112 of them (48% currently in operation). RFPs will be released annually during the grant period, with those sub-grants being monitored by peer reviewers as well as a highly trained and qualified panel of experts in charter school operations (e-63).

In the past, sub-grant funds were automatically awarded once you had received the planning grant. That will not be the case moving forward, a set of competitive requirements will have to be fulfilled (e-64), strengthening the process of the sub-grant disbursement of funds.

Oregon plans to implement a peer review process; however, they do not mention if that peer review is staffed by charter personnel, district, and/or ODE personnel.

They do plan to have a very rigorous portfolio plan, including participation from both both charters and local districts districts. Participation will be both in the assessment evaluation as well as the peer reviews.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes

Competitive Preference Priority 1: High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that all authorized public chartering agencies in

the State use one or more of the following:

a) Frameworks and processes to evaluate the performance of charter schools on a regular basis that include--

1) Rigorous academic and operational performance expectations (including performance expectations related to financial management and equitable treatment of all students and applicants);

2) Performance objectives for each school aligned to those expectations;

3) Clear criteria for renewing the charter of a school based on an objective body of evidence, including evidence that the charter school has (a) met the performance objectives outlined in the charter or performance contract; (b) demonstrated organizational and fiscal viability; and (c) demonstrated fidelity to the terms of the charter or performance contract and applicable law;

4) Clear criteria for revoking the charter of a school if there is violation of law or public trust regarding student safety or public funds, or evidence of poor student academic achievement; and

5) Annual reporting by authorized public chartering agencies to each of their authorized charter schools that summarizes the individual school 's performance and compliance, based on this framework, and identifies any areas that need improvement.

b) Clear and specific standards and formalized processes that measure and benchmark the performance of the authorized public chartering agency or agencies, including the performance of its portfolio of charter schools, and provide for the annual dissemination of information on such performance;

c) Authorizing processes that establish clear criteria for evaluating charter applications and include a multi-tiered clearance or review of a charter school, including a final review immediately before the school opens for its first operational year; or

d) Authorizing processes that include differentiated review of charter petitions to assess whether, and the extent to which, the charter school developer has been successful (as determined by the authorized public chartering agency) in establishing and operating one or more high-quality charter schools.

Strengths:

Oregon appears to have adopted an adequate performance framework that will enable them to partner and collaborate with NACSA and traditional local public districts, on many different fronts. They have also partnered with Portland State University, and have begun training across the state for the past year, in professional development for charter school authorizers. It would appear they have put together a comprehensive plan that details performance objective and a system of measures for those objectives. This plan appears to be sound, with the consistence requiring all charters to adhere to the plan and utilize these measures. This plan addresses traditional public schools as well, allowing the traditional schools to participate in the peer panel reviews for the charter schools.

They clearly go above and beyond, demonstrating a comprehensive plan, not only listing the plan in the LEA portfolio, but also including it in the District's report card, reflecting a system of checks and balances with two sources checking the outcomes. The state is also stepping up to take responsibility, by training authorizers with professional development, training and conference sharing, and collaboration with other organizations such as League of Oregon Charter Schools Annual Conference, the Oregon School Board Association Annual Conference, and the Confederation of School Administrators regional and annual conferences.

They appear to have an extensive evaluation process for all charter schools in Oregon, with a multistep procedure taking place (e-26), with authorizers evaluating not only the academic performance, but the fiscal performance as well as if the charter schools are meeting their performance expectations. Not only do authorizers have to review applications for completeness, but all applicants can appeal through the Oregon State Board of Education as well.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Competitive Preference Priority - Authorizer other than LEA or Appeal Process

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a LEA, or an Appeals Process

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

a) Provides for one authorized public chartering agency that is not an LEA, such as a State chartering board, for each individual or entity seeking to operate a charter school pursuant to State law; or

b) In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, allows for an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Strengths:

They clearly offer an appeal process should the initial district deny the charter school application. (e-27) They also have backed up the point that this process works since they currently have the Oregon State Board of Education as the authorizer for 4 charter schools in Oregon.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2015 04:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2015 11:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Oregon Department of Education (U282A150014)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
State-Level Strategy		
1. State-Level Strategy	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Policy Context for Charter Schools		
1. Policy Context	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Selection Criteria		
Past Performance		
1. Past Performance	10	7
Quality of Plan to Support Ed. Dis. Students		
1. Ed. Dis. Students	15	10
Vision for Growth and Accountability		
1. Growth and Accountability	10	7
Dissemination of Information and Best Practices		
1. Dissemination	10	7
Oversight of Public Chartering Agencies		
1. Oversight of Authorizers	15	12
Management Plan and Theory of Action		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	10
Sub Total	80	63
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes		
1. CPP 1	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Competitive Preference Priority		
Authorizer other than LEA or Appeal Process		

1. CPP 2

	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	120	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SEA Panel - 5: 84.282A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Oregon Department of Education (U282A150014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - State-Level Strategy

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the State-level strategy for using charter schools to improve educational outcomes for students throughout the State. In determining the quality of the State-level strategy, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA 's CSP activities, including the subgrant program, are integrated into the State s overall strategy for improving student academic achievement and attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates) and closing achievement and attainment gaps, and complement or leverage other statewide education reform efforts;

2) The extent to which funding equity for charter schools (including equitable funding for charter school facilities) is incorporated into the SEA' s State-level strategy; and

3) The extent to which the State encourages local strategies for improving student academic achievement and attainment that involve charter schools, including but not limited to the following:

i. Collaboration, including the sharing of data and promising instructional and other practices, between charter schools and other public schools or providers of early learning and development programs or alternative education programs; and

ii. The creation of charter schools that would serve as viable options for students who currently attend, or would otherwise attend, the State 's lowest-performing schools.

Strengths:

The SEA has indicated that there are four basic purposes that this grant will be used for if awarded. These basic purposes are then tied to the charter school application in its strategies and practices. Since the state has constructed it such that charter schools are considered part of the local district's portfolio (meaning that academic performance data is reported with the sponsoring district), this connection increases the likelihood that the charter authorizer will ensure that the CSP activities will align to the State's overall strategies for improving student outcomes. (pg. e29)

The SEA applicant has demonstrated that there are a number of policies in effect that attempt to create equity in charter school funding. For example, the application points to a recent tax that was enacted to fund arts education in K-5 schools. The charter schools in those districts will also receive that funding similar to the non-charter public schools. During the 2016 legislative session there will be a working group created to examine the cost of charter funding and sponsorship. The ODE will be a part of this coalition. (pg. e30-31)

The applicant provides for and encourages the collaboration of charter and non-charter public schools. It cites a number of examples (see below) in which the differing entities have come together to increase communication and the sharing of best practices. (pg. e32)

Example 1: The creation of a steering committee to promote collaboration and authorizer quality.

Example 2: The creation of a two day statewide conference on Charter School Leadership.

Example 3: The commission of a longitudinal performance and demographic study from the Northwest Regional Education Lab.

Weaknesses:

None observed.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Policy Context for Charter Schools

1. The Secretary considers the policy context for charter schools under the proposed project. In determining the policy context for charter schools under the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The degree of flexibility afforded to charter schools under the State's charter school law, including:

i. The extent to which charter schools in the State are exempt from State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools; and

ii. The extent to which charter schools in the State have a high degree of autonomy, including autonomy over the charter school's budget, expenditures, staffing, procurement, and curriculum;

2) The quality of the SEA's processes for:

i. Annually informing each charter school in the State about Federal funds the charter school is eligible to receive and Federal programs in which the charter school may participate; and

ii. Annually ensuring that each charter school in the State receives, in a timely fashion, the school's commensurate share of Federal funds that are allocated by formula each year, particularly during the first year of operation of the school and during a year in which the school's enrollment expands significantly; and

3) The quality of the SEA's plan to ensure that charter schools that are considered to be LEAs under State law and LEAs in which charter schools are located will comply with sections 613(a)(5) and 613(e)(1)(B) of IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101, et seq.), title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d, et seq.), title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681, et seq.), and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794).

Strengths:

The applicant clearly indicates that Oregon Revised Statute provides charter schools with the autonomy to adopt or design their own curriculum. In addition, the law allows for the charter to have sole discretion with regards to staffing, budgeting, school calendars, and contracting.

The applicant discusses the various departments within the ODE that work to ensure that charter schools receive their share of funding. Since the charter is a part of the public district, the IDEA funding remains with the funds for students with disabilities. They also state that there is ongoing technical assistance provided to the LEA regarding federal rules and charter schools.

The applicant states that since the main district is considered the LEA and not the charter school, the district is responsible for ensuring that all schools (charters included) adhere to all the specified statutes. (pg. e34)

Weaknesses:

It was unclear from the application how the agencies are actually informing the actual charter schools about funding. The evidence presented seems to indicate that the ODE is notifying the main district and from there it is the responsibility of the supporting district to ensure dissemination.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Past Performance

1. The Secretary considers the past performance of charter schools in a State that enacted a charter school law for the first time five or more years before submission of its application. In determining the past performance of charter schools in such a State, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which there has been a demonstrated increase, for each of the past five years, in the number and percentage of high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State;

2) The extent to which there has been a demonstrated reduction, for each of the past five years, in the number and percentage of academically poor-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State; and

3) Whether, and the extent to which, the academic achievement and academic attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates) of charter school students equal or exceed the academic achievement and academic attainment of similar students in other public schools in the State over the past five years.

Strengths:

The applicant provides data documenting the significant increase in the number of charter schools in the state. They point to the high number of high performing, high poverty schools that have now become Model schools, going so far as to list one school by name. (pg. e34)

The SEA has demonstrated a recognition for the need to close low performing charter schools. This is evidenced by the closure of five charter schools located in the bottom 15% of Oregon schools at the end of the 14-15 school year. (pg. e35) There is also information provided that indicates the SEA views closure of low performing charter schools as a key focus. (pg. e36)

The applicant provided information about the demographics of students in charter schools, specifically around gender, of students attending charter schools to illustrate the population served. (pg. e37)

Weaknesses:

The data presented was not for the requested five year period. Providing the information for the requested period would strengthen this application.

The data presented did not clearly define the number of charter schools that were underperforming in the specified timeframe and how many of those schools were closed as a result. The documentation discusses schools that closed at the end of the 14-15 school year only. (pg. e35)

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of Plan to Support Ed. Dis. Students

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA 's plan to support educationally disadvantaged students. In determining the quality of the plan to support educationally disadvantaged students, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The extent to which the SEA' s charter school subgrant program would--

i. Assist students, particularly educationally disadvantaged students, in meeting and exceeding State academic content standards and State student achievement standards; and

ii. Reduce or eliminate achievement gaps for educationally disadvantaged students;

2) The quality of the SEA 's plan to ensure that charter schools attract, recruit, admit, enroll, serve, and retain educationally disadvantaged students equitably, meaningfully, and, with regard to educationally disadvantaged students who are students with disabilities or English learners, in a manner consistent with, as appropriate, the IDEA (regarding students with disabilities) and civil rights laws, in particular, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;

3) The extent to which the SEA will encourage innovations in charter schools, such as models, policies, supports, or structures, that are designed to improve the academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged students; and

4) The quality of the SEA 's plan for monitoring all charter schools to ensure compliance with Federal and State laws, particularly laws related to educational equity, nondiscrimination, and access to public schools for educationally disadvantaged students.

Strengths:

The application documents the requirement that the awarding of sub grant funds is contingent upon charter petitioners specifically addressing the needs of educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant lists specific target populations (at risk, drop out students) and some of the ways the charter schools will assist with these students. They clearly state “only those applicants that provide clear and quantifiable evidence of educationally disadvantaged student success...will be awarded sub grant funds”. (pg. e38)

The applicant provides a weighted lottery system that provides historically underserved populations better access to charter schools. They clearly identify these target populations, such as ELL, families in poverty, families of color. (pg. e39)

The applicant states that there are a number of different and innovative learning methods that are in production. There is also the requirement that applicants applying for dissemination funds must demonstrate previous success with educationally disadvantaged students.

The applicant provides clear guidance to the sponsoring district regarding the criteria for monitoring charter schools. Specific reports are due to the ODE annually, and there are model tools provided to the supporting districts in order to support them in their oversight of charter schools.

Weaknesses:

There does not seem to be a clear plan to recruit, admit, enroll, serve or retain educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant does speak of a recently passed law that would allow some targeted recruitment in the future, however there was no evidence of this currently.

The applicant does not provide actual documentation of the innovative programs that are proposed. As the items are in the developmental stage, there is insufficient evidence of their validity or success.

There could have been more clarity regarding how the SEA specifically ensures charter schools are addressing the needs of educationally disadvantaged students, ensuring that charters are compliant with all federal and state laws.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Vision for Growth and Accountability

1. The Secretary determines the quality of the statewide vision, including the role of the SEA, for charter school growth and accountability. In determining the quality of the statewide vision, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality of the SEA' s systems for collecting, analyzing, and publicly reporting data on charter school performance, including data on student academic achievement, attainment (including high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates), retention, and discipline for all students and disaggregated by student subgroup;

2) The ambitiousness, quality of vision, and feasibility of the SEA' s plan (including key actions) to support the creation of high-quality charter schools during the project period, including a reasonable estimate of the number of high-quality charter schools in the State at both the beginning and the end of the project period; and

3) The ambitiousness, quality of vision, and feasibility of the SEA' s plan (including key actions) to support the closure of academically poor-performing charter schools in the State (i.e., through revocation, non-renewal, or voluntary termination of a charter) during the project period.

Note: In the context of closing academically poor-performing charter schools, we remind applicants of the importance of ensuring adherence to applicable laws, policies, and procedures that govern the closure of a charter school, the disposition of its assets, and the transfer of its students and student records.

Strengths:

The state annually collects and compiles data regarding student achievement from charter schools. This data is then broken down to identify trends in special population as well as in the aggregate. It is also compared to students from the sponsoring district. Once compiled the data is added to the State report card system and made widely available to all stakeholders.

The applicant provides a clear picture of the number of charter schools expected to open during the grant period. The criteria for granting sub grants and dissemination funding is clearly outlined and provides links to the creation of high-quality charter schools. (pg. e43)

The applicant discusses the use of grant funding to better equip authorizers in the data analysis of academic progress of charter schools.

Weaknesses:

The applicant discusses the use of grant funding to better equip authorizers in the data analysis of academic progress of charter schools. The goal is to recognize academically struggling schools and make the necessary closures. While feasible, it lacks some of the detail in explaining how this will support the process of revocation or non-renewal. (pg. e44)

The data in the reports does not specifically address high school graduation rates and college and other postsecondary education enrollment rates, retention, and discipline for all subgroups and the aggregate.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Dissemination of Information and Best Practices

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA' s plan to disseminate information about charter schools and best or promising practices of successful charter schools to each LEA in the State as well as to charter schools, other public schools, and charter school developers (20 U.S.C. 7221b(b)(2)(C) and 7221(c)(f)(6)). If an SEA proposes to use a portion of its grant funds for dissemination subgrants under section 5204(f)(6)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7221c(f)(6)(B)), the SEA should incorporate these subgrants

into the overall plan for dissemination. In determining the quality of the SEA's plan to disseminate information about charter schools and best or promising practices of successful charter schools, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- 1) The extent to which the SEA will serve as a leader in the State for identifying and disseminating information and research (which may include, but is not limited to, providing technical assistance) about best or promising practices in successful charter schools, including how the SEA will use measures of efficacy and data in identifying such practices and assessing the impact of its dissemination activities;
- 2) The quality of the SEA's plan for disseminating information and research on best or promising practices used by, and the benefits of, charter schools that effectively incorporate student body diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity and diversity with respect to educationally disadvantaged students, consistent with applicable law;
- 3) The quality of the SEA's plan for disseminating information and research on best or promising practices in charter schools related to student discipline and school climate; and
- 4) For an SEA that proposes to use a portion of its grant funds to award dissemination subgrants under section 5204(f)(6)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7221a(f)(6)(B)), the quality of the subgrant award process and the likelihood that such dissemination activities will increase the number of high-quality charter schools in the State and contribute to improved student academic achievement.

Strengths:

The applicant is in the process of joining a number of groups in order to provide the resources districts need in order to disseminate best practices. They are also participating in research projects with established agencies in order to gather and analyze data such as graduation rates, college matriculation rates, persistence rates, and performance rates. Once completed, the data will be made available to all stakeholders.

The applicant clearly outlined the criteria for receiving dissemination grants. The items required, such as an outreach plan targeting outlying districts and poor performing districts, should lead to increasing the number of high quality charter schools. Also, the applicant is giving special consideration to groups that can prove direct success in closing achievement gaps. Finally, the applicant is requiring all applicants incorporate culturally relevant educational practices into their programs. (pg. e30-31)

Weaknesses:

Based on the data provided, many of the steps necessary to be the State leader for dissemination seem to be in progress and therefore are not validated or tested for efficacy.

The data does not state how the dissemination will specifically incorporate student body diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity.

There was no evidence outlining how the dissemination of best practices related to school climate or student discipline will occur.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Oversight of Public Chartering Agencies

The Secretary considers the quality of the SEA's plan (including any use of grant administrative or other funds) to monitor, evaluate, assist, and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies. In determining the quality of the SEA's plan to provide oversight to authorized public chartering agencies, the Secretary considers how well the SEA's plan will ensure that authorized public chartering agencies

are --

- 1) Seeking and approving charter school petitions from developers that have the capacity to create charter schools that can become high-quality charter schools;
- 2) Approving charter school petitions with design elements that incorporate evidence-based school models and practices, including, but not limited to, school models and practices that focus on racial and ethnic diversity in student bodies and diversity in student bodies with respect to educationally disadvantaged students, consistent with applicable law;
- 3) Establishing measureable academic and operational performance expectations for all charter schools (including alternative charter schools, virtual charter schools, and charter schools that include pre-kindergarten, if such schools exist in the State) that are consistent with the definition of high-quality charter school as defined in this notice;
- 4) Monitoring their charter schools on at least an annual basis, including conducting an in-depth review of each charter school at least once every five years, to ensure that charter schools are meeting the terms of their charter or performance contracts and complying with applicable State and Federal laws;
- 5) Using increases in student academic achievement as one of the most important factors in renewal decisions; basing renewal decisions on a comprehensive set of criteria, which are set forth in the charter or performance contract; and revoking, not renewing, or encouraging the voluntary termination of charters held by academically poor-performing charter schools;
- 6) Providing, on an annual basis, public reports on the performance of their portfolios of charter schools, including the performance of each individual charter school with respect to meeting the terms of, and expectations set forth in, the school 's charter or performance contract;
- 7) Supporting charter school autonomy while holding charter schools accountable for results and meeting the terms of their charters or performance contracts; and
- 8) Ensuring the continued accountability of charter schools during any transition to new State assessments or accountability systems, including those based on college- and career-ready standards.

Strengths:

The applicant recognizes the need for model tools and consistency among the different charter schools authorizers.

The current framework is aligned to the state standards and adheres to the criteria required for high-quality charter schools.

The applicant requires that any charter clearly define that academic achievement be the primary source of data used in decision making regarding renewal options. The applicant cited the specific wording from the legislation. (pg. e49)

The applicant stated that all schools in the state are required to submit annual performance reports to the ODE. ODE then compiles these and publishes a comprehensive report.

The state is in the process of developing the tool that the authorizers will use in order to create strong partnerships with charter schools that will maintain their autonomy.

The state recently transitioned to a new state-wide assessment, which includes charter school participation, so they are familiar with the process. According to the applicant, having gone through this recent transition has prepared them for continued accountability through future transitions. (pg. e50-51)

Weaknesses:

Based on the data provided, the model tools that will be used widely are currently in the pilot stage. There was no data attesting to their validity or efficacy. (pg. e47)

They are transitioning to a new Model Contract that will be customizable by individual school districts. This new mechanism will require implementation to see its efficacy and applicability.

While there is a plan to use a tool, it is still in the planning phase; there was no data provided regarding its fidelity and application. (pg. e34)

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Management Plan and Theory of Action

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and the project 's theory of action. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project s theory of action, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality, including the cohesiveness and strength of reasoning, of the logic model (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) and the extent to which it addresses the role of the grant in promoting the State-level strategy for using charter schools to improve educational outcomes for students through CSP subgrants for planning, program design, and initial implementation; optional dissemination subgrants; optional revolving loan funds; and other strategies;

2) The extent to which the SEA' s project-specific performance measures, including any measures required by the Department, support the logic model; and

3) The adequacy of the management plan to --

i. Achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including the existence of clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and

ii. Address any compliance issues or findings related to the CSP that are identified in an audit or other monitoring review.

Note: The Secretary encourages the applicant to propose a comprehensive management plan and theory of action for assessing the achievement of the objectives, including developing performance measures and performance targets for its proposed grant project that are consistent with those objectives. The applicant should clearly identify the project-specific performance measures and performance targets in its plan and should review the logic model application requirement and performance measures section of this notice for information on the requirements for developing those performance measures and performance targets consistent with the objectives of the proposed project. The applicant may choose to include a discussion of the project-specific performance measures and targets it develops in response to the logic model requirement when addressing this criterion.

Strengths:

Both the intended personnel and proposed project outline are delineated in a manner that engenders confidence regarding their timely completion. The professional experience of the project manager and other key personnel should allow for addressing and remediation of any compliance issues.

The different components of the project activities align with the Logic Model and are appropriate in scope and sequence in order to accomplish the intended objectives.

The applicant articulates clear strategies that will increase the number of high quality charter schools in the state. The staff that are listed as a part of the personnel possess key attributes (previous educational leadership experience, charter

school development and supervision experience) that will provide a solid leadership team. In addition, the plan presented to implement both the sub grants and dissemination grants are reasonable in timeline and scope. (pg. e35-39)

Weaknesses:

None observed.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the SEA 's charter school subgrant program, including the extent to which the project design furthers the SEA' s overall strategy for increasing the number of high-quality charter schools in the State and improving student academic achievement. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1) The quality of the SEA' s process for awarding subgrants for planning, program design, and initial implementation and, if applicable, for dissemination, including:

i. The subgrant application and peer review process, timelines for these processes, and how the SEA intends to ensure that subgrants will be awarded to eligible applicants demonstrating the capacity to create high-quality charter schools; and

ii. A reasonable year-by-year estimate, with supporting evidence, of

a) the number of subgrants the SEA expects to award during the project period and the average size of those subgrants, including an explanation of any assumptions upon which the estimates are based; and

b) if the SEA has previously received a CSP grant, the percentage of eligible applicants that were awarded subgrants and how this percentage related to the overall quality of the applicant pool;

2) The process for monitoring CSP subgrantees;

3) How the SEA will create a portfolio of subgrantees that focuses on areas of need within the State, such as increasing student body diversity or maintaining a high level of student body diversity, and how this focus aligns with the State-Level Strategy;

4) The steps the SEA will take to inform teachers, parents, and communities of the SEA' s charter school subgrant program; and

5) A description of any requested waivers of statutory or regulatory provisions over which the Secretary exercises administrative authority and the extent to which those waivers will, if granted, further the objectives of the project.

Strengths:

The applicant intends to create an application process for sub-grant awards in order to increase the likelihood of high-quality charter schools. They have a clear timeline for notification of availability of funds. There is also a detailed peer review process. Given the plan proposed by the applicant the creation of high-quality charter school is likely. (pgs. e62-63)

The SEA has planned to hold mandatory training sessions for all sub-grantees to discuss grant requirements, reporting requirements, data collection methods, etc. (pg. e72)

The applicant has clearly aligned the sub grant criteria to include serving historically underserved populations. Further, they are contracting annually with an organization that provides expertise and PD focusing on culturally responsive educational practices. They have indicated that they will model this PD similar to one already in existence in Portland in collaboration with the Oregon Center for Educational Equity. (pg. e72)

The SEA will use multiple sources to inform stakeholders of the information. They refer to email blasts, listservs, and departmental presentations.

The applicant did not request any waivers.

Weaknesses:

None observed

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: High-Quality Authorizing and Monitoring Processes

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that all authorized public chartering agencies in the State use one or more of the following:

a) Frameworks and processes to evaluate the performance of charter schools on a regular basis that include--

1) Rigorous academic and operational performance expectations (including performance expectations related to financial management and equitable treatment of all students and applicants);

2) Performance objectives for each school aligned to those expectations;

3) Clear criteria for renewing the charter of a school based on an objective body of evidence, including evidence that the charter school has (a) met the performance objectives outlined in the charter or performance contract; (b) demonstrated organizational and fiscal viability; and (c) demonstrated fidelity to the terms of the charter or performance contract and applicable law;

4) Clear criteria for revoking the charter of a school if there is violation of law or public trust regarding student safety or public funds, or evidence of poor student academic achievement; and

5) Annual reporting by authorized public chartering agencies to each of their authorized charter schools that summarizes the individual school 's performance and compliance, based on this framework, and identifies any areas that need improvement.

b) Clear and specific standards and formalized processes that measure and benchmark the performance of the authorized public chartering agency or agencies, including the performance of its portfolio of charter schools, and provide for the annual dissemination of information on such performance;

c) Authorizing processes that establish clear criteria for evaluating charter applications and include a multi-tiered clearance or review of a charter school, including a final review immediately before the school opens for its first operational year; or

d) Authorizing processes that include differentiated review of charter petitions to assess whether, and the extent to which, the charter school developer has been successful (as determined by the authorized public chartering agency) in establishing and operating one or more high-quality charter schools.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear statements regarding the academic and operational expectations of charter schools. For example, they state their adoption of the Performance Framework created by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers as a method to ensure the use of a rigorous measure and metric for student academic performance, financial performance and organizational stability. They reiterate that within the Framework there are specific measures to address each of the previously mentioned categories. (pg. e23)

The applicant also provides information regarding the criteria for renewal and revocation of a charter. According to the documentation, the main factors in the renewal of a charter are the review of the school's annual performance reports, annual audit of the financials and an annual site visit. The revocation of a charter is stated to be an option when there is failure to meet charter terms, student performance requirements, maintain financial stability or failure to correct violations to state or federal laws. (pg. e24)

There are procedures for the completion and submission of annual reports documenting the charter school's faithfulness to the charter's petition as well as the performance of the students. The evaluation of charter schools is clearly outlined with there being a clear way for charters to provide completed applications and appeal authorizer decisions.

The SEA requires that any pre-operational requirements of the charter be included in the contract and reviewed by the authorizer prior to starting the school. (pg. e25)

Finally, there is a process outlined in the application that allows for the consideration of prior charter school history in decision making procedures. (pg. e27)

Weaknesses:

None observed.

Reader's Score: 15

Competitive Preference Priority - Authorizer other than LEA or Appeal Process**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a LEA, or an Appeals Process**

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

a) Provides for one authorized public chartering agency that is not an LEA, such as a State chartering board, for each individual or entity seeking to operate a charter school pursuant to State law; or

b) In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, allows for an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

Note: In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

Strengths:

The SEA states that the primary authorizers of charter schools are the school districts within which the applicants wish to locate. There are, however, opportunities for the State Board of Education to review denials. If the appeals process is exhausted, the applicant allows for either the Oregon State Board of Education or an institute of higher education in Oregon to act as the LEA and provide oversight for the charter school. (pg. e27)

Weaknesses:

None observed.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2015 11:33 AM