

CSP Application Process Webinar Summary

Charter School Subgrant Verification Process

Shannon led a meeting to provide guidance on the subgrant verification process, discussing the narrative requirement, budget submission, and scoring criteria for charter school applications. She emphasized the importance of proper financial planning during the 18-month grant period, noting that technical assistance funds would benefit all charter schools in the state. Debby joined the meeting briefly to discuss the upcoming peer review process and her new role as a board member at C.S. Lewis Academy.

CSP Grant Review Process Challenges

The meeting focused on the CSP grant process and the challenges of finding peer reviewers. Shannon expressed concerns about budget constraints and the need for self-elimination among applicants. The team discussed potential new reviewers, including Michael Clark, and Debby offered to contact him. They also addressed technical issues related to the webinar setup and recording. Shannon and Debby coordinated the start of the meeting, welcoming participants and ensuring they were properly identified.

Charter School Grant Application Review

The meeting focused on reviewing the application process for charter school grants. Shannon introduced her team and provided an overview of the grant structure, emphasizing that 90% of the funds go to schools, with 7% used for technical assistance and 3% for grant implementation. Participants were asked to introduce themselves and their schools, specifying whether they are applying for a new school, replicating, or expansion grant. Several technical issues with the SurveyMonkey Apply portal were discussed, and Barbie provided guidance on resolving login and dashboard problems. The conversation ended with a reminder about the importance of marking tasks as complete and submitting the application to ensure it is received by the deadline.

Grant Application Process Overview

The meeting focused on the application and review process for a grant, with Shannon explaining the steps involved, including eligibility checks, training sessions, application completion, peer review, and interviews. Barbie addressed technical issues and promised to send a new invite to Julie, who will be replaced by Kristin as the project manager. Shannon outlined the components of the application, emphasizing the importance of the educational model section, which accounts for 54 points, and advised participants to clearly articulate their goals and project plans. She also highlighted the need to review and potentially amend lottery procedures to comply with federal regulations.

Grant Application Process Overview

The meeting focused on the grant application process, where Shannon explained that policy amendments must be submitted by March, even if pending board approval, to complete the application. The financial management section was highlighted as significant, with a dedicated webinar next week to discuss budget preparation, and Barbie requested that the allowable cost guide be included in the follow-up email. The competitive preference priorities were outlined, offering additional points for innovative charter models, rural needs, and charter-district school collaborations, with clarification provided that points would only be awarded for new expansions, not existing programs. The peer review process was described, involving three independent reviewers scoring applications, with a minimum threshold of 85 points required for advancement, and the conversation ended with details about upcoming interview dates for selected schools.

Schola's Grant Awardee Support Strategies

Shannon and Claire discussed Schola's role in supporting grant awardees, focusing on enrollment, retention, and family engagement strategies. Claire presented Schola's platform and services, including professional development, one-on-one coaching, and technology support for tracking enrollment pipelines. Shannon emphasized the importance of Schola's assistance for sustainable recruitment and capacity building, while also mentioning an upcoming opportunity for awardees to work with math specialists to improve student outcomes.

Charter School Leadership Incubator Program

The meeting discussed the Leadership Incubator Fellow program, a 12-month initiative designed to prepare leaders for roles in charter schools. Suzanne Owen presented the program, highlighting its focus on mentoring and training future leaders, with fellows being assigned to up to four charter schools. Shannon emphasized that the program is not contingent on receiving the CSP award and encouraged interested schools to attend a webinar the following day. The next steps for applying to the program were outlined, including completing eligibility and letter of intent requirements through SurveyMonkey by 11:50 PM the following day, with applications due by March 4th.

Charter School Lottery Policy Requirements

The meeting focused on clarifying lottery policy requirements for charter schools, where Shannon explained that while the federal department doesn't specify exact percentages, schools must ensure the majority of students are admitted through a lottery system rather than being filled with employees' relatives. The group discussed the upcoming March 4th deadline for applications, with Shannon offering to help review submissions for accuracy and Debby confirming she would add incubator fellowship information to the training calendar. The conversation ended with a discussion about technical issues some participants faced joining the meeting, and Shannon noted that she would send the allowable cost guide for budget planning in preparation for next week's deep dive into grant funding.

Math Conference Budget Review

The team discussed a proposal for a math-focused conference and related activities, with a potential cost of up to \$95,000 for a full year's work. They agreed to review the budget to determine if funds were available, particularly from the \$30,000 allocated for SCOLA. As a backup plan, Debby suggested identifying high-performing math schools for roundtable discussions at the conference. The team also confirmed upcoming meetings for the next day, including a Scala presentation at 9:30 and a webinar the following Monday.

Authorizer Training and Grant Review

The group discussed a \$75,000 authorizer training contract and reviewed EdConnective's proposal, which was around \$24,000 per school for one year. They agreed to put out an RFP for the training services and emphasized that they would only pay after the training was completed in June. The team also examined their grant goals, particularly the 5% improvement target for math scores by year two, acknowledging that timing was problematic since they couldn't report meaningful data until after the current school year. They noted that while the grant specified CSP awardees, the logic model indicated they should focus on growing charter school seats across the sector rather than just among awardees.

Math Reviewer Selection and Pipeline

The team discussed the selection of peer reviewers for math applications, with Shannon expressing concern about the high cost per review (\$1500) and Debby suggesting potential reviewers including Maylani Kirk, Lynn Herring, and Tirza Anderson. They agreed to reach out to previous applicants who were not selected and to contact Michael Clark about reviewing applications from schools he previously worked with. The group also addressed the status of 7 schools in their pipeline, noting that 4 of them would participate in a math summer project due to having available data, while the remaining 3 would not participate due to lack of students for data collection.