



Ohio

Ohio's CSP Subgrant Review and Award Process

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

NEW APPLICANTS

APRIL 2018

Table of Contents

Overview 3

Technical Review 3

Process 3

Notification..... 3

Peer Review 4

 Recruitment..... 4

 Selection Process..... 4

 Peer Reviewer Training 4

 Application Assignment 5

Needs Assessment Advisory Group 5

Subgrant Selection 5

 Score Analysis..... 5

 Standard Rubric Items 5

 Competitive Preference Priorities 6

 Application Ranking..... 6

 CSP Reserve..... 6

 Final Selection..... 6

Award Announcement 7

Attachment 1: Technical Review Checklist (New Applicant) 8

Attachment 3: Pre-Review Conflict of Interest Statement..... 16

Attachment 4: Post-Review Conflict of Interest Statement 18

Overview

Ohio's Charter (Community) Schools Program (CSP) subgrant competition review process for new applicants includes two levels: a technical review and a peer review. If CSP applicants are located in participating Needs Assessment Advisory Group (NAAG) territories, peer reviewers will evaluate the competitive preference priorities in those applications using participating advisory group established priorities.

CSP applicants located in districts designated in academic distress will only compete with other applicants from the same district, and funding will be subject to Ohio's CSP reserve fund.

Technical Review

Each Ohio CSP subgrant application will undergo a technical review (Attachment 1) after the application window closes. The technical review is the first step in vetting school applicants, and it serves to verify that: (1) the applicant adheres to all requirements; (2) the applicant proposes to use all funds on authorized activities; and (3) the submitted application is complete.

Process

The technical review will be completed by at least two staff members from the Ohio Department of Education: the grant manager and one other Department staff member, with assistance from other staffers. These staff members will review each CSP subgrant application and complete a Technical Review Checklist for each applicant, assessing criteria under the following categories:

- Eligibility requirements;
- Allowable use of funds;
- Unauthorized activities of the subgrant;
- Required forms;
- Application narrative; and
- Application appendices

Department personnel will come to consensus on whether the applicant meets each requirement, and the director of the Office of Community Schools will facilitate each consensus meeting. Prior to beginning application reviews, staff reviewers will be trained on this process to ensure consistency.

If an application fails to meet any of the reviewed requirements, the Office of Community Schools grants manager, in consultation with the Office of Community Schools director and Department leadership, will make a final eligibility decision. If a conclusion is not reached prior to the beginning of the peer review, the application will be included in the review with the option of removing it prior to award. Applications deemed to be ineligible following the technical review will be disqualified prior to submission to the peer review panel.

If the community school governing authority is unable to demonstrate an "arm's-length" relationship in the Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Education Management Organization (EMO) Questionnaire (Appendix 12) or the Disclosures (Appendix 10), the applicant will not meet the requirements of the technical review.

Technical Review Checklists will be completed online via the Department's online grants management system, the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP). Subgrantee applicants will not have access to feedback from the Department via CCIP until the grants are awarded.

Notification

Applicants will not receive notification on the status of the technical review. Applicants that successfully meet all technical review criteria will advance to the peer review. Applicants that do not meet all technical review criteria may receive notice that their applications were unsuccessful at the time of subgrant award announcement, along with the criteria that were not met.

Peer Review

The new applicant CSP Planning/Implementation subgrant application is competitive. The Department will establish an expert review team comprised of education stakeholders to score CSP subgrant applications using a detailed rubric with established criteria. Peer reviewers are selected on the basis of submitted qualifications and are trained to evaluate applications. All reviewers must be free of any conflicts to ensure the scoring process is unbiased and the Department has established a process for this determination as outlined in this document.

Selection Criteria

Peer reviewers must be education stakeholders with expertise in a range of fields, including, but not limited to, curriculum and instruction, law, governance, management, leadership, finance, school start-up, policy and community school operations. Preferred qualifications for peer reviewers include community school authorizing and accountability, community school policy, community school research and evaluation, community school development and implementation or community school grant administration. Peer reviewers may have expertise in various geographies, including urban, suburban and rural communities.

Recruitment

The department will develop a Call for Reviewers document to include the minimum and preferred qualifications, the reviewer application, conflict of interest process and forms and other pertinent information for interested individuals meeting the established qualifications. The Department will complete the recruitment of peer reviewers based on the established qualifications.

Peer Reviewer Qualifications

The minimum qualifications for a peer reviewer include, but are not limited to, three years' experience in one or more of the following areas of expertise: curriculum and instruction, law, governance, management, leadership, finance, school start-up, policy and community school operations. Preferred qualifications for peer reviewers include three years' experience in one or more of the following areas: community school authorizing and accountability, community school policy, community school research and evaluation, community school development and implementation or community school grant administration.

Selection Process

The department's resume review team will review submitted resumes. The selection process will consist of the following steps: minimum qualifications review, preferred qualifications review and final selection.

1. Minimum qualifications review: Department staff will review the submitted resumes from potential peer reviewers to determine if the minimum qualifications have been met. Applicants meeting the minimum qualifications will move to the second phase of review.
2. Preferred qualifications review: Department staff will review resumes meeting the minimum qualifications to determine if applicants hold expertise in the preferred qualifications. Applicants meeting the preferred qualifications will be ranked in order of experience in the preferred qualifications.
3. Final selection: Ranked applicants will be notified if selected to be peer reviewers.

Peer Reviewer Training

The Department will provide training via webinar for all peer reviewers in the following areas:

- Request for application;
- Rubric;
- Evaluation criteria;
- Competitive preference priorities;
- Needs Assessment Advisory Group priorities;
- Conflict of interest process; and
- Navigating the CCIP

Application Assignment

Subgrant applications that successfully met all requirements of the technical review will be assigned to no less than four peer reviewers for review and scoring of the full subgrant application.

The appropriate subgrant applications will be assigned to reviewers based on a random selection completed by the Department's data management team, which also will provide a list of "next reviewers" that the grants manager can use in the event that a reviewer needs to be reassigned. Conflicts of interest identified by the reviewers will be reviewed as a part of the initial assignment process. The assignments will be entered in the CCIP system, providing the reviewers access to the subgrant application documents and the scoring rubric.

If a reviewer identifies a potential conflict of interest for a grant application to which he or she has been assigned, the Office of Community Schools grants manager will reassign the application in question to another reviewer from the list provided by the data management team. The reviewer who was removed from the application may be assigned to another application, if appropriate.

Needs Assessment Advisory Group

The Needs Assessment Advisory Groups (NAAGs) are organizations located in urban areas that consist of school, business and government leaders. NAAGs that wish to participate in the CSP subgrant review process will do so by providing the Department with a summary of priorities prior to the release of the application within CCIP. To facilitate this list, the Department will provide each NAAG with demographic, achievement and voucher data for all schools in its territory. The Department also will train NAAGs on how to use this data to generate a summary of priorities, which will relate to the competitive preference priorities (described and published in the request for application). Participating NAAGs shall sign a memorandum of understanding with the department outlining responsibilities as well as disclosure information and/or conflict of interest statements.

Each participating Needs Assessment Advisory Group's summary will be posted to the Department's website no later than 10 days prior to the release of the application within CCIP. The summary will serve as guidance to peer reviewers when evaluating applicants from the NAAG's territory. Specifically, the summary will inform the scoring of the competitive preference priorities, which pertain to strategic replacement, high-need location, educationally disadvantaged students and proven educational models. If applicable, peer reviewers will score the competitive preference priorities according to the location's stated needs.

Subgrant Selection

The Department will seek to fund the application(s) showing the most promise for meeting the primary goals of the program. Quality applications will be identified during the analysis of the scores following the peer review. No applications that score under the identified quality cut score will be funded. All applications scoring at or above the quality cut score are considered eligible for funding dependent on available funds; however, the Department takes several other factors into account when determining the final list of subgrant awardees.

Score Analysis

The Department will analyze the peer review scores to determine a quality cut score that will be used to determine initial eligibility.

The Department will develop a calibration application that can be used when training the reviewers and for calibration purposes. Each reviewer will score the calibration application. The results of those scores will provide the Department with additional data points that will help to identify the severity of individual scorers.

Standard Rubric Items

For each scored application, the peer review scores will be analyzed at an item level. For each scored item, if there is one reviewer's score for that item that results in a gap of two or more points from the other scores, that score will be removed from the calculation. The remaining three scores for the individual item will be averaged to determine the final score for that item. If there is no two-point gap by an individual scorer, all scores for that

item will be included in the calculated average to determine the final score for that item. If there is not just one scorer that would qualify as an outlier, all scores will be included in the calculated average.

Competitive Preference Priorities

For each competitive preference item of the scoring rubric, if there is one reviewer's score that differs from the remaining three scores, that score will be removed from the calculation. The remaining three scores for the item will be averaged to determine the final score for that item. If all of the reviewers awarded points for the competitive preference priority item, all of the scores for that item will be included in the calculated average to determine the final score for that item. If there is not just one score that would qualify as an outlier, all scores will be included in the calculated average.

Application Ranking

The final score for each eligible application (scoring at or above the quality cut score) will be calculated by summing the final scores for each standard rubric and competitive preference priority item. The eligible applications will be ranked based on the final score from highest to lowest total score. In the event that one or more applications have the same total score, the ranking among those applications will be based on the final scores for the competitive preference priority items.

CSP Reserve

As part of the CSP subgrant competition, the Department created a CSP reserve fund that designates a portion of the grant funding for community school applicants located in school districts designated in academic distress. Eligible community school applicants, as determined by the quality cut score, whose facilities are located in the identified areas will be evaluated on the same criteria and in the same manner as all other eligible applicants but will only compete with proposals submitted from that territory to receive a portion of the CSP reserve fund.

CSP reserve fund territories:

1. A school district subject to an academic distress commission under Ohio Revised Code 3302.10; or
2. A municipal school district as defined in Ohio Revised Code 3311.71.

The Department will calculate the number of subgrants available to be awarded from the CSP reserve fund based on an assumption that subgrantees awarded planning grants will ultimately receive the total maximum allowed subgrant amount of \$700,000. The Department will select qualifying eligible applications (scoring at or above the quality cut score) for award from the CSP reserve based on peer review scores until the maximum number of possible awards has been reached. The number of planning subgrants available to be awarded from the CSP reserve for subsequent years will be dependent on the availability of federal funds and the number of subgrantees that are eligible for, and request, a renewal subgrant for implementation year 1 and/or year 2.

If there are not enough funds available in the CSP reserve fund to award all qualifying eligible subgrants, the remaining eligible applicants will be included in the overall determination of available awards based on peer review scores and total funds available for subgrant awards.

Final Selection

The Department will calculate the number of subgrants available to be awarded. The calculation will be based on an assumption that subgrantees awarded planning grants will ultimately receive the total maximum allowed subgrant amount of \$700,000 over a three-year period and that subgrantees awarded year 1 Implementation grants will receive the total maximum allowed subgrant amount of \$600,000 over a two-year period.

Eligible applications (scoring at or above the quality cut score) will be placed in ranking order based on the peer review scores as described in the "Peer Review" section of this document. The Department will select subgrants in order until all eligible applications have been selected for award or until the available federal funds have been allocated.

Following the selection of subgrants for the CSP reserve fund, the remaining eligible subgrant applications will be placed in ranking order based on the peer review scores as described above. The Department will select subgrants in order until all eligible applications have been selected for award or until the available federal funds from the CSP reserve have been allocated.

If the Department identifies items that are unauthorized or not properly categorized that require a CSP subgrant budget modification prior to the subgrant award, applicants will be notified and given an opportunity to submit a budget revision to address those issues. Applicants will need to submit requested changes prior to the official subgrant award notification. Please note that any applicant that does not provide an approved, revised CSP subgrant budget by the Department's deadline may not receive a subgrant award.

Award Announcement

After the selection process has been completed, and any required subgrantee budget modifications have been submitted and reviewed, the Department will notify all applicants of the disposition of their subgrant applications. The Department will generate an award letter from the superintendent of public instruction to each applicant that is awarded a subgrant. The letter will be sent via email to the contact listed in the application. In addition, the application status in the CCIP will be updated, which will generate a history log entry that includes the substantially approved date. Applicants whose applications are not selected for award will be notified by email.

A list of applicants awarded subgrants will be posted on the CSP grant page of the Department's website, along with a list of applicants that were not awarded subgrants.

Attachment 1: Technical Review Checklist (New Applicant)

Instructions: Department staff members complete the checklist below to indicate if the application has all required items. If needed, Department staff enter comments for each application section in the indicated “Comments” fields. Once the technical review is completed, Department staff members indicate whether or not the application is approved to continue through the review process.

Name of Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Eligibility Requirements

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
1. Applicant meets the federal definition of a public charter school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Applicant is planning or implementing a high-performing, site-based general education community school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Applicant is planning or implementing a community school based on a model with a track record of high-quality performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Applicant identified a high-performing educational model operated by its contracted CMO/EMO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Applicant’s sponsor meets eligibility criteria outlined in the Request for Application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. (For planning grant) Applicant has a preliminary agreement that describes the intention of both the applicant’s sponsor and the developer to pursue the execution of a community school contract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. (For implementation grant) Applicant has an executed community school contract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Applicant IS NOT a Dropout Prevention and Recovery School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Applicant IS NOT an e-school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Applicant has never received a CSP grant from the U.S. Department of Education or the Ohio Department of Education for the same activities prior to 2015	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Applicant does NOT have designated feeder patterns, demonstrating separate and distinct schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The applicant does NOT have weights associated with its lottery. The applicant is a community school that provides all students in the community with an equal opportunity to attend the charter school [20 U.S.C. 7221-7225g]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The applicant does NOT have lottery and enrollment policies that include preference for students in other community schools operated by the CMO/EMO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS			

Ineligibility Criteria

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
1. Applicant is a dropout prevention and recovery community school as defined in Ohio statute ORC 3314.35(A)(4)(a)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Applicant is an e-school as defined in Ohio statute ORC 3314.02(A)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Applicant has received CSP grant funds directly from the U.S. Department of Education or Ohio subgrants for the same activities prior to 2015	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Applicant is a community school that has been open for more than three years at the time this request for application was issued	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Applicant is a community school under contract with a sponsor that meets ineligibility criteria outlined in the Request for Application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Applicant is a community school with an active designated feeder pattern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Applicant identified a high-performing educational model implemented by a different CMO/EMO than its contracted CMO/EMO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Applicant is unable to demonstrate an “arm’s length” relationship with its contracted CMO/EMO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS			

Allowable Use of Funds

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
1. All costs in the budget fall under allowable costs as outlined in the Allowable Costs Guide and there are no additional costs outlined within the application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Applicant has demonstrated that state or local funds are unavailable to cover any budgeted expense at issue	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The application and budget does not include expenditures that are not “allowable, allocable, or reasonable” as defined in the Nonregulatory Guidance Handbook (updated January 2014) and the Uniform Guidance [2 CFR 200]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS			

--

Required Forms

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
Cover Page	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Completed Application Submission Checklist	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signed Certification Page	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Governing Authority Signed Resolution (for certification page)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signed Statement of Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signed Statement of Sponsor Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Goals Budget Spreadsheet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS			

Application Narrative and Technical Requirements

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
1. Narrative is 35 pages or fewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Narrative font size is 11 point	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Narrative font style is Arial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Narrative page margins are one inch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Narrative includes a header on all pages with all the following information: page numbers, community school name, school IRN and sponsor's name	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Narrative section includes:			
A. Executive Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Subgrant Project Goals, Budget, Budget Narrative and Evaluation Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Applicant includes a description of how it will use other federal funds (funding source, allocated amounts, title), in conjunction with CSP subgrant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

funding, to meet project goals and objectives in the CSP subgrant application			
C. School Community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Educationally Disadvantaged Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Description of how the community school will comply with sections 613(a)(5) and 613(e)(1)(B) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Educational Model	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. School Goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Parent and Community Outreach and Engagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Community School Personnel and External Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Governance and Management Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Business Capacity and Continued Operation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS			

Application Appendices

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
1. Community School Enrollment Policy, including Lottery Protocol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Completed CSP Budget Form (to be completed in Ohio's e-grant system, CCIP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Copy of Community School's Annual and Long-Term Budgets and Last Audited Financial Statement (when applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. The applicant used the Department's annual budget template and five-year forecast template	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Copy of Preliminary Agreement or Executed Contract, including all attachments and any amendments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Technology Plan (required if requesting funds for technology)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. School Library Development Plan (required if requesting funds for library)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Professional Development Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Marketing Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Performance Management Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Disclosure Information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Copy of Lease Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. CMO/EMO Contract (or other provider contracts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The contract between the community school governing authority and the CMO/EMO includes a provision allowing the governing authority to terminate the contract for cause prior to the end of the term.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. The contractual fees for the CMO/EMO are reasonable. If the applicant contracts with a CMO/EMO, it provided a detailed explanation and breakdown of services and how the contractual fees are reasonable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflicts of Interest Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. A potential conflict of interest was identified during the technical review process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Governing authority members, founding members and disclosure information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Evidence of public benefit corporation or nonprofit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. State report card(s) and an explanation of the state's academic measures and metrics for a community school operating a high-performing educational model outside of Ohio (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. CSP Subgrant Project Goals and Activities Form(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Each project activity form includes the CSP budgeted amount and other federal funding sources including amounts to be allocated for the activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Charter/Education Management Organization (CMO/EMO) Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Applicant demonstrates CMO/EMO "arm's length" requirement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Waiver Requests (OPTIONAL)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS			

Overall Recommendation for Technical Review (*check one*):

- APPROVED** **NOT APPROVED**

Additional Comments

Attachment 2: Conflict of Interest Procedure

Please review the following definitions of “directly affiliated,” “indirectly affiliated” and “unaffiliated” to determine whether you have, may have or appear to have a conflict of interest.

1. Scorers “Directly Affiliated” with a Grant Application

A scorer is directly affiliated with a grant application when the scorer or a member of the scorer’s family¹ contributes to the development and/or execution of a grant application in a substantive, measureable way, whether or not compensation is requested or received. Further, scorers with a direct or indirect pecuniary interest² in any grant application may not participate in the scoring of any grant applications with which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest.

By way of example, scorers directly affiliated with grant applications include, but are not limited to:

- A governing board member of a community school applying for a grant;
- A member of the board of a sponsor of a community school applying for a grant;
- The principal or superintendent of a community school applying for a grant;
- An administrator or educator working for the community school or operator of the community school applying for a grant;
- An employee of the sponsor or operator of a community school applying for a grant;
- Consultants or suppliers participating in or planning to participate in implementing a grant in partnership or with a grant applicant; or
- An employee of the sponsor or management company of a community school applying for a grant.

If a scorer directly affiliated with a grant application scores any applications with which he or she is affiliated, the grant application to which the scorer is affiliated will be deemed void.

2. Scorers “Indirectly Affiliated” with a Grant Application

A scorer is indirectly affiliated with a grant application when the scorer or a member of the scorer’s family does not contribute to the development or execution of a grant application in a substantive, measurable way but maintains an indirect professional relationship with a grant applicant. Scorers indirectly affiliated with a grant application may not review any applications.

By way of example, scorers indirectly affiliated with grant applications may include, but are not limited to:

- A former colleague of anyone developing and/or executing a grant application; or
- A present or former employee of any organization developing or executing a grant application.³

A scorer indirectly affiliated with a grant application may not score any application. If a scorer happens to score an application with which he or she has an indirect affiliation, that score will be void and the grant application must be reviewed by another “unaffiliated” scorer before the application advances to the next step of the grant application review process.

¹ Family members include, but are not limited to, the following: grandparents; parents; spouse; children and stepchildren, whether dependent or not; grandchildren; brothers and sisters; or any person related by blood or marriage and residing in the same household.

² Pecuniary interest includes anything of value. For a full definition, see section 1.03 of the Ohio Revised Code.

³ A scorer is considered a former employee if he or she worked for an organization developing or executing a grant application at any point during the past year.

3. Scorers “Unaffiliated” with a Grant Application

A scorer is unaffiliated with a grant application when the scorer or a member of the scorer’s family neither contributes to the development and/or execution of a grant application in a substantive, measurable way nor maintains an indirect professional relationship with a primary or secondary grant applicant. Scorers without any direct or indirect affiliation may review any grant application.

If scorer is...	Directly affiliated with a grant application	Indirectly affiliated with a grant application	Unaffiliated with any grant application
Ability to score grant applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scorer may not review any grant applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scorer may not review any grant applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scorer may review any grant application.
Ramifications of scoring an affiliated grant application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly affiliated grant applications he or she scored are void. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indirectly affiliated grant applications he or she scored will be void and the application must be reviewed by another scorer. 	

Attachment 3: Pre-Review Conflict of Interest Statement

CHARTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM GRANT PRE-REVIEW CERTIFICATION REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR REVIEWERS OF GRANT APPLICATIONS

Name [Last, First]:

(Please Print)

Name of current employer:

Address (current employer):

Other Employers (if applicable):

Check only one:

I have read the “Managing Conflicts of Interest or Appearance of Conflicts of Interest for Scorers,” and I hereby certify that, based on the information provided:

I have no relationships with any person or entity that might constitute a conflict of interest.

I have the following potential conflict(s) of interest:

Identify the individual or entity with whom you have an economic or fiduciary relationship and briefly describe the nature of the relationship/conflict. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

<i>Individual or Entity</i>	<i>Nature of Relationship</i>

CERTIFICATION

I certify that I have read the attached “Conflict of Interest Procedure.” I certify that to the best of my knowledge I have disclosed all potential conflicts of interest that I have or may have with the Charter Schools Program grant, and I fully understand the confidential nature of the grant application review process and agree: (1) to return all materials related to it; (2) not to disclose or discuss the materials associated with the review, my evaluation or the review meeting with any other individual except as authorized by designated Ohio Department of Education administrative staff; (3) not to disclose information about approved grants prior to the signing of the grant agreement; and (4) to refer all inquiries concerning the review to Ohio Department of Education administrative staff or other designated officials.

Signature: _____

_____ Date

Attachment 4: Post-Review Conflict of Interest Statement

CHARTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM GRANT POST-REVIEW CERTIFICATION FORM REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR REVIEWERS OF GRANT APPLICATIONS

Date(s) of review: _____

Provide the names of the Charter Schools Program subgrant applicants for which the reviewer evaluated during the competition:

Check only one:

I have read the "Conflict of Interest Procedure," and I hereby certify that, based on the information provided:

I have no relationships with any person or entity that might constitute a conflict of interest.

I have the following potential conflict(s) of interest:

Identify the individual or entity with whom you have an economic or fiduciary relationship and briefly describe the nature of the relationship/conflict. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

<i>Individual or Entity</i>	<i>Nature of Relationship</i>

CERTIFICATION

I fully understand the confidential nature of the review process and certify that in the review above, I did not participate in an evaluation of any application or proposal with which I knowingly had a conflict of interest.

Printed Name

Signature
