

**Statutory Provisions Governing Charter School State Grants and Replication and Expansion Grants
Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as Reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act**

I. State Grants (“Grants to Support High-Quality Schools”)

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
Entities Eligible to Apply for a State Grant	
<p>The following types of entities may apply for funding to administer a charter schools program in a State:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A State educational agency (SEA) 2. A State charter school board 3. The Governor 4. A charter school support organization (CSO, defined as a nonprofit, nongovernmental entity that is not an authorized public chartering agency and that provides, on a statewide basis: (1) assistance to developers during the planning, program design, and initial implementation of a charter school; and (2) technical assistance to operating charter schools). 	<p>Previously, only State educational agencies were eligible.</p> <p>Under Department of Education requirements, multiple eligible applicants may apply for a grant in consortium. Thus, two or more entities in a State that are eligible to apply for a charter schools grant could apply jointly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you know which entity intends to apply for your state? 2. Is it possible to develop a consortium so that the SEA applies in partnership with entities that can help ensure a high-quality application, with the SEA serving as the fiscal agent?
Limitation on Grants to a State	
<p>No State entity may receive a grant for use in a State in which a State entity is currently using a grant.</p>	<p>In other words, if one entity in a State has a grant, no other eligible in the State may receive a grant until the first grant runs out.</p>
Authorized Program Activities	
<p>State entities may use their grants:</p>	

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With at least 90% of the grant, to make subgrants to eligible applicants¹ for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Opening and preparing for the operation of new charter schools; ○ Opening and preparing for the operation of replicated high-quality charter schools²; and ○ Expanding high-quality charter schools; • To provide technical assistance to eligible applicants and authorized public chartering agencies (“authorizers”) and to work with authorizers to improve authorizing quality (at least 7%); and • For administrative costs, which may include technical assistance (up to 3%). 	<p>Under the previous statutes, states could make subgrants only for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-award planning and design of the educational program of a charter school: and • Initial implementation of the charter school. <p>Support for replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools was provided only through the separate replication and expansion grants.</p> <p>Note that technical assistance is authorized under both the 7 percent set-aside and under the 3 percent set-aside.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are working to see if ED will permit FY 2016 grantees to have the flexibility to make grants for these purposes, and to leverage 7% for authorizer quality. 2. What framework is in place in your State, or will be developed, to improve authorizer quality with the seven percent set-aside? Statute requires a description of: <i>How the State entity will provide oversight of authorizing activity, (including how the State will ensure better authorizing such as by establishing authorizing standards that may include approving, monitoring, and re-approving or revoking the</i>

¹ An “eligible applicant” is defined as a developer that has applied to an authorized public chartering authority to operate a charter school and has provided timely notice to that authority. In turn, “developer” is defined as an individual or group of individuals (including a public or private nonprofit organization), which may include teachers, administrators, and other school staff, parents, or other members of the local community in which a charter school project will be carried out.

² See section on Replication and Expansion Grants for definition of a “high-quality charter school.”

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
	<p><i>authority of an authorizer based on the performance of charter schools in the areas of student achievement, student safety, financial and operational management, and legal compliance, except that, if the applicant is a CSO, the application must describe how the entity will support the State’s technical assistance to and oversight of authorizing activity.</i></p>
Maximum Grant Period	
Up to 5 years	Previously, was up to 3 years, but many states received no-cost extensions. Unless addressed in appropriations bills, there may not be sufficient funding for 5-year grants since the statute requires grants to be fully funded for their first two years when the grants are awarded.
Competitive Grant Priorities	
The Secretary must give priority to a State entity to the extent that it meets the following priorities:	<p>The statutory language does not specify whether the priorities must be “absolute” (only State entities meeting the priority may compete for funding) or “competitive” (State entities will receive extra competitive points to the extent that they meet the priority). This will be determined by the Department of Education in the individual competitions.</p> <p>Note also that, under some of the new priorities, eligible State entities in a State may need to collaborate, depending on the identity of the actual applicant. For example, in a particular State, efforts to use best practices from charter schools to improve struggling schools and LEAs might be under the purview of the SEA and not be subject to any level</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
	of influence by the State charter school board or the State’s charter support organization. By communicating and collaborating across organizations, an applicant from a State, whatever its identity, should be able to mount a stronger application.
Priority 1: The State entity is located in a State that allows at least one entity that is not a local educational agency (LEA) to be an authorizer or, if LEAs are the only authorizers, the State has an appeals process for denied applications.	Virtually identical to previous law. In the 2016 competition, this was a competitive priority.
Priority 2: The State entity is located in a State that ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.	New under ESSA. How will your state demonstrate that it has met this, particularly the “prompt” part?
<p>Priority 3: The State entity is located in a State that provides charter schools one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for facilities • Assistance with facilities acquisition • Access to public facilities • The ability to share in bonds or mill levies • The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings • Low- or no-cost leasing privileges 	New under ESSA. A state only has to have one of these in place to win additional points.
Priority 4: The State entity is located in a State that uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and LEAs.	New under ESSA. ED not likely to make this a high-value priority.
Priority 5: The State entity supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through such activities as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.	New under ESSA.
Priority 6: The State entity has taken steps to ensure that all authorizers implement best practices for charter school authorizing.	The FY 2016 competition included a competitive priority for States in which all authorizers use one or more of the

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
	<p>following: (1) Authorizing processes that establish clear criteria for evaluating charter applications and include a multi-tiered clearance or review of a charter school; (2) Authorizing processes that include differentiated review of charter petitions to assess whether, and the extent to which, a developer has been successful in establishing and operating one or more high-quality charter schools; and (3) Clear and specific standards and formalized processes that measure and benchmark the performance of the authorized public chartering agency or agencies.</p>
<p>State Application: Descriptions of the State’s Program</p>	
<p>The State entity’s application must include a description of the entity’s objectives in running a quality charter school program and of how those objectives will be carried out, including descriptions of how the entity will:</p>	<p>Previous law also called for a description of the objectives of the State’s program.</p>
<p>1. Support the opening of new charter schools and, if applicable the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools, including the proposed number of schools to be opened, replicated, or expanded</p>	<p>New language. However, in the FY 2016 competition applicants described their “logic model” for using the grant to support a statewide model for increasing the number of high-quality charter schools in the State. This is the first clear authorization of using funds for replication and expansion. The definition of high quality is broader and more flexible than what has previously been used for the CMO competition.</p>
<p>2. Inform eligible charter schools, developers, and authorizers of the available funds under the program</p>	<p>Carried over from previous law</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
<p>3. Work with eligible applicants to ensure that they access all Federal funds that they are entitled to achieve, and help charter schools supported by those applicants to: (1) participate in Federal programs; (2) receive the Federal funds they are eligible to receive; and (3) meet the needs of students served under the Federal programs, including English learners (ELs) and students with disabilities (SWDs)</p>	<p>Expands slightly on language from previous law. In addition, in the FY 2016 competition applicants described how charter schools in the State would comply with IDEA.</p>
<p>4. Ensure that authorizers (in collaboration with LEAs where applicable) establish clear plans and procedures for assisting students enrolled in a charter school that closes or loses its charter</p>	<p>New language While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into any of the selection criteria. For this and other descriptions that are not explicitly addressed in the criteria, ED might find a way to incorporate them through regulation. The closest fit would likely be under Criterion 2. (See below.)</p>
<p>5. In the case that the entity is not an SEA, work with the SEA and charter schools to maximize charter school participation in Federal and State programs, and work with the SEA to operate the State’s program under the grant</p>	<p>New language. For non-SEA applicants, this requirement will clearly entail partnering. While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into any of the selection criteria.</p>
<p>6. Ensure that each eligible applicant receiving a subgrant uses its funds for eligible purposes and is prepared to operate charter schools receiving subgrant funds, in a manner consistent with the applicant’s application, after the subgrant ends</p>	<p>New language intended to prevent funds going to “faux charters”. Previous law required that the subgrant application describe how the authorizer would provide for continued operation of a school, once the Federal funds had expired</p>
<p>7. Support charter schools in LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement under Title I, and support the use of charter schools to improve or turn around struggling schools</p>	<p>New language. This is not incorporated into the selection criteria, but at some point it could disadvantage states that have a less urban/high-poverty focused charter school portfolio.</p>
<p>8. Work with charter schools on recruitment and enrollment practices that promote inclusion of all students (including by eliminating barriers to the enrollment of educationally disadvantaged students) and work</p>	<p>New language. However, in the FY 2016 application applicants described how enrollment lotteries would be conducted in the State, including any preferences or</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
with them on supporting all students once they are enrolled so as to promote retention (including by reducing the use of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom)	exemptions from lotteries. SEAs will have varying levels of capacity to “work with” charters. This could be an opportunity for CSOs and other organizations to partner with the SEA in writing the application. While this is a required description, it is incorporated into the selection criteria.
9. Share best and promising practices between charter schools and other public schools	Previous law required a description of how the SEA would disseminate best or promising practices of charter schools to each LEA in the State. While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into the selection criteria.
10. Support efforts to increase charter school quality initiatives, including meeting quality authorizing elements	New language
11. Provide oversight of authorizing activity (including how the State will establish better authorizing such as by establishing authorizing standards that may include approving, monitoring, and re-approving the authority of an authorizer based on the performance of charter schools in the areas of student achievement, student safety, financial and operational management, and legal compliance), except that if the applicant is a CSO, the application must describe how the entity will support the State’s technical assistance to and oversight of authorizing activity	New language. If the applicant is a CSO, this requirement will mean partnering with other entities. This language was heavily negotiated during conference, and state responses will likely be watched closely.
12. Work with applicants receiving subgrants to support the opening of new charter schools or models that are high schools	New language While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into the selection criteria.
State Application: Additional Descriptions	
The application must describe:	

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
The extent to which the State entity is able to meet and carry out the statutory priorities	Under each competition, the Department of Education has instructed that applicants describe how they would meet the statutory and Secretarial priorities.
1. The extent with which the entity is working to develop or strengthen a cohesive statewide system to support the opening of new charter schools (and, if applicable, replicated or expanded high-quality charter schools)	New language. While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into in the selection criteria.
2. The extent to which the entity is working to develop or strengthen a cohesive strategy to encourage collaboration between charter schools and LEAs on the sharing of best practices	New language. While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into in the selection criteria.
3. How the entity will award competitive subgrants, including a description of the application each eligible applicant will be required to submit ³ and a description of how the entity will review applications	<p>Previous law required an assurance that the SEA would require eligible applicants to submit applications meeting certain requirements, but did not require a description of the State’s subgrant application</p> <p>This requirement could be an issue for states that currently award grants to all newly authorized charters (such as MA).</p> <p>While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into the selection criteria.</p>
4. In the case of an entity that partners with an outside organization, the roles and responsibilities of the partner	New language
5. How the entity will ensure that each charter school receiving program funds has considered and planned for the transportation needs of the school’s children	<p>New language</p> <p>While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into the selection criteria.</p>

³ The law further specifies six components of the subgrant application. See section 4303((f)(1)(C)(i).

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
<p>6. How the State in which the entity is located addresses charter schools in the State’s open meetings and open records laws</p>	<p>New language. This language was compromise language and is merely a description of whatever is (or is not) in state law. While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into the selection criteria.</p>
<p>7. How the entity will support diverse charter school models, including models that serve rural communities.</p>	<p>New language. Unclear how any applicant will respond to this. While this is a required description, it is not incorporated into selection criteria.</p>
<p>State Application: Assurances</p>	
<p>A State entity’s application must assure that:</p> <p>1. Each charter school receiving funds under the grant will have a high degree of autonomy over budget and operations, including over personnel decisions</p>	<p>Assurances tend to be something for applicants to “check off” and don’t typically require narrative.</p> <p>New language. Previous law gave a State a priority if it gave charter schools a high degree of autonomy over budget and expenditures, but did not include an assurance.</p>
<p>2. The entity will support charter schools in meeting the educational needs of their students</p>	<p>New language. Unclear how this is anything but an easy “give away” assurance in terms of requiring anything apart from the general stated mission of an SEA.</p>
<p>3. The authorizer of any charter school that receives funds under the entity’s program adequately monitors each school in recruiting, enrolling, retaining, and meeting the needs of all students</p>	<p>New language. SEA authorizers that apply would be assuring this about themselves.</p>
<p>4. The entity will provide adequate technical assistance to eligible applicants in meeting objectives related to supporting charter schools in LEAs with a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, using charter schools to</p>	<p>New language.</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
<p>improve or turn around struggling schools, and meeting the educational needs of their students</p>	
<p>5. The entity will promote quality authorizing, such as through providing technical assistance to authorizers on monitoring charter schools by assessing annual performance data, reviewing schools’ annual financial audits, and holding charter schools accountable against the academic, financial, and quality controls agreed to by between the school and the authorizer.</p>	<p>Pursuant to a requirement in appropriations language, recent competitions have required the SEA to assure that State law, regulations, or other policies ensure that each charter school: (1) operates under a legally binding charter or contract between itself and its authorizer that describes the obligations and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer; (2) conducts annual, timely, and independent audits of the school’s financial statements that are filed with the authorizer, and (3) demonstrates improved student achievement.</p> <p>Also pursuant to appropriations language, recent competitions have required an assurance that authorizers in the State use increases in student achievement for all groups of students as one of the most important factors when determining whether to renew or revoke a school’s charter.</p> <p>We are hopeful that this year’s appropriations bills will be passed without this language. It isn’t in the current House or senate bills.</p>
<p>6. The entity will work to ensure that charter schools are included, with traditional public schools, in decision-making about the public school system in the State</p>	<p>New language</p>
<p>7. The entity will ensure that each charter school receiving funds under the entity’s program makes publicly available (consistent with Title I report card requirements) information to help parents make informed decisions about their children’s educational options, including</p>	<p>New language</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
<p>information on the school’s educational program, student support services, parent contract requirements, enrollment criteria, and annual performance and enrollment data, disaggregated by Title I subgroups</p>	
State Application: Waiver Requests	
<p>The application must include a request and justification for any waivers of Federal statutory or regulatory provisions that the State entity believes are necessary for the successful operation of charter schools that will receive funds under the entity’s program.</p> <p>If the entity submitting the application is a CSO, the application must instead include a description of how the CSO will work with the State to request such waivers, where applicable.</p>	<p>Carried over from previous law</p> <p>New language added because of the new inclusion of CSOs as eligible State entities. Will require cooperation between a CSO and the State government.</p>
Selection Criteria	
<p>The Secretary must award grants to State entities based on the quality of their applications, taking into consideration:</p>	<p>As in earlier competitions, the Department of Education may, through rulemaking, add additional selection criteria to the statutory criteria. They have indicated that there will not be rulemaking for the FY 2017 competition.</p>
<p>1. The degree of flexibility of the State’s charter schools law, and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under that law</p>	<p>Previous law made the degree of flexibility a factor, but how the applicant would work to maximize flexibility was not.</p>
<p>2. The ambitiousness of the State entity’s objectives for the quality charter school program carried out with the grant</p>	<p>Carried over from previous law</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Analysis and Implications
<p>3. The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students</p>	<p>Carried over from previous law.</p>
<p>4. The State entity's plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants; b. Work with authorizers to avoid duplication of the work for charter schools and authorizers; and c. Provide technical assistance and support for eligible applicants receiving subgrants and for quality authorizing efforts in the State 	<p>New statutory language. However, the criteria used by the Department in the FY 2016 competition included, among other things: (1) the quality of the SEA's process for monitoring subgrants; and (2) the quality of the SEA's plan to monitor, evaluate, assist, and hold accountable authorizers.</p>
<p>5. The entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State</p>	<p>New language. An important distinction is that this is a plan for input for charter schools statewide, not each individual charter school.</p>

II. Grants for Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
Entities Eligible to Receive a Grant	
Charter management organizations (CMOs, defined as a nonprofit organization that operates or manages a network of charter schools linked by centralized support, operations, and oversight.	Through the FY 2016 competition, the Department made grants to CMOs, defined as a nonprofit organization that operates or manages multiple charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools.
Purpose of the Program	
To provide competitive grants to enable eligible entities to open and prepare for the operation of one or more replicated high-quality charter schools or to expand one or more high-quality charter schools.	The FY 2016 competition awarded grants for the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools.
Key Definitions	
<i>Replicate</i> means to open a new high-quality charter school, or a new campus of a high-quality charter school, based on the educational model of an existing high-quality charter school, under an existing charter or an additional charter, if permitted or required under State law	The FY 2016 competition defined <i>replicate</i> as opening one or more new charter schools that are based on the charter school model or model for which the applicant presents evidence of success
<i>Expand</i> means to significantly increase enrollment or add one or more grades to a high-quality charter school	The FY 2016 competition defined “ <i>significantly expand</i> ” as a charter school increasing its student count or adding at least two grades over the course of the grant.
<i>High-quality charter school</i> means a charter school that:	The FY 2016 competition defined a “ <i>high-quality charter school</i> ” as a school that:

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows evidence of strong academic results, which may include strong student academic growth, as determined by the State • Has no issues in the areas of student safety, financial and operational management, or statutory or regulatory compliance • Has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students • Has demonstrated success in increasing student academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for each of the Title I subgroups (subject to “N size” restrictions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the previous three years (or the life of the school, if less than three years), has demonstrated strong academic results based on: (1) increasing student academic achievement for all students (including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students); (2) either demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps between subgroups, or having no significant gaps; and (3) results (including through statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates, where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students that are at or above the average for such students in the State • Had no significant compliance issues, particularly in the areas of student safety and financial management. <p>The statutory definition of a high-quality charter school is clearly much less complex than the definition previously used by the Department.</p>
Application: Data to be Included	
<p>An CMO’s application must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student assessment results for all students and for each Title I subgroup 	<p>Required student assessment results, schoolwide and by subgroup, on statewide tests for the previous three years, compared to all students in other schools in the State or States at the same grade level and compared to other schools serving similar demographics of students</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
2. Attendance and student retention rates for the most recently completed school year	Required annual student attendance and retention rates, schoolwide and by subgroup, for the previous three years, compared with other similar schools
3. If applicable, the most recent four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and extended-year cohort graduation rates	Required, where applicable and available, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates (schoolwide and by subgroup) for the previous three years, and the methodology used to calculate these rates
4. Information on any significant compliance and management issues encountered in the previous three years by any school operated or managed by the CMO, including in the areas of student safety and finance	Required information on any significant compliance issues identified in the last three years within each school managed by the applicant, including in the areas of student safety, financial management, and statutory or regulatory compliance
Application: Descriptions	
<p>An application must include descriptions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant’s objectives for implementing a high-quality charter school program with grant funds, including the proposed number of high-quality charter schools the applicant proposes to open (through replication) or expand 	Required descriptions of the applicant’s objectives for replicating or substantially expanding high-quality charter schools, and of the methods it would use to determine its progress toward those objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The educational program that the applicant will implement in those schools, including information on how the program will enable all students to reach State standards, the grade levels or ages of children to be served, and the instructional practices that will be used 	Required description of the educational program to be implemented, including how the program would enable all students (<i>including educationally disadvantaged students</i>) to meet State standards, the grade levels or ages of students to be served, and the <i>curriculum and</i> instructional practices to be used (i.e., virtually the same language, except where italicized)

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the charter schools will be sustained after the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model for the applicant 	<p>Same type of language, but no requirement for a multi-year financial and operating model</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the applicant will ensure that the charter schools opened or expanded will recruit and enroll students, including SWDs, ELs, and other educationally disadvantaged students 	<p>Required description of how all students in the community (including SWDs, ELs, and other educationally disadvantaged students) will be informed about the new or expanded charter schools and given an equal opportunity to attend; also required a description of how the schools would comply with IDEA</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A request and justification for any statutory or regulatory waivers that the applicant believes are necessary for the successful operation of the schools it will open or expand 	<p>Same requirement</p>
	<p>Also required descriptions of: (1) how the applicant operates or manages its charter schools, and how it will operate or manage the new ones (including information on central office functions, governance, daily operations, financial management, human resources management, and instructional management); (2) how the applicant would ensure that the new or expanded schools receive their commensurate share of Federal funds; (3) the administrative relationship between the schools to be opened or expanded and the authorizer; (4) how parents and other members of the community would be involved in the planning, program design, and implementation of the new or expanded schools; (5) how the grant funds would be used, including how they would be used in conjunction with other Federal funds and with any matching funds; and (6) for each charter school currently operated or managed by the applicant: the year founded, grades served, number of students, address, percentage of students in each subgroup, three years of assessment results by subgroup, three years of student</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
	<p>attrition rates, and, for high schools, graduation and college attendance rates</p> <p>Through rulemaking, the Department could add these or other descriptions under the next competition.</p>
Application: Assurance	
<p>An application must ensure that the applicant has sufficient procedures in effect to ensure timely closure of low-performing or financially mismanaged schools, and clear plans and procedures for students in close schools to attend other high-quality schools.</p>	<p>No comparable requirement</p>
Selection Criteria	
<p>The Secretary must award grants based on the quality of applications, taking into consideration <i>such factors as</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree to which an applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement for all students and all subgroups 	<p>Included a criterion on the quality of the eligible applicant, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree to which the applicant had demonstrated, for three years, increasing academic achievement and attainment for all students, including educationally disadvantaged students • The degree to which the applicant had, over a three-year period, achieved closure of gaps between subgroups or had achieved results for subgroups that are above the State average • The degree to which the applicant had achieved results (performance on statewide tests, attendance and retention rates, graduation rates, college attendance and enrollment rates) that are above average for the State

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A determination that an applicant has not operated or managed a significant proportion of charter schools that have been closed, have had their charter revoked due to problems with compliance, or have had the school's affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated 	No comparable criterion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A determination that the applicant has not experienced significant problems with compliance that could lead to the revocation of a school's charter 	No comparable criterion
<p>Note that the language "such factors as" indicates that the Department could use these or other criteria.</p>	<p>Other criteria were on the potential contribution of the project in assisting educationally disadvantaged students, the quality of the project design, the quality of the management plan, and the quality of the evaluation plan.</p>
Competitive Grant Priorities	
<p>The Secretary must give priority to eligible entities that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan to operate or manage high-quality charter schools with racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies Demonstrate success in working with schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement under Title I Propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students 	<p>Gave absolute priority (i.e., applicants had to meet at least one of the priorities in order to compete) to applicants that either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were currently managing or operating more than one high-quality charter school; or Currently operated or managed charter schools in which at least 60 percent of students were from low-income families <p>Gave competitive priorities (i.e., extra points) to:</p>

Application and Related Requirements	Comparison with Most Recent (FY 2016) Competition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to operate or manage high-quality charter schools that focus on dropout recovery and academic reentry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicants that would serve students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes <i>or</i> would replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve students attending schools identified for improvement under Title I <i>or</i> would serve or coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone; and Applicants with a demonstrated record <i>or</i>, and continued commitment to, taking active measures to promote student diversity and serve SWDs and ELs at a rate comparable to that of local regular public schools