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Objectives

1. Review logic model basics
2. Introduce logic model review tool
3. Identify strategies to strengthen logic models
4. Strategize with peers for ways to strengthen existing logic models
Agenda

- Logic model review
- Introduce and discuss logic model review tool
- Identify strategies to strengthen logic models
- Group activity
Who is WestEd?

WestEd® is a research, development, and service agency that works with education and other communities to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults.

WestEd® has monitored several U.S. Department of Education (ED) discretionary grant programs including the Charter Schools Program, Magnet Schools Assistance Program, and Voluntary Public School Choice.
Logic Models

• Why are we talking about them?
• What are they?
• What is in them?
Why are we talking about logic models?

- The 2015 and 2016 Notices Inviting Applicants require that grantees include a **Logic Model** that “**addresses the role of the grant in promoting the state-level strategy for expanding the number of high-quality charter schools** through startup subgrants, optional dissemination subgrants, optional revolving loan funds, and other strategies.”
What is a logic model?

• “A logic model is a **systematic** and **visual** way to present and share your understanding of the relationships among the **resources** you have to operate your program, the **activities** you plan, and the changes or **results** you hope to achieve.” (W.K. Kellogg Foundation 2004)

• And also... the **context** in and **assumptions** with which you operate.
What is in a logic model?

Resources
- Staff, partners, funding, other

Activities
- Project work

Outputs
- Products

Outcomes
- Short-, mid-, long-term
What is in a logic model?

- **Resources**
  - Staff, partners, funding, other

- **Activities**
  - Project work

- **Outputs**
  - Products

- **Outcomes**
  - Short-, mid-, long-term

- **Assumptions**
- **External Factors**
- **External Evaluation**
What makes a good logic model?

• Clarity – Are the connections among elements clear and logical? Is level of detail appropriate?
• Accuracy – Does the model reflect the project? Is content complete?
• Utility – Is it useful?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>SHORT</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Philosophy</td>
<td>Mission &amp; Vision</td>
<td>Demonstrated commitment to new mission &amp; vision. Publish on Agency website.</td>
<td>Division policies and efforts are congruent with mission and vision.</td>
<td>New Paradigm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Competitive Start-Up Subgrants</td>
<td>Updated/Redefined mission and vision statements.</td>
<td>CSP funding opportunities will become available.</td>
<td>Charter schools will demonstrate an increase in student performance for math and reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in charter school applicants submitting high-quality applications that reflect innovative practices.</td>
<td>Start-Up Grant 2015-20 grantees demonstrate financial sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Education Agency Staff</td>
<td>Monitoring/ Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of charters will increase each year.</td>
<td>Increased awareness by parents, students, and teacher regarding charter school performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Education Agency Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of students meeting the state standard in reading and math will increase each year.</td>
<td>Number of poor-performing charter schools will decrease.</td>
<td>Increase in the number of charter schools earning accountability with distinction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Partners</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Number of students in charters will increase each year.</td>
<td>State funds (ADA) and other fiscal/tangible resources are made available to high performing charter operators through effective revocations and closures of poor-performing charters.</td>
<td>Decrease in the number of charter schools requiring non-renewal, revocation, or surrender.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Authorize Expansion and Growth</td>
<td>Number of charters meeting the Texas definition of “high-performing” will increase each year.</td>
<td>First-year charter schools will be better prepared to successfully operate in Year 1.</td>
<td>Charter school students demonstrate an increase in college and career readiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Support</td>
<td>Charter School RFA &amp; Authorization Process</td>
<td>Number of charters meeting the Texas definition of “poor-performing” will decrease each year.</td>
<td>Financial management and data quality at new charters will improve.</td>
<td>Positive increases in the financial sustainability of struggling charters/traditional school districts and (or) non-startup grantees due to the incorporation and communication of best practices and lessons-learned from Start-Up grantees past and present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Open</td>
<td>Charter Support &amp; Networking</td>
<td>One-hundred percent of first-year charters receive initial site visits.</td>
<td>Improved collaboration and information-sharing among charter education stakeholders, including the sharing of data and promising instructional and other practices.</td>
<td>Evolving application and review process for new charter schools that (1) tracks trends among applicants to better serve the Texas community where need is greatest; (2) identify innovative applicants that can meet those needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual attendance increase at Summer Summit.</td>
<td>Regular networking/support meetings between Agency staff and charter stakeholders.</td>
<td>Increased attendance at Summer Summit and other professional development activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Stakeholder(s)</td>
<td>Revised Open</td>
<td>Number of charters receiving standard achievement ratings in FIRST will increase.</td>
<td>Identification and dissemination of identified best practices.</td>
<td>Fewer poor-performing charter schools in Texas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items labeled in **BLUE** indicate CSP Grant-specific inputs, measures, and outcomes. However, additional information in **BLACK** has been provided to situate Texas’s CSP Grant-specific objectives into the larger state-wide strategy for the Texas charter school portfolio.
## Logic Model

### Inputs
- Staff
- Materials
- Expertise
- Funds
- Time
- Contractors

### Activities
- Award subgrants
- Professional development
- Technical assistance
- Equity training
- Organize annual project director meetings
- Monitor subgrantee activities
- Authorizer development
- State-wide professional development

### Participants
- Charter school developers
- Charter school operators
- Charter school boards
- Teachers
- School district administrators
- School district boards

### Outputs - Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase # of high-quality charter schools</td>
<td>Increase equitable access to high-quality schools of choice</td>
<td>Increase high-quality charter schools are respected as incubators for educational innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase quality of school district oversight</td>
<td>Increase graduation rates</td>
<td>Increase college persistence in charter school graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create library of model authorizer tools</td>
<td>Charter school demographics reflect the district in which they are located</td>
<td>Create state-level policy on authorizer quality standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge of culturally responsive educational practices</td>
<td>Improve student achievement in historically underserved student groups</td>
<td>More chronically low-performing charter schools close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase opportunities to collaborate with high-quality schools</td>
<td>Increase knowledge of effective practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions
1. By providing intensive incubation periods with support and equity training, newly approved charter schools will have a stronger opening and be better positioned to serve all students well – increasing student achievement in all subgroups, decreasing inequity, and improving graduation rates.
2. By giving charter schools in their first term of operation a high level of professional development and subgrant support, charter schools and educators will be able to develop high-quality, culturally responsive curriculum and educational practices designed to improve student achievement and graduation rates.
3. By funding high-quality charter schools to capture effective practices and disseminate them through collaborative partnerships with other public schools, the knowledge of best practices and relationships with other public schools will increase.
4. By focusing on authorizer development and creating model authorizer tools, the quality of charter schools will increase because only high quality charters will be approved or renewed and authorizers will provide better support to ensure continuous improvement.
### California Charter Schools Program Logic Model 2016–19

#### Resources

- Federal Grant Funds
- CDE Program Staff
- Charter Organizations
- California State Laws

#### Activities

- Inform community about funding opportunities
- Technical Assistance (TA) Trainings
- Planning and Implementation (P/I) Sub-Grants
- Creation and implementation of LCAP as required by state law
- Monitoring LCFF for funding priorities and educationally disadvantaged students
- Collect and Evaluate Quarterly and Annual Reports
- Monitor Fiscal Management and Governance training requirements
- Sub-grantee monitoring site visits/desk reviews
- Leadership Training
- CDE collaboration on conferences, webinars, and workshops
- My Digital Chalkboard
- Dissemination Sub-Grants

#### Outputs

- Two annual regional trainings/workshops for charter developers and authorizers
- Two annual webinars for charter developers
- Release of P/I Request for Applications (RFA) every fall with TA workshops
- Data collection from charter schools program (CSP) sub-grantees
- Fund up to 110 new charter schools annually
- Site monitoring visits and desk reviews
- Presentations at charter school association conferences
- Fund up to 10 Dissemination sub-grantees
- Weekly Charter Schools Division collaboration meetings
- Release of Dissemination RFA every spring with TA webinar

#### Participation

- Increase quality of RFA applications to increase the number of schools eligible for funding (PM 1a)
- Increase in quality of applications with programs targeted for Educationally Disadvantage Students (PM 1a, 1d, 1e)
- Increase in student enrollment in CA charter schools (PM 1b, 1d, 1e)
- Increase in student academic performance for all charter school students (PM 1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d)
- Data sets to track educationally disadvantage students (PM 1d, 1e, 2e)

#### Short-term

- Increase in number of high-quality charter schools (PM 1a, 1b)
- Improvement of academic achievement for educationally disadvantaged students (PM 1d, 2e)
- Increase in student academic performance for all charter school students (PM 1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d)
- Data sets to track educationally disadvantage students (PM 1d, 1e, 2e)

#### Long-term

- Increase in program fidelity and accountability for sub-grantees (PM 4a, 4b, 4c)
- Increase in fiscal sustainability of sub-grantees (PM 4a, 4b, 4c)
- Increase in the amount and quality of resources available to stakeholders (PM 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e)

#### Assumptions

The California State Board of Education will approve the new state accountability measures.
Getting from here to there

• Know where you start
  • Review your current logic model
• Know what you can adjust (and what you can’t)
  • These are a part of your approved application package
  • Revisions to clarify and strengthen are preferred
  • Major changes should be done in conjunction with Program officer
Better...Stronger...Faster?

- Components in the right order
- Elements under the correct components
- Defined and detailed elements
- Inclusion of project objectives and/or performance measures in outcomes
- Articulated relationships
- Defined assumptions, external factors
Evaluation and Logic Model Initiative

• Convene(d) semi-regular expert panel to review logic models, identify criteria, develop rubric and review tool
• Validated review tools with panel and CSP staff
• Reviewed all 2015 and 2016 grantee logic models against rubric
• Providing on-going resources, TA, and guidance
Logic Model Review Tool

Structural Components
Content Review
Rubric
• Relationships
• Timelines
• State Strategy
• Resources
Identified areas for follow-up
Structural Components

• Are all components included (resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, assumptions, and external factors)?
• Are there explicit relationships?
• Are outcomes defined within the grant time frame?
Content Review

• Is there an alignment with the state strategy?
• Are the project objectives/ performance measures included?
• Are projected outcomes feasible?
• Do outcomes demonstrate meaningful value/public benefit?
### Initial items to review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Components</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments/Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes resources/inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes (all components must be present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes external factors (contextual situation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes relationships between components (e.g., resources to activities to outputs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes relationships between specific elements (e.g., arrows or other linkages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes short-term outcomes (1-2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes mid-range outcomes (3-4 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes end/long-term outcomes (5+ years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Review</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments/Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit alignment with state strategy for expanding high-quality charter schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States or references grant project goals and objectives (constructs for performance measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected outcomes seem feasible based on the outputs, activities, and inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project outcomes represent a meaningful value to the public (public value/benefit; e.g., academic growth, closing ach. gap, graduation rates, college acceptance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric

• Alignment/relationship between grant goals, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes
• Reasonable timeframe for activities and outcomes within the period of the grant
• Connects grant project to state strategy
• Adequacy of resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard/Criteria</th>
<th>1 – Weak</th>
<th>2 – Basic</th>
<th>3 – Adequate</th>
<th>4 – Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment/relationships between grant goals, inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes</td>
<td>Illogical or no connections; activities without outcomes or outcomes without activities; no assumptions mentioned</td>
<td>Lack of alignment; individual lists made sense but were not connected; no arrows/relationships; limited articulation of assumptions</td>
<td>Reasonable linkages and plausible connections for most components; assumptions may not be fully articulated</td>
<td>Logical linkages; valid connections; clear alignment across all components/elements; evidence for key assumptions/relationships; ALL aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard/Criteria</td>
<td>1 – Weak</td>
<td>2 – Basic</td>
<td>3 – Adequate</td>
<td>4 – Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable timeframe for activities and outcomes within the period of the grant</td>
<td>No timeframe suggested; cannot be measured</td>
<td>Not achievable within grant period; not reasonable/realistic (e.g., 100% proficient after 1 year; 10-year graduation rates)</td>
<td>Mix of outcomes within and outside of the grant period (sufficient content and performance measures within the grant period)</td>
<td>Timeline is reasonable with most objectives/performance measures within the grant period (could have a few longer-term goals outside of the grant program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard/Criteria</td>
<td>1 – Weak</td>
<td>2 – Basic</td>
<td>3 – Adequate</td>
<td>4 – Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects grant project to state strategy</td>
<td>No explicit connection or alignment between grant project and state strategy; project or state strategy is missing</td>
<td>Illogical connection or alignment between grant project and state strategy</td>
<td>Partial connection or alignment between grant project and state strategy</td>
<td>Internally consistent and valid connections between grant activities and state strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard/ Criteria</td>
<td>1 – Weak</td>
<td>2 – Basic</td>
<td>3 – Adequate</td>
<td>4 – Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Resources</td>
<td>Unable to assess sufficiency and relation of resources</td>
<td>Insufficient resources <strong>AND</strong> not clearly related to or supportive of grant activities</td>
<td>Insufficient resources <strong>OR</strong> not clearly related to or supportive of grant activities</td>
<td>Sufficient resources are clearly defined and are related to and support grant activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic Model Rubric:</td>
<td>1 – Weak</td>
<td>2 – Basic</td>
<td>3 – Adequate</td>
<td>4 – Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment/relationships between grant goals, inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes</td>
<td>Illogical or no connections; activities without outcomes or outcomes without activities; no assumptions mentioned</td>
<td>Lack of alignment; individual lists made sense but were not connected; no arrows/relationships; limited articulation of assumptions</td>
<td>Reasonable linkages and plausible connections for most components; assumptions may not be fully articulated</td>
<td>Logical linkages; valid connections; clear alignment across all components/elements; evidence for key assumptions/relationships; ALL aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable timeframe for activities and outcomes within the period of the grant</td>
<td>No timeframe suggested; cannot be measured</td>
<td>Not achievable within grant period; not reasonable/realistic (e.g., 100% proficient after 1 year; 10-year graduation rates)</td>
<td>Mix of outcomes within and outside of the grant period (sufficient content and performance measures within the grant period)</td>
<td>Timeline is reasonable with most objectives/performance measures within the grant period (could have a few longer-term goals outside of the grant program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects grant project to state strategy</td>
<td>No explicit connection or alignment between grant project and state strategy; project or state strategy is missing</td>
<td>Illogical connection or alignment between grant project and state strategy</td>
<td>Partial connection or alignment between grant project and state strategy</td>
<td>Internally consistent and valid connections between grant activities and state strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Resources</td>
<td>Unable to assess sufficiency and relation of resources</td>
<td>Insufficient resources AND not clearly related to or supportive of grant activities</td>
<td>Insufficient resources OR not clearly related to or supportive of grant activities</td>
<td>Sufficient resources are clearly defined and are related to and support grant activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Activity

- With colleagues and peer states, review your logic models and rubrics

Then... (see handout)
- Strengthen relationships
- Clarify resources
- Identify state strategy
Homework

• Clarify timeframes
• Identify assumptions and external factors
• Talk with Program Officers
Wrap-up/Discussion

- Questions?
- What’s next?