

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/21/2018 12:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Central Queens Academy Charter School (U282E180032)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	23
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	20
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Access to High-Quality Educational Choice		
1. Increasing Access	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs		
1. Enrollment Programs	2	0
Sub Total	2	0
Total	104	94

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 3: 84.282E

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Central Queens Academy Charter School (U282E180032)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational Opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students and serve those students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.**

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed program has been designed to expand the educational opportunities for economically and educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant provided comprehensive data to evidence the high poverty in the targeted service area. For example, in the targeted areas 89% of the student population is categorized as economically disadvantaged. Among this population, 69% is Hispanic and Latino, thus the need to focus on the ELL student population. (pgs. e20-23)

The applicant provided numerous strategies as to how the program will meet their targeted goals of increasing opportunities for ELL students. For example, the proposed program will use a lottery based selection system and 30% of the available slots will be reserved for ELL subgroups of students. (pg. e36) Targeted mailing, open houses and school tours will be utilized to increase recruitment and potential enrollment.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 23

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable**

Strengths:

The applicant provided two general goals and objectives that are aligned with increasing enrollment through expansion, increasing academic gains and preparing students for college success. (pg. e36)

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provided proposed goals and objectives, they were not specifically aligned with measurable outcomes. For example, in goal one, the applicant indicated the goal is to expand available seats at the charter school. The applicant, however, did not provide any measurable data to indicate numerically how they would measure success of meeting this goal. Another example is that the applicant's goal is to prepare students for college success and beyond through increasing student achievement. The applicant did not provide any measurable numerical data to support this outcome. Additionally, throughout the narrative, the applicant's focus has been on increasing educational opportunities for ELL students, however, the applicant does not provide any goals and objectives to support their ELL focus.

Reader's Score: 8

2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed expansion has been appropriately designed to meet the needs of ELL students. For example, the applicant will focus on literacy aligned with six key academic and non-academic elements. Some of those elements include: (1) literacy focus, (2) rigorous standards, (3) teacher development and a longer school day. (pgs. 43-45) Additionally, to address the targeted population, the applicant will provide culturally responsive support services and character development. All of which are key elements linked to academic success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub Question

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability**

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant provided a general GEPA statement reiterating the program will provide equitable access to the project, the applicant did not provide a narrative that specifically addressed how the proposed program will encourage and recruit applicants from underrepresented groups of people.

Reader's Score: 0

- 2. (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel**

Strengths:

The applicant successfully demonstrated that the key staff have the necessary qualifications and training needed to implement the project. For example, the Executive Director will also serve as the Project Director. Based on a review of her resume, she has many years of professional work experiences. The School Director is a lifelong teacher and has degrees in the field of education. Similarly, the Chief Financial Officer has experience as a Financial Director at other charter schools, as well as experience with public and private organizations. (pgs. e40-41)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a detailed management plan that is aligned with the tasks and activities needed to implement the proposed project. The management plan has key milestones aligned with a timeframe and persons responsible for completing each activity. For example, the applicant will begin during the Summer of 2018 to develop the curriculum and hire the needed staff. The School Director will be responsible for overseeing these activities. Based a review of the timeline, the proposed project has the potential to meet the budget guidelines and finish the project within a reasonable timeframe of the grant ending. (pgs. E 40-42)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the charter school to be replicated or expanded is a high-quality charter school, including:

(1) The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students and for each of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA, attending the charter schools the applicant operates or manages. These subgroups of students include: Economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and students who are ELs.

(2) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.

(3) The extent to which charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have been closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation; have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management; have experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter; and have had any significant issues with respect to student safety.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant presented a strong program narrative that has the potential to be successful in expanding its program to meet the needs of ELL students. The application was focused and provided data to evidence prior year(s) successes with all sub-groups. The applicant presented solid evidence that there is a need to focus on increasing the literacy instruction for ELL students, which will mainly consist of the growing Hispanic population in the targeted area. (pgs. e1-54)

(2) The applicant provided extensive data that indicate the program has made growth on statewide assessments. The applicant adequately addressed the proposed plans to increase academic and annual student performance on statewide assessments. The applicant indicated and provided annual assessment data which shows some annual growth have been made among high-need students, the plan is to increase that growth by 1% each year over the next five years. In addition to annual academic growth, the applicant outlined a plan to improve attendance, decrease the dropout rate and increase parental involvement. (pgs. 27-28)

(3)

The applicant's charter school has been in existence since 2012 and there have been no infractions or closing of the school during this time period.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Continuation Plan

1. The extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate charter schools that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a reasonable continuation plan that indicated the program will be sustained using public school funds, Title I funds, IDEA funding and other government funding. Additionally, the applicant will launch a capital campaign to raise funds. The applicant has raised over 4.5 million dollars from various donors, special events and government funding. For example, the applicant indicated that their lead donor is the Ong Family Foundation who has provided over 1.4 million dollars and has pledged an additional 1 million. The applicant's program appears to have solid funding sources, such the Walton Family Foundation, the Tang Family and the Carson Family Trust. (pgs. e54-55)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Access to High-Quality Educational Choice****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Supporting High-Need Students by Increasing Access to High-Quality Educational Choice**

This priority is for projects that are designed to increase access to educational choice and improve academic outcomes and learning environments for one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students in communities served by rural local educational agencies**
- (ii) Children with disabilities**
- (iii) English learners**
- (iv) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian Tribes.**

Note: Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

- (i) Not applicable
- (ii) Not applicable

(iii) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed program expansion is specifically geared towards improving the academic outcomes for English Language Learners (ELL) which is the fastest growing student population in three targeted multi-ethnic and multi-lingual communities. The applicant further demonstrated that the schools in those targeted areas are overcrowded and ranked as high-risk schools. Thus, expanding the charter school will provide more educational opportunities to those affected students. (pg. e20) The proposed program expansion at the fifth-grade level will focus on improving the literacy levels of approximately 30% of students either determined to be ELL or those who should be labeled as ELL and have not been assessed yet.

- (iv) Not applicable

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2—Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools

The extent to which the proposed project is designed to increase student access to, participation in, and completion of dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high schools.

Strengths:

Not applicable. The applicant is not proposing a Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools program component.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable. The applicant is not proposing a Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools program component.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/21/2018 12:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/22/2018 12:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Central Queens Academy Charter School (U282E180032)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	22
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	20
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	14
Sub Total	100	88
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Access to High-Quality Educational Choice		
1. Increasing Access	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs		
1. Enrollment Programs	2	0
Sub Total	2	0
Total	104	90

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 3: 84.282E

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Central Queens Academy Charter School (U282E180032)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational Opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students and serve those students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.

Strengths:

As described in the application (e16, e19), the school serves a population that is highly diverse, and mostly representative of its neighboring area. Students have shown higher achievement and growth (p. e28) than neighboring schools; according to a state performance analysis, the school has shown academic achievement that is "higher than expected to a large degree" in several subject areas (pp.e104-e124). When disaggregated, as in pp. e31-33, the school shows success for its subgroups.

The school enrolls a higher proportion of economically disadvantaged students than does the neighboring district.

Weaknesses:

While the school has shown achievement and growth, it is below SUNY's goal in Math and ELA for 75 percent of "All Students" to show proficiency as noted on pp. 118-119.

The 30 percent lottery preference is likely to add ELL/ED students, but the school could do more to recruit those students specifically, as the school actually currently enrolls ELL students at a slightly lower rate than the neighboring district.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 22

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable

Sub Question

Strengths:

The broad goals on p. e38 are reasonable, as is the enrollment plan on e39 and the timeframe on e40.

Weaknesses:

While some of the outcomes on p. e38 are clear and measurable: ie "Meet and exceed charter accountability goals, others are less so: ie, "Proficiency as measured by state assessments exceeds peers" (which peers, and which CQA groups?), or "Replicate CQA middle school programs," and "Plan CQA high school" (how will success on these be measured?). The application would be strengthened by including a table with clearer, more specific targets.

Reader's Score: 7

2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs

Strengths:

The school has shown success with the target population in the past. Its model, including both academic and non-academic aspects as described beginning on p. e45 provides a well-thought-out approach to addressing the target population. The school uses increased instructional time (longer days and years), frequent assessments, and teacher training to support its focus on literacy, for example.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability

Strengths:

The school has staff from underrepresented groups, and makes some effort to recruit them, as described on p. e41.

Weaknesses:

To strengthen the application, the school could describe its "intentional hiring practices" from p. e41. This would make the actual recruiting practices and their potential efficacy clearer.

Reader's Score: 1

Sub Question

2. (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel

Strengths:

The project's key personnel have appropriate skills and experiences in running schools and other types of nonprofit organizations. They have experience, in terms of educational leadership, finance, and fundraising, as described by the application p. e41 and in the resumes provided in e82-94.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The application team has very strong project management experience, and has had successes specifically with this school. The application's description on pp. e33-34 is appropriate, and the application provides milestones, timelines, and responsible parties on p. e40.

Weaknesses:

Because the application does not provide fully direct, measurable goals/outcomes in every case, it would be strengthened by showing how management of the project will lead directly to student outcomes (other than equipping the new school). For example, it is not clear how Outcome 3: "Plan CQA High School" would be measured. Also Outcome 2: "Proficiency as measured by state assessments exceeds peers" could be clarified to describe which assessments, which peers, and what "exceeds" means, specifically.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

- 1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the charter school to be replicated or expanded is a high-quality charter school, including:**

(1) The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students and for each of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA, attending the charter schools the applicant operates or manages. These subgroups of students include: Economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and students who are ELs.

(2) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.

(3) The extent to which charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have been closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation; have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management; have experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter; and have had any significant

issues with respect to student safety.

Strengths:

- (1) As shown in Table 1 and in pp. e104-e124, the school has shown both academic success and growth for subgroups. For example the school's performance was rated "higher than expected to a large degree" in ELA and Math, when compared to other schools.
- (2) As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the school has exceeded the local and state averages in Math and ELA every year they've been open. The school's retention rate in 2016-17 was 97 percent.
- (3) The schools have not had charters revoked or faced other compliance issues according to the application.

Weaknesses:

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.
- (3) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Continuation Plan

- 1. The extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate charter schools that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available.**

Strengths:

The application states that the school plans to operate on local/state/title funding after the grant period on p. e54, and has an improving financial position. The school has successfully raised \$4.5MM to date to support its work, and has relationships with several local and national funders.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 14

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Access to High-Quality Educational Choice

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Supporting High-Need Students by Increasing Access to High-Quality Educational Choice**

This priority is for projects that are designed to increase access to educational choice and improve academic outcomes and learning environments for one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students in communities served by rural local educational agencies
- (ii) Children with disabilities
- (iii) English learners
- (iv) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian Tribes.

Note: Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The school currently exists in an area with a large number of ELL students. It has a lottery preference for local students as described on p. e21, which is likely to mean some ELL enrollment because it specifically reserves space for those students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2—Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools

The extent to which the proposed project is designed to increase student access to, participation in, and completion of dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high schools.

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/22/2018 12:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/22/2018 12:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Central Queens Academy Charter School (U282E180032)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	26
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	20
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	13
Sub Total	100	93
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Access to High-Quality Educational Choice		
1. Increasing Access	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs		
1. Enrollment Programs	2	0
Sub Total	2	0
Total	104	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 3: 84.282E

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Central Queens Academy Charter School (U282E180032)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational Opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students and serve those students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.**

Strengths:

CQA has a 30% ELL lottery preference, ensuring that ELL students are disproportionately overrepresented compared to the district (e36). Outreach is produced in Spanish and dominant Asian languages and the school has leadership and staff members that can communicate in these languages (e37). The proposal indicates an active commitment and focus on ELL and immigrant student populations which also translates into a disproportionately higher economically disadvantaged population.

Despite servicing traditionally disadvantaged subgroups, CQA as a whole (with its large ELL population) has significantly outperformed NYS, NYC, and its District schools in Proficiency and Growth on all major assessments (e25-e30). The data clearly indicate expanded educational opportunities for ELL and economically disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 26

Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable**

Strengths:

The application presents six outcomes and two goals, which are clearly specified and measurable. The first goal is to increase educational opportunity by expanding CQA seats, which would be met by the opening of the K-4 elementary school and replication of the middle school program (e38).

Sub Question

The second goal is to prepare CQA scholars for success in college and beyond, which would be met through proficiency testing, charter accountability goals, and effect size in comparative performance according to annual accountability reporting (e38). These outcomes are clearly specified and measurable and serve the purposes of the grant.

Weaknesses:

The goal of planning the CQA High School is not clearly defined and measurable as stated. It is uncertain what level of planning would constitute satisfaction of this particular outcome.

Reader's Score: 11

2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs

Strengths:

The design of the project is rooted in the principles of the existing middle school. These include six key academic and non-academic design elements. The academic elements are well described to include a focus on literacy, rigorous standards based academics and frequent assessments to foster growth, a focus on teacher development, and more time on tasks. The proposal articulates a reasoning behind each of the design elements, rooted in research-based best practices (e45-e48).

The design of the program is appropriate to the target population and has achieved success at the middle school level; expansions into the elementary grades and later high school are likely to result in improved academic outcomes for the disproportionately ELL student body of the emerging charter school network.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability

Strengths:

No strengths found.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

Although diversity of staff includes 15% Hispanic/Latino, 17% African-American, and 7% Asian-American, no clear plan for maintaining or increasing applications for employment from traditionally underrepresented groups is indicated from the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel

Strengths:

The Executive Director and Founder possesses experience in strategic planning and resource management to effectively oversee the expansion of existing school. The school Principal has previously founded a charter school and has experience as school administrator and on the Board of Trustees. The Chief Financial Officer has experience in overseeing the financing and construction of a 48,000 square foot school (e41-e42). The team of key personnel have appropriate experience, education, training, and knowledge to effectively oversee the expansion of the charter school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The applicant has a demonstrated ability to operate a successful charter school servicing a student population disproportionately ELL and economically disadvantaged (e43). A statement of clean independent audits since inception in 2012 is included (e44).

A timeline for CSP funded project activities is included along with appropriate milestones, timelines, and defined responsibilities. The responsibilities are split among the School Director, Executive Director, Chief Financial Officer, Assistant Principal, and Operations Director (e40). The activities include work on the initial Elementary School expansion followed by the Middle School replication (e40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the charter school to be replicated or expanded is a high-quality charter school, including:

(1) The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students and for each of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA, attending the charter schools the applicant operates or manages. These subgroups of students include: Economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and students who are ELs.

(2) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.

(3) The extent to which charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have been closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation; have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management; have experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter; and have had any significant issues with respect to student safety.

Strengths:

Applicant has demonstrated significant success on state assessments with a disproportionately ELL and economically disadvantaged student population as demonstrated by comparison scores on state assessments including NYS ELA & Math and Earth Science Regents Exam (e27-e30). Very high proficiency levels in math as state, city, and district scores declined over the last four years indicate strong curricular programming and adept implementation.

The proposal indicates an attendance rate of 97% and zero suspensions or expulsions in the previous three years (e56). A student retention rate of 97% is also listed (e96), indicating a strong commitment to the school by the students and parents.

The applicant affirms that there have been no significant compliance or management issues within the last three school years at CQA (e96).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Continuation Plan

- 1. The extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate charter schools that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available.**

Strengths:

The proposal indicates that future expansion of grades will be eligible through a facility subsidy to offset costs (e54). In addition, a fund development program has raised in excess of \$4.5 million over six years through private donations, competitive government grant programs, and special events (e55). Significant philanthropic support includes The Ong Family Foundation, the Walton Family Foundation, Tang Family Foundation, and Carson Family Trust (e55).

The applicant claims that at the conclusion of the grant program, all fully enrolled school programs will be sustainable using a variety of public funds (e54).

Financial statements indicate positive cash flows and significant reserve funds to support the expansion and continued

operation of the school in subsequent years (e64-e67).

Weaknesses:

The application appears to state the necessity of additional CSP funds as one component in order to continue normal operations (e54). This casts at least some question on the sustainability of the program absent private donations and or similar grant awards.

Reader's Score: 13

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Access to High-Quality Educational Choice

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Supporting High-Need Students by Increasing Access to High-Quality Educational Choice

This priority is for projects that are designed to increase access to educational choice and improve academic outcomes and learning environments for one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students in communities served by rural local educational agencies**
- (ii) Children with disabilities**
- (iii) English learners**
- (iv) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian Tribes.**

Note: Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The proposal indicates a commitment to non-discriminatory enrollment practices including the use of “linguistically and culturally competent” practices to recruit and retain non-native English speakers (e12).

The school has a focus on ELL and recently immigrated student outcomes with a primary goal of “advancing ELL scholars’ achievement through the usage of intensive reading and writing instruction” (e21). The school reserves 30% of its 5th grade intake class for ELL enrollment and serves a disproportionately Hispanic and economically disadvantaged population. Despite this, the school outperformed peers in all state assessments (e22-23).

The testing data (e23-e30) provides compelling evidence that the school is improving academic outcomes for ELL students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2—Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools

The extent to which the proposed project is designed to increase student access to, participation in, and

completion of dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high schools.

Strengths:

The school is not applying under this priority.

Weaknesses:

The school is not applying under this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/22/2018 12:46 PM