

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/15/2018 12:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Good Will Home Association (U282E180004)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	11
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	5
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	12
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	11
Sub Total	100	71
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	2
Sub Total	2	2
Total	104	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 1: 84.282E

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Good Will Home Association (U282E180004)

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 proposed project of Threshold Program is designed to include homebound high school aged students who are pregnant and or suffer from a physical or psychological handicapping condition as mentioned on page e23. The applicant utilizes data to support this initiative and why the applicant will cater to this group. Evidence of initial enrollment and growth of the school illustrates the significance of this project in the state of Maine. There is a current waiting list of 14 students which shows the need to increase this charter. On pages e27-e29, the project addresses the need to support high-needs students access to high quality educational choice of students who live in rural communities and have disabilities.

Weaknesses:

While the plan addresses preparing students to higher education with dual enrollment courses, the plan does not address a clear plan to support students academically that are disabled. On page e26, the plan does not clearly articulate what academic plans will be in place for disabled students.

Reader's Score: 11

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 proposed project of Threshold Program is designed to include homebound high school aged students who are pregnant and or suffer from a physical or psychological handicapping condition as mentioned on page e23. The applicant utilizes data to support this initiative and why the applicant will cater to this group. Evidence of initial enrollment and growth of the school illustrates the significance of this project in the state of Maine. There is a current waiting list of 14 students which shows the need to increase this charter. On pages e27-e29, the project

Sub Question

addresses the need to support high-needs students access to high quality educational choice of students who live in rural communities and have disabilities.

Weaknesses:

While the plan addresses preparing students to higher education with dual enrollment courses, the plan does not address a clear plan to support students academically that are disabled. On page e26, the plan does not clearly articulate what academic plans will be in place for disabled students. The logic model on pages e58-e63 does not clearly articulate the specificity of data metrics that will support and meet the goals.

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 proposed project of Threshold Program is designed to include homebound high school aged students who are pregnant and or suffer from a physical or psychological handicapping condition as mentioned on page e23. The applicant utilizes data to support this initiative and why the applicant will cater to this group. Evidence of initial enrollment and growth of the school illustrates the significance of this project in the state of Maine. There is a current waiting list of 14 students which shows the need to increase this charter. On pages e27-e29, the project addresses the need to support high-needs students access to high quality educational choice of students who live in rural communities and have disabilities.

Weaknesses:

While the plan addresses preparing students to higher education with dual enrollment courses, the plan does not address a clear plan to support students academically that are disabled. On page e26, the plan does not clearly articulate what academic plans will be in place for disabled students.

Reader's Score: 12

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 noted.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

In the application, this area was unable to find the specifics to support the criteria in this area and topic.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

On pages e41-e44, the applicant addresses all relevant information on project personnel. This includes a principal of over 11 years, employees with educational experience that supports the area in which the individuals lead and serve, and adequate years of experience in those roles.

Weaknesses:

None 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 logic model on pages e58-e63 which outlines the initial outcomes, long term outcomes, and impacts.

Weaknesses:

The plan does not address clearly defined responsibilities and timelines for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant does not hold accountable roles for staff in key project personnel. In reference to page numbers e58-e63, the initial outcomes and long term goals are not outlined with specific dates and key milestones with key personnel held accountable. It is unclear in the logic model how the applicant intends to meet the metrics as set forth in the logic model.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

The plan meets the needs of rural students who have special needs or are teen moms. The evidence of success of meeting performance targets is outlined on pages e198-199. This includes meeting daily attendance rate ranging in 80% to 92% and reenrollment includes being over 90%. In 2015-2016, there is evidence that 100% of students meet the graduate goal and 97% of students passed taking dual enrollment classes.

Weaknesses:

In reference to pages e97-e132 – e114 and appendices, the applicant boasts high graduation rates and enrollment, but does not specify the details in how the replication or academic achievement results can be novel among other charters or other state schools. The only data that the applicant refers to is through NWEA on page e105, but does not utilize data from college entrance exams i.e. SAT/ ACT. While the applicant mentions that 86% of students took the SAT in spring 2016, no relevant data was presented or available for dissemination.

Reader's Score: 12

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:

A plan is outlined for use of funds on pages e252-271. This plan of spending focuses on salary and benefits.

Weaknesses:

While the plan addresses how grant funding will be spent, the applicant relies on state per pupil allocation for each child in MEANs. It was suggested that ongoing efforts to fundraise will continue to provide funding. It does not address transportation and recruitment efforts. There is concern for continuation of the plan with funding if students are currently being enrolled as stated on page E 32. The plan does not articulate the specifics on how funding will support this year's students.

Reader's Score: 11

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 applicant addressed students of the rural parts of Maine and addresses students of special education as noted on pages e27-e29.

Weaknesses:

None 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:

The applicant addressed a partnership for dual/ concurrent enrollment for early college courses as noted on pages e27-e29.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/15/2018 12:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2018 01:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Good Will Home Association (U282E180004)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	13
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	3
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	13
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	10
Sub Total	100	71
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	2
Sub Total	2	2
Total	104	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 1: 84.282E

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Good Will Home Association (U282E180004)

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 Threshold charter school functions as an alternative high school for students who are "economically disadvantaged, and/or have disabilities." (e18) The program appears to be specifically designed for students who have one or more factors contributing to educational disadvantage, including those with mental health issues, students who are pregnant or parenting, and other dropouts. (e18, e23) MeANS, the parent school, serves 69% FRL eligible students (nearly double the state average of 38%), and 36% SWD (more than double the state average of 16%). (e22) MeANS graduation rate was higher than the state average and its dropout rate was lower (91% v. 86% and 2% v. 3%, respectively). (e22) Of the 20 current Threshold students, half are FRL, and half are SWD (e23), and two are homeless.

Weaknesses:

To date (in its first year of operation) the Threshold school serves only 20 students and the expansion would be for only 120 more students. (e18) The overall impact of the project at capacity would expand the program by 100 seats, which is a large number of dropout to recover through a single program, but the application states that in SY 2015-16 alone, there were 241 dropouts in the target counties. (e32) MeANS, the parent school, serves only 178 students total. (e22) The Threshold program may primarily be a dropout reengagement program for former MeANS students, as opposed to a program open to all dropouts. (e23) Seven of the 20 students currently in the program are MeANS students. The application specifically states that the program is "designed for those students who cannot succeed in the standard MeANS program." It is not clear whether this means that students must first apply to or enroll in MeANS or they can apply directly to Threshold. The application later references "referring schools." (e24)

Reader's Score: 13

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: 24

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 application clearly defines an overarching goal to guide the Threshold program: reengage dropouts or those at risk of dropping out via a home-based, teacher-led model. (e30) This innovative approach is supported by weekly in person visits and daily technology-supported interaction. Students also meet at least monthly in small groups. (e31) Four specific project objectives are identified, and each includes a variety of measures an baseline and grant-end targets. (e38-41) The narrative explains that the baseline is established using current or soon to be available data from the first year of the Threshold program and its 20 current students. (e37)

Weaknesses:

The objectives are somewhat convoluted, and in some cases the measures appear less than objective. Additionally, the academic goals cited in objective 2 are all NWEA based, yet the application is for a high school and intends to address the CPP for early college access, so not including a measure of college readiness such as SAT/ACT appears to be an oversight. (e39) Having individual annual goals would strengthen this second of the application, as it is difficult to understand whether the grant term (year five) targets are expressed in SMART terms. The application fails to clearly specify what a successful outcome for the grant would look like. The application does include a "logic model" (e58-63), however, it does not add any new information about the design of the project.

Reader's Score: 12

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 application clearly identifies the educationally disadvantaged students the Threshold program is designed to serve throughout the narrative. The home-based learning program is of specific benefit to these students (pregnant and parenting, those with physical and mental disabilities, those with significant home life issues). Various studies that support the application of a home-based program are cited. (e30) Further, the regular home visits by a certified teacher allow for unique insight into critical issues that affect student engagement, which the application cites as particularly challenging in Maine, such as living in a home environment impacted by poverty, addiction, divorce, or mental illness. (e30) The application cites specific evidence to back these claims, such as rates of domestic assault reporting and children living in the care of the state. (e31) The application demonstrates the existence of sufficient students to fill the proposed 120 seats over five years, including by citing the number of dropouts in the proposed service area (241 in 2015-16 alone). (e32) Student-teacher ratio is appropriately low given the home-visit model, 10-1 for general education teachers. (e32) Other grant-funded staff will include a full-me social worker (e33), assistant principal/project manager, instructional design teacher, and 10% of the Agriculture Coach (e34).

Weaknesses:

The application does not clearly define the "year-round schedule," which it cites are a factor in improving educational outcomes for at risk students. (e31) The narrative does not address the expansion of the special ed teaching staff specifically. Currently, there are 20 students, two teachers, and a "part time" SpEd teacher. (e33) The narrative indicates that the plan is to add one teacher for every ten students in increased enrollment, and later states that at least two of the ten teachers hired will have SpEd certifications. (e42) This is particularly concerning given the high SWD rates for the current MeANS and Threshold programs. The application also allocates only 20% me for the SpEd Director on the Threshold program, even though at capacity it will have 120 students, about 2/5 of the total MeANS enrollment at that point. (e43) Further, it is not clear whether one social worked will be sufficient for 120 students, especially given the distance learning model. (e42) The narrative does not explain what the four "satellite centers" will be or who will staff them (e33), and this appears to run contrary to earlier claims that the Threshold model minimizes infrastructure cost. It is not clear why the school needs an "instructional design teacher" given that the narrative previously stated that the Threshold program uses the same curriculum as the MeANS campus, which has been open for seven years. (e34) The narrative goes on to state that Threshold teachers "will draw on" MeANS curricula as appropriate for their students. The application does not explain how Restorative Justice programs can or will be used in a one-to-one or distance learning model. (e35)

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 12

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: 8

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The application does not appear to address this element.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Numerous current staff of the MeANS school will participate in the project, including the current principal and director of instruction, both Threshold teachers currently on staff, the admissions director, the SpEd director, and the agricultural coach. (e42-4) A variety of new positions are proposed to support the implementation of the seat expansion including 10 FTE teachers (min. 2 SpEd certified, the others core subject certified), instructional design teacher, social worker, assistant principal (75% FTE), Technology Integrator (10% FTE), data specialist secretary (25% FTE). (e42-3) The listed positions, including the new hires, appear to be sufficient to staff the project as described in the narrative. It is notable that the planned hires include individuals who will support the teachers in managing the particular challenges of distance learning. It is also important that the director of SpEd is specifically being tasked to work on the expansion of the Threshold model (at 20% time). All individuals listed, based on their resumes, appear to have the relevant qualifications, education, and work experience to handle their assigned duties. (e275-298)

Weaknesses:

The application does not include specific data points to establish the track record of success with the targeted student population for the current staff members. The overall performance of the school can best be described as somewhat successful under the current staff and is discussed later in this evaluation.

Reader's Score: 8

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 states that Threshold is a successful current sub-program of MeANS, managed by the principal. (e44)

Weaknesses:

The application does not include a detailed management plan as required by the criteria. While the application includes some job descriptions from which to glean an idea of responsibilities of specific staff members with regard to the Threshold program, it is not possible to assess who is ultimately accountable for what parts of the program, and who bears responsibility for ensuring that all enrolled students are receiving a high quality education. There is no clearly defined timeline for implementation of the proposed expansion, nor are specific tasks or workstreams defined. The application indicates that the principal of MeANS will be the project director (e41), however, the narrative previously appeared to state that the assistant principal, to be hired using grant funding, would fill this role. It is unclear why, if the school already has a DOI, who will put 40% of his time toward the grant projects on Threshold, they need to hire an instructional designer for the Threshold program. For the roles that are not FTE, it is unclear whether the new positions will be hired at the percentages listed above, or whether they will fulfill other responsibilities at the main school. Additionally, the job descriptions are inconsistent and it is not possible to assess whether they are for FT roles or meant to be PTE hires. (Job descriptions are interspersed with resumes, e 275-297)

Reader's Score: 3

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:

Based on the included authorizer performance report (e97-132), the following performance trends were observed:

1. Since 2013, MeANS has not received any ranges of "does not meet" on any performance standards, however, its ranges on academic proficiency and academic growth have trended down to "partially meets."
2. In 2016 the school performed better than in the previous two years.
3. Attendance rates have remained relatively consistent (91% in 2013, 92% in 2014, 86% in 2015 and 91% in 2016).
4. Reenrollment rates have increased.
5. While graduation rates have fluctuated, they have consistently been at or above 85%.
6. Governance and operations ranges were consistently at the standard, and the narrative indicates that the Board took steps to address identified concerns.
7. The school has a positive track record in fundraising including a major new facility build completed without use of public funds, as well as public and private grant awards and philanthropy.

8. Parent participation has remained relatively strong.

Weaknesses:

Based on the included authorizer performance report (e97-132), there may be concerns about the quality level of the school. It is not clear why the performance standards are set as low as they are (e.g. 50% students making annual growth on NWEA), and this makes it even more concerning when they miss targets. Specifically, in 2014-15, only 46% of students made one year's academic growth on NWEA in math and reading, although 76% made a year's growth in language. In 2015-16, only 45% made a year's growth in reading, and the language percentage slipped to 62%, while math rose to 60%. The school was only able to balance its budget in 2013 based on increased funding from the parent nonprofit Good Will Hinkley. There were apparently findings which required a corrective action plan in the FY 2013 and 2015 audits. (e114). There seem to be some consistent issues typical to high school students in the targeted population previously discussed including bullying incidents and incidents of students using illegal substances. Additionally, it appears that the school regularly does not fully participate in required parent student surveys. (e123-5) Two minor technical compliance violations were noted, neither required corrective action.

Reader's Score: 13

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 has a solid financial and fundraising track record, including a substantial capital campaign, as well as a history of annually balancing its budget. (e45, Appendix G e97-132) Commentary in the Annual Performance Report from the authorizer indicates that the current leadership team has risen to meet challenges and was able to overcome a difficult year in which they had 80 new students and less than 50 returning students, with resulted in significant school culture shock. This took place in the first year of the current principal's tenure, and school performance on most authorizer metrics rebounded last school year.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly describe a continuation plan, nor is it clear if there are staff that are dedicated to fundraising. Additionally, it is not clear whether MeANS intends to add seats to the Threshold program if grant funding is not approved or is not provided at the level requested. Further, the application states that 35 students have already applied for the proposed 40 available Threshold seats for SY 2018-19 (e32), and it is not possible to glean from the materials provided whether the school can afford to expand by 20 seats if this grant is not received.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

MeANS itself is a rural LEA. (e27) 93% of current MeANS and Threshold students are from rural counties. (e18, e27) The grant application proposes to increase the size of the current program fivefold. Students in the home-based Threshold program are more likely to be SWD than the on campus MeANS students (50% v. 36). (e27)

Weaknesses:

None 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:

The MeANS campus is co-located with a community college, and students can dual-enroll and take classes on campus or online. On average 40% of juniors and seniors participate in dual or concurrent enrollment classes. (e28) The success rate for these students was quite high last year, with 96% of students getting a C or higher, 78% received a B or higher. Additionally, there are multiple HEI partners including the co-located KVCC, Southern Maine CC, Central Maine CC, Colby College, and U of Maine. Additional partnerships with Thomas College and Unity College are in development. (e28)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/13/2018 01:32 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/21/2018 08:01 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Good Will Home Association (U282E180004)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	12
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	5
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	16
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	10
Sub Total	100	76
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	2
Sub Total	2	2
Total	104	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 1: 84.282E

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Good Will Home Association (U282E180004)

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:

(e24 - 29) The Applicant describes a program has the same educational standards as for all other MeANS students, ensuring the same level of rigor as the current program. Based on a collaborative, relationship-based and reflective teaching model, it recognizes that strong interpersonal ties and connections with the students (and parents if possible) is critical (e36). It proposes a high level of daily, weekly and ongoing academic and other support interactions with the students by their teachers, consistent with developing relationships that are very important to the success of at-risk students.

(e29) The program is addressing the needs of some of the most difficult to serve students. It proposes a cost effective way to serve these students, within existing current infrastructure constraints by bringing these students to the campus on the one day that other students are not on site. This allows these students to have on-site experiences without the need to acquire an additional facility (e26). Having the teachers visit the students in their homes also more cost effective than having to transport students daily the long distances involved in their rural setting.

(e30) It is a highly personalized approach, which is critical to being successful with these types of disconnected students.

Weaknesses:

(e29) It is not possible to tell if an increase from 20 to 120 students will make a significant impact in assisting educationally disadvantaged student population because there is no information about the size of the educationally disadvantaged student population that needs to be served.

The Threshold program is a new program, only one year old and with an enrollment of 20 students.

, an independent study method of instruction can be very difficult for many students. (e23) The program is serving students who, for a range of reasons "...cannot succeed in the standard MeANS program...", a program already designed for students at high risk of school failure. This includes students who are habitually truant, who are homeless and neglected. All of these factors work against a student's ability to be successful in an educational approach that requires ongoing, independent and self-directed learning.

Reader's Score: 12

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: 24

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:

(e38, 39, 40, 41) There is a range of appropriate goals measuring academic progress. The NWEA progress calls for a year's growth in math, English and reading. Other appropriate measures (e.g., college dual enrollment – target of 60%, daily communication with their teacher (target of 75%) and post his school plans (target of 100%))

Weaknesses:

(e58) The logic model is not well aligned with the project design. It is unclear how testing will be completed in a manner that ensures the integrity of the measurements. All academic measures are growth measures; there is no information about meeting traditional grade level expectations.

Reader's Score: 12

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:

(e23, 24, 25) The program is specifically structured for students with serious challenges. It includes a strong student – teacher connection. Other strengths include weekly home visit and daily communication. There is strong connections and support from social services, transportation support restorative just approach and personal learning plans for each student, which are best practices for serving this target population.

Weaknesses:

(e33) There is a lack of adequate Special Education staffing/support, with only 20% of the Special Education Director assigned to this work, and no indication of additional special education teachers/providers being added to support the program. (e23) The application reports that fifty percent (50%) of the students are identified as eligible for special education services, it is unclear how these needs are being met.

Reader's Score: 12

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 evidence provided.

Weaknesses:

No evidence provided.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

(e41, e71-81, e275-297) The resumes for key staff showed significant experience and expertise. Tonya Arnold, the Head of School has served in administrative positions since 2009. She has serviced as Principal/Superintendent of Maine Academy of Natural Sciences since 2015. She has extensive administrative experience and advanced graduate degrees. School Co-Director and Curriculum Director, Dr. Pariser has a doctorate in Psychology and Education and significant academic work on serving at risk students. She also has significant program administrative experience managing programs for at-risk students. The additional staff also has significant and appropriate experience.

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:

(e41-45) The language in the management plan is general, discussing the Executive Director's general responsibilities. There is a high level task chart for each of the three years of the proposed project. (e43-45). (e44, 54) A strength is the collaborative leadership mode with teacher leads reporting to Head of School. Head of School reports to the board of directors. Additional information is included on pages e-211-214.

Weaknesses:

(e44) The information in the project narrative was very limited. It is two paragraphs . There is no identification of timelines and milestones, making it difficult to determine management's specific tasks related to implementation and ongoing management tasks.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

(e22 -23, e87-92) The school graduation rates are above the statewide average and other performance measures were strong, especially for the population served. For example, a 91% graduation rate, a 2% drop out rate, as well as specific outcomes that were reported in the MeANS's Charter Renewal and updated information dated 9-20-2017 (e87). This data includes that 74% of students were at pace or above to graduate on time, and 88% of students made NWEA growth targets for math, reading and language usage) (e88).

Weaknesses:

The student achievement data provided is student growth data; it did not include the actual achievement levels obtained by the students. This made it difficult to determine overall effectiveness of the school. (e114) Some issues with adequate budget ending balances and variations from budgeted to actual amounts. Limited description of management plan; e.g., no information regarding budget process and schedules. No information about internal and board level milestones and evaluations.

Reader's Score: 16

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:

(e45, 49) There is a plan to fund the program on an ongoing basis through state and federal funding, with the need for limited fundraising support. The organization has a track record of successful fundraising (e45 – \$10 million in four years). There is a recognition of the need to continue fund raising activities.

Weaknesses:

(e48, 49) No discussion about any specific potential of funding sources (e.g., foundations with an interest in supporting this work) to raise the projected fifteen percent (15%) ongoing funding gap projected or the strategies in interest them in supporting the school/program.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

(e27) This applicant proposes to increase choice in rural areas (Kennebee and Somerset counties).

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:

(e26,27) This proposal includes a strong dual enrollment opportunity for participants . Each student will have a Personalized Learning Plan (PLP), which will include college going plans and opportunities for taking college level classed. The school also has a partnership with Kennebec Valley Community College, a fully accredited post-secondary institution, which is located adjacent to the school, and it offers dual enrollment opportunities for MeANS students.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/21/2018 08:01 AM

