

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/15/2018 11:31 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Mathematics, Science and Technology Charter School (U282E180008)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students | | |
| 1. Disadvantaged Students | 15 | 10 |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 30 | 26 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 10 | 8 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 10 | 8 |
| Quality of the Eligible Applicant | | |
| 1. Eligible Applicant | 20 | 16 |
| Continuation Plan | | |
| 1. Continuation Plan | 15 | 13 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 81 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 1 | | |
| Access to High-Quality Educational Choice | | |
| 1. Increasing Access | 2 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 2 | 1 |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs | | |
| 1. Enrollment Programs | 2 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 104 | 83 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 2: 84.282E

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Mathematics, Science and Technology Charter School (U282E180008)

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:

School states that it projects a higher number of incoming students will be in need of English Learner (EL) support (e27). School plans to train teachers in EL support strategies (e27). Original school (MaST) serves a Title I population of 40% and Special Education population of 14% (e50). School has extensive wait lists that assure continued enrollment which should reflect current trends (e33).

Weaknesses:

Enrollment plans are general recruiting strategies and do not address specific goals to enroll educationally disadvantaged students. Plan gives minimal information on demographics for the current K-4 school, the wait lists for the expansion, the original K-12 school, or the surrounding public schools (e20-e22).

Reader's Score: 10

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 program goals provided are specific and measurable. Goals include benchmarks for assessments in reading and math, attendance rate, 1:1 devices, and parent participation in program event (e27-e29). Proposed program includes state standards (e29) and socio-emotional (e21-e24) support embedded in the curriculum.

E306-314 budget narrative provides additional details on goals and priorities for the project, including Chromebooks, iPads, and classroom furniture to support the expansion.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The timelines included are for the 2019-2020 school year only, out of a 3-year plan (e27-e29).

Reader's Score: 13

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 program provides access to technology to a student population that is 58% low income (e53).

School states there were 11,516 applications for 100 open seats for K-12 at the original location, and 3,600 applications for 100 seats (K-4) at the expansion location (e50), clearly demonstrating the community's support for the program.

School has garnered multiple awards in serving its student population, including being named a National Blue Ribbon School (e50) and a "model school" on the School Performance Profile (e50).

Weaknesses:

Minimal demographics have been provided.

Reader's Score: 13

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:

This criterion has not been addressed.

Weaknesses:

No demographics for key personnel have been provided. No plan for recruiting and retaining employees in underrepresented groups has been provided.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

CEO has been associated with the school since 2004 and holds a Master's degree. School has earned multiple awards while CEO has served in leadership at MaST, including number one charter school in state (2015) and P21 Exemplar School in 2014-15 (STEM award) (e70-e74, e282). Most key personnel hold advanced degrees in related fields, and many are certified teachers (e282-e285). Leadership team demonstrates a long-term commitment to the school, with 5 members of the leadership team having been associated with the school for between 8 and 14 years (e282-e285).

Weaknesses:

Only the CEO resume has been provided. Narrative describes other key personnel.

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:

School plan for use of funds is clear and consistent with educational approach and use of technology (e31-e32). Use of funds will focus on priorities in technology and classroom furnishings to add new classrooms as enrollment expands to include additional grade levels (e312-e314). The budget describes specific purchases to be made for each new school year of the three-year project. The management plan outlines the timelines and responsibilities for major activities, ordering iPads and storage carts, Chromebooks and storage carts, classroom furniture, and interactive display boards as the school expands over three years (e47-e49).

Weaknesses:

Plan does not assign tasks to specific people to improve accountability (e312-e314). School plan gives general goals but does not list specific measurable objectives or timelines.

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:

School was recognized as a National Blue Ribbon school in 2017 (e15), demonstrating academic excellence. MaST II was named a "model school" in the School Performance Profile, the state's highest distinction (e50). MaST achieved a 100% graduation rate in the past with 94% students going on to college (e19). School has consistently outperformed local schools on state assessments (e66). 2016-17 data for Economically disadvantaged students at MaST II shows 62% compared to schoolwide total of 65.66% proficient in ELA, and 40% compared to schoolwide total of 47.47% in Math (e66); these scores show the school is successful in helping these students meet the academic achievement of the whole school population.

School states that it has wait lists of hundreds at each grade level (e21). School lists "N/A" for compliance issues (e66). No significant problems or issues are noted in the audit and charter renewal documents.

Weaknesses:

School assessment results by sub-group (e66) show percent proficient but do not give the state comparisons or recent trends, and do not provide the number or percentage of students in each subgroup. Students with disabilities at MaST II show 12% compared to schoolwide total of 65.66% proficient in ELA, and 13% compared to schoolwide total of 47.47% in Math: these scores may indicate a challenge in helping students with disabilities succeed.

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:

School had included letters of support from significant state and community agencies, such as Charter School Growth Fund (e195), Keystone Alliance for Public Charter Schools, and Philadelphia City Council (e196-e211), and a variety of support letters from parents (e212-e232). These letters indicate broad community and state support for the continuation and expansion of the program.

School expresses intention to seek grant funding to support program continuation (e58). School states that it is developing a replacement schedule for all technology (e54).

School audit reports an increase in fund balance in FY2017 over \$700,000 for a total fund balance of \$18,151,630.

Weaknesses:

Continuation plan (e54-e55) does not provide details for how the school plans to fund the program with future enrollment growth, grants and/or donations.

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:

Original school (MaST) serves a Title I population of 40% and Special Education population of 14% (e50). School serves a population that is 58% low income. School states it has developed a budget with supports to handle at risk and high-needs students (e20). School has implemented a variety of strategies to sustain enrollment figures, including activities, events, and learning experiences that appeal to a diverse population (e20).

Weaknesses:

Minimal demographics for the current K-4 school and the original MaST school have been provided. No plan is given for recruiting and enrolling students in the subgroups referenced above (e18-19).

Reader's Score: 1

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:

Plan describes a partnership with a local community college to develop dual enrollment opportunities. This program is in the "test" phase (e19) to implement a program that follows the model from the original MaST school.

Weaknesses:

Plan does not give sufficient detail regarding the dual enrollment partnership to determine if this is a viable opportunity (e19-e20). No data is provided for the number of students enrolled to date and the success rate of these students. Plan does not describe the independent option in detail (e19).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/15/2018 11:31 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/20/2018 07:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Mathematics, Science and Technology Charter School (U282E180008)

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 | 27 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 10 | 10 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 10 | 7 |
| Quality of the Eligible Applicant | | |
| 1. Eligible Applicant | 20 | 18 |
| 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 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 104 | 95 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 2: 84.282E

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Mathematics, Science and Technology Charter School (U282E180008)

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 proposes a variety of methods to recruit and attract new students including print and electronic advertising, evening informational meetings and local school fairs, targeted mailouts to areas where schools are overcrowded, advertised open houses, and information on the school website (p. e21). The applicant states that the proposed school will be very diverse in regards to ethnicity, socioeconomic levels, educational support levels, and the population as a whole (p. e20). The applicant states the hundreds of students are on wait lists at each grade level (p. e21). The applicant states that they currently offer over fifty clubs, activities, and cultural events in order to sustain the diversity of their student population (p. e21). Orientation activities, extra academic supports, and a robust program of interventions for at-risk students are provided including Dibels literacy and math probes to measure basic academic skills that form the basis for tiered instruction using an RTI approach (p. e24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the application.

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: 27

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 clearly defined objectives, measurable goals, and criteria for measurement for the proposed project. These include goals for attendance, access to technology, professional development for teachers to assist EL students, the use of digitally immersive curriculum, dual credit enrollment, and the diffusion of resources to students and parents to help students with school work at home (p. e27-29)

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The goals of having 90% of instructional staff participate in a minimum of one 60 minute professional development annually with the focus on supporting EL students (p. e27) seems to be insufficient for teachers to meet the needs of EL students in regards to their responsibilities in regard to the instructional plan for EL students outlined on p. e37-38. Activities accomplished by teachers include the adaptations/modifications in the delivery of content instruction that all teachers provide, including both instruction and assessment (p. e37). Although the applicants indicated that the trained EL teacher will provide the adaptations and modifications required for the EL student, content delivery will presumably require much more rigorous training than a 60 minute professional development annually.

Reader's Score: 13

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 lists a multitude of approaches in the design of the proposed project designed to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged students. State standards are built into the project design with measurable outcomes identified at each grade level (p. e29), a comprehensive literacy program (p. e30-31), a lower student-teacher ratio that allows for one-on-one and small group instruction (p. e30), and technology to improve student literacy, monitor progress, provide on-line resources, and adaptive technology for students and teachers. In addition, the applicant details a comprehensive differentiated instructional approach designed to meet student's needs in reading and math and assist educationally disadvantaged, special education, and EL students (p e32-34). The applicant also details a comprehensive system of embedded social and emotional supports that is tiered in its approach so that all students have an opportunity to gain skills resulting in productive behavior, with more intensive interventions for more behaviorally challenged students (p. e38-41). Student physical and mental health needs are described in the plan as well (p. e42-43).

Weaknesses:

The bulk of the interventions described are based on what the school is currently doing to assist educationally disadvantaged students through 4th grade. The applicant does not overtly state that these interventions will be used with the expanded grade levels, so it must be assumed that these interventions will continue into the expanded grade levels.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant states that MaST does not discriminate in its hiring practices according to federal guidelines (p. e45) and describes a process for recruiting qualified employees (p. e44)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the application.

Reader's Score: 1

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

Strengths:

P. e282-285 give a summary of key project personnel. Many of the MaST personnel have had extensive experience with the school and have held multiple staff positions as they have progressed through the organization. The CEO has overseen the school as it has achieved many significant accomplishments including being designated as a National Blue Ribbon School (2017) (p. e282).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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 management plan provides a detailed account of project activities including the purchase of technology, furniture, and interactive displays. The time frame when these activities will be conducted and the personnel responsible are included in the plan (p. e47-49).

Weaknesses:

The management plan must be reconciled with the budget narrative (p. e306-314) as no budgeted amounts are included in the management plan. Personnel responsible for accomplishing tasks related to the management plan are listed as teams (ESP technology team, ESP operations and curriculum members) so it is difficult to pinpoint who has ownership of the management plan elements (p. e47-49).

Reader's Score: 7

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

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 applicant lists many accomplishments of the school, including National Blue Ribbon designation (2017), a 99% graduation rate (2016), a 96% college entrance rate (2016), and named a model school in the School District of Philadelphia School performance Profile (p. e50). The applicant has proficiency rates for math, reading, and science (elementary and middle) and Algebra I and Literature for three years that far exceed other district, charter and peer schools for three years measured (2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16) (p. e51). Students have seen aggregate growth in math and grade 4 and 8 science for the last year measured (2016) and attendance rates above the 90th percentile for the three years measured. Retention rates at elementary and middle are 98% to 100% for all years measured for within year and cross-year retention. The percent of students with no (zero) out of school suspensions in at least 98% for all years measured (p. e51). There is no evidence presented that the applicant had any statutory or regulatory issues that could have led to the revocation of the charter.

Weaknesses:

High school retention rate percentile ranks (75th, 79th, 80th respectively for the years measured) are below the elementary retention rates and, based on their percentile, lower than 20% of the comparison schools.

Reader's Score: 18

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 states that the school has created a plan to allow students to eventually buy the technology purchased by the school at graduation as well as a replacement schedule for the technology purchased through the grant. The applicant states that furniture purchased with grant funds will be selected in such a way that the durability and functionality of the furniture will meet the factors that drive engagement and will allow flexibility and sustainability.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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:

The applicant indicates that support for learners will be collaborative and differentiated on the individual needs of each student, including high-need, low income, and English Language Learners (p. e18). The applicant lists a variety of recruiting strategies aimed towards all students on p. e21 including various types of advertising, evening meetings, targeted recruitment in areas with overcrowded schools, and school fairs.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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 indicates that students will have opportunities to test into a dual enrollment program at the end of 9th grade in order to receive an associate's degree in their 12th grade year (p. e19) in a partnership with the Community College of Philadelphia with at least 20% of students opting to take the dual enrollment assessment(p. e28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide detailed strategies as to how students are recruited and encouraged to take the dual enrollment assessment, any academic tutoring that students may be able to access prior to the assessment, and what types of supports are available for students once enrolled in the dual credit program to ensure their success and the completion of requirements for an Associates' degree. (p e19-20).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/20/2018 07:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/16/2018 02:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Mathematics, Science and Technology Charter School (U282E180008)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students | | |
| 1. Disadvantaged Students | 15 | 14 |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 30 | 27 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 10 | 9 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 10 | 7 |
| Quality of the Eligible Applicant | | |
| 1. Eligible Applicant | 20 | 16 |
| Continuation Plan | | |
| 1. Continuation Plan | 15 | 15 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 88 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 1 | | |
| Access to High-Quality Educational Choice | | |
| 1. Increasing Access | 2 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 2 | 1 |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs | | |
| 1. Enrollment Programs | 2 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 104 | 90 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CSP Developers (84.282E) - 2: 84.282E

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Mathematics, Science and Technology Charter School (U282E180008)

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:

MaST II is currently servicing 58% low-income students in over 31 zip codes with a 95% daily attendance rate (e53). MaST's staffing model is based on expectation of 15.9% students with disabilities, following state averages (e63).

To meet the needs of students with differing levels of readiness, English proficiency, or students with disabilities, MaST II will provide support through low student to teacher classroom ratios, differentiated instruction, push-in and pull-out special education and EL instruction, counseling, and social work services (e22-23).

To support students with disabilities, MaST II has an experienced Special Education coordinator, dedicated special education teachers, a full time social worker, and a part time school psychologist. The school will hire additional staff as needed to meet increasing special education needs as the school expands (e63).

MaST has developed a robust universal screening system using the DIBELS Next curriculum measurements to determine which students may be at risk in literacy and then to develop an intervention plan, if needed (e23). The steps in the process to identify, review data, develop a plan, and inform parents of progress is detailed on pages e23-25. MaST is currently piloting DIBELS Next Math probes (e23).

MaST uses a two-pronged approach to accelerate student achievement: in content area subjects, they group students heterogeneously while in ELA and Math they group them homogeneously based on assessments (e25). Students identified as being significantly behind or not making progress will receive intervention support from a broad repertoire of supports that could include after school tutoring, small group reading or math intervention (RTI), classroom behavior supports, counseling, special education, EL instruction, or summer school. Teachers also regularly arrange time for re-teaching before and after school (e25-26).

MaST uses Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtII) to support students who need additional assistance and are progress monitored on a weekly or bi-weekly basis (e26). If a student's need for differentiation is greater than what is practical in a general education setting, MaST will provide a multi-disciplinary evaluation to determine eligibility for special education services (e26).

Weaknesses:

MaST does not provide any data to allow the review to assess whether the school will serve students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools. It is not clear whether MaST is providing a superior education compared to neighboring schools because it is not clear what MaST's student population looks like compared to neighboring schools.

Recruitment and enrollment strategies are not specific or targeted to specific student populations, and as mentioned above in CPP #1, they do not describe any efforts to target families that speak a language other than English.

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: 27

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 presents overarching project objectives, measurable goals, and methods for measurement in a table on pgs. e27-29. MaST also provides a basic logic model in the appendix (e305).

The budget narrative in the appendix (e306-314) provides additional details on project design and goals. CSP grant funding will allow MaST II to establish an innovative replication of its first school over first few years when funding is limited (e307). MaST II intends to open a second campus in 2019-20 and is starting a ground zero with purchases and setup for the school and wants to provide a technology rich environment for students in the 21st century (307). For this, they are requesting \$900,000 split evenly over three years (e308). Each year the budget will repeat itself as additional grades are added and MaST must purchase flexible style seating/furniture, devices, device storage, and interactive teaching/learning displays (e309). Each year of the grant, MaST II plans to furnish 10 classrooms with student desks and chairs (e309). Each year, MaST II will purchase iPads and Chromebooks for all student use, but will provide them at a 1-1 ratio for the high school grades (e310). MaST will survey needs of teachers and decide on best digital displays to purchase for each department (e311).

Weaknesses:

The table on pgs. e27-29 could have been strengthened with more specificity in the overarching objectives. For example, the first objective states that "by creating an innovative and inspiring workspace for students, we anticipate that students will want to come to school and the attendance rates will be high" (e27). This objective would be strengthened by providing more detail on what the innovative and inspiring workspace will look like in terms of equipment, because the grant proposal is for equipment only, over three years (\$300,000/year). (The budget narrative in the appendix provides some of this information, but the narrative would have been strengthened by including it together in one table.)

Reader's Score: 14

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:

MaST's educational program begins with the end in mind: students will have the knowledge and skills necessary to be prepared for high education and the global economy (e29). MaST employs a core set of practices that are central to the academic program: small school/individualized approach to students, focus on literacy, technology supports, differentiated instruction/personalized learning, general education supports, special education, collaboration model, special education teacher supports, intensive instructional support services, and English Learner supports. These core practices are described in detail on pages e29-e38. Apart from describing practices and processes, the applicant also describes in some cases the staff members that are responsible for leading

Sub Question

and/or implementing practices with fidelity.

MaST II uses a three-tiered model of supports to develop and sustain personal, behavioral, and social skills of students (universal supports, secondary supports, and intensive supports). The strategies used in each of these tiers are described on pgs. e38-e41. To track student progress, MaST uses Review 360, a specialized student information system that tracks and summarizes student behavior, allowing staff to respond to student behavior data in real-time and to gauge effectiveness and continue improving continuum of supports (e41).

MaST II will provide school nursing services to students (e41-42) and its Student Assistance Program (SAP) team will review data from Review 360 to prioritize students based on level of need and identify students who may need mental health or other, more intensive behavioral supports with the school counselor and/or social worker (e42).

Weaknesses:

Nowhere in the application are we provided with the percentage of English learners or racial and ethnic subgroups, so it is hard to assess whether the project design is appropriate for this population.

Reader's Score: 13

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 identified.

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes their recruitment process for teaching staff, but beyond providing the boiler-plate assurance that MaST “does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin...” (e44) it does not mention any efforts to encourage applications from persons from underrepresented groups.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

The entire ESP team will assist in this project, but the three groups/roles specifically responsible for implementation are the ESP Curriculum Representative, ESP Technology Team, and ESP Communication Representative (e44).

The roles and responsibilities of the MaST ESP team for operations, curriculum design and implementation, technology integration and infrastructure, data management, HR, special education supports, school environment design/building, construction management and renovation, professional development, board development and

Sub Question

policy, website and PR, coaching and mentoring, community outreach, and grant writing is detailed on pgs. e55-58.

The resume for MaST's CEO, John Swoyer, is provided on e70-71 which details his various roles at MaST since 2004. Of note of John's resume is the entry that states he is the owner of TechnologixPA (since April 2009) that provides "technology support and services for home and business users" (e72). Flag for CSP staff: Given the project's heavy focus on technology, Swoyer's ownership of TechnologixPA struck me as a relevant area of expertise but also a potential conflict of interest. Staff may want to review MaST's procurement policies.

MaST's organizational charts (including operational and local school charts) and ESP team biographies are provided on e280-e285. Taken together, the team's experience is extensive and covers 14 different functional areas. Areas critical to growth and expansion are covered by specific roles (i.e. community relations and innovative projects, special education, technology integration specialist).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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 provides a management plan that includes timelines, items to be purchased, specific action steps (including any applicable pre-requisites), and the responsible team(s) (e47-49).

In the appendix, the applicant provides a budget narrative table for each of the three years that includes items/equipment to be purchased, cost per item or set, quantity, total cost, and a brief description of how the items will be utilized (e312-314).

Weaknesses:

The management plan does not reference the budget request or integrate with the budget narrative provided in the appendix, so it is unclear how the project can be assessed to determine whether it was delivered "on time and within budget". Furthermore, the plan lacks clearly defined responsibilities. Only teams are referenced, not specific individuals, so it is difficult to determine where accountability lies.

The management plan includes action steps, but lacks measurable milestones. Because this project is focused on purchasing equipment (i.e. iPads, Chromebooks, furniture) to re-make student learning spaces, the application could have been easily strengthened if the applicant provided quantitative indicators of success (i.e. purchase 100 iPads by March 2019).

Reader's Score: 7

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:

In 2017, MaST was named a National Blue Ribbon School, one of only 9 in the state of PA, and 342 nationwide. MaST/MaST II are in demand, with MaST having 11,516 applications last year for only 100 open seats across the K-12 span, and MaST II receiving 3,600 applications for 100 seats across K-4. MaST is "leading the way" with academics in the local Philadelphia charter community and had 96% of its student attend college in 2016. In the same year, MaST also had a 99% graduation rate while serving a school-wide Title I population of about 40%, inclusive of approximately 14% special education students (e50).

MaST II, which opened K-4 two years ago, was named a "model school" in the School District of Philadelphia's School Performance Profile. This is the highest distinction you can receive and shows growth happening at MaST II (e50).

In PSSA Math, Reading/ELA, and Science, MaST consistently out-performed district schools, charter schools, and peer schools for three years, between 2013-14 and 2015-16 (e51). This is despite a drop in performance between 2013-14 and 2014-15 in all subjects. Since that year, the school's growth index has increased and is positive (e51).

Retention rates are high across all three years between 2013-14 and 2015-16 (hovering between 98 and 100%) (e51).

On high school Algebra I and Literature Proficiency, MaST clearly outperforms district and charter school averages and is on par with performance at peer schools (e52). Graduation rates have been climbing since 2013-14 when MaST graduated 96.15% and 99% in 2015-16.

The applicant provides 2016-17 PSSA data for MaST I and MaST II disaggregated across grades by ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and IEP students (e66). There are some bright spots – like 100% of Hispanic/Latino students in 6th grade at or above proficiency in ELA (greater than schoolwide average of 85.9%) – but it is hard to distinguish how subgroups are performing overall and across years relative to schoolwide outcomes.

Compliance or possible revocation issues are not addressed in the application, except for on pg. e66 which contains the header "MaST I or MaST II Compliance Issues – N/A". The charter renewal documents and audit provided in appendix do not indicate any evidence of non-compliance.

Weaknesses:

On PSSA Math Proficiency (Grades 3-8), MaST dropped significantly – from 91.76% in 2013-14 to 59.48% in 2014-15.

The table on e66 that disaggregates performance across grades and subgroups would be clearer if overall performance rates were provided and if data was provided for additional years and in comparison to state, district, and peer school averages for subgroups. It is hard to tell how the performance of MaST's IEP and economically disadvantaged students compares to populations in other schools in the area.

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:

MaST intends to continue to grow its technology device program and has created a plan that can sustain itself through its operating budget and also its plan to sell back devices to students upon graduation (for a low cost) so that they don't have to transfer files and can keep their student portfolio intact. The applicant also plans to create a replacement schedule to be used year-over-year to replace classroom technology and labs (e54).

To make classrooms feel like innovative learning spaces, furniture and design will be sustainable (e54).

Application included a letter of support from Charter School Growth Fund, which plans to support MaST's second campus expansion and planning for a potential third campus (e195). Overall, the application included many letters of support – from funders and city agencies.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

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:

The applicant provides assurance that "MaST II will provide services to high-need, low income, and EL students" (e18). To do this, the MaST Educational Service Provider (ESP) team from the flagship campus will work on "building out strategies to support all learners, specifically those that may need adaptations or modification" (e18-19).

The applicant anticipates a very diverse student body (in ethnicity, socioeconomic, and educational support levels) given the demand in a wide variety of zip codes. Because of this, MaST has developed a budget with supports to handle at risk and high need students (e20).

Despite the fact that MaST I and MaST II had hundreds of students on the wait list at every grade level, the applicant still provides an overview of strategies that MaST II will use to attract new students – such as radio and TV ads, email

campaigns, open houses and invitations to school events, etc.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe any recruitment efforts to target families that speak a language other than English.

The applicant does not provide any descriptive statistics of its existing student demographics except for students with disabilities (14%) and economically disadvantaged (58%). We are not provided the percentage of English learners enrolled, or the percentage of students by race/ethnicity.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

MaST II has a dual enrollment partnership with Community College of Philadelphia; this partnership allows for students to test in at the end of 9th grade, and if successful, allow students to gain their associate's degree with a focus on either healthcare or business before they graduate as 12th graders (e19).

MaST I has been able to achieve a 100% graduation rate in the past, with 94% of students going to a 4 or 2-year college. MaST I will provide services and supports to help replicate successes and processes at MaST II (e19).

One of MaST's core values is to "establish multiple learning sites for high school students on college campuses" (e20).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include enrollment figures or success rates for the dual enrollment program at MaST I (only overall graduation rates on pg. e19), even though it currently has a partnership with the Community College of Philadelphia (e28).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/16/2018 02:30 PM