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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/15/2018 12:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Nueva Esperanza, Inc. (U282E180031)
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	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	4
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	3
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	69
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	72

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: **********

Applicant: Nueva Esperanza, Inc. (U282E180031)

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 project to expand the current middle and high school to include elementary grades. With a student body of 96% Latino students, the population encompasses 23% of English Language Learners and 18% of students with learning disabilities as noted page e35.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **15**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: **25**

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:

There are three goals notated in the proposal that supports student achievements on pages e27-e31. These goals include raising the achievement for all students on the standardized tests and other performance measures. For example, students will show 70% growth on all benchmark assessments from school-year entry to end-of-year as mentioned page e28.

Weaknesses:

While goal 2 is admirable of eliminating the achievement gaps for all students are closed within three consecutive years of enrollment, exceeding the state requirement. This goal is stated on page e29, but does is not measurable with specific objectives and outcomes.

Sub Question

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 proposal addresses the target population. The applicant proposes a project to expand the current middle and high school to include elementary grades. With a student body of 96% Latino students, the population encompasses 23% of English Language Learners and 18% of students with learning disabilities. On page e23, the proposal specifically addresses North Philadelphia neighborhoods where there is a high number of low-income, primarily Hispanic and African American and immigrant population that are not English proficient.

Weaknesses:

On page e26, the applicant uses historical data to hypothesize that future students will be one to three grade levels below the other students. Data citing could have made this section stronger to support the needs of the target 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: 7

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:

There is not a clear plan to recruit for employees to represent the students that attend or that are being recruited to attend.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Resumes of training and experience of key project personnel is provided beginning on page e68- e88 which shows significant experience in academics and fiscal operations.

Weaknesses:

Key project personnel has not have extensive experience with the grade levels (K-5) that will be a part of the expansion grant. Resumes on file on pages e68-e88 highlight this.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 7

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 logic model on page e57 analyzes the grant funding and school district funding to support costs of expansion of elementary school.

The budget narrative found on page e221-e222 addresses a five year plan of what will be spent each year which includes:

- Personnel
- Equipment
- Educational Professional Development
- Curriculum Resources
- Supplies
- Technology
- Equipment
- Student Furniture

Weaknesses:

The logic model on page e57 does not clearly specify responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Reader's Score: 4

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 annual charter evaluation documentation began on page e143 indicates the following result:

- The organizational compliance and viability totaled 23 out of 26.

Data provided to support graduation rates is only current to 16-17 on page e142

Weaknesses:

The annual charter evaluation documentation began on page e143 indicates the following results:

- In 16-17, proficiency for ELA, Math, and Science either approaches standard or does not meet standard.
- In 16-17, the school indicated growth in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science.
- In the data, matriculation and readiness for SAT/ACT approaches or did not meet standard.
- During mystery calls in early 2018, the school did not affirm that they provide translation or interpretation services to interested applicants in need of assistance.
- The schools code of conduct is not transparent via website and permits expulsion of repeated minor, non-violent offenses such as uniform violations and failure to complete homework for all students including early elementary students.
- The school does not comply with best practices for emergency preparedness and breakfast participation.

Reader's Score: 3

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 EACS school is already moving forward with the opening of the elementary school. Currently, classes are being held in a rented building. Esperanza has a plan to raise funding for a capital project to hold all of their students using bond issues and grants. Land has already been purchased. According to page e41, the applicant has had successful financing projects in the past which allowed for past renovations and expansions.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a project to expand the current middle and high school to include elementary grades. With a student body of 96% Latino students, the population encompasses 23% of English Language Learners and 18% of students with learning disabilities as noted on pages e19-e21.

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 has a strong special education and English as a second language departments. EACS offers dual enrollment opportunities at Esperanza College of Eastern University. In the year 2014-2015, 51 students enrolled in courses for college credit as indicated on page e38.

Weaknesses:

In the application, there was not a reference of current dual enrollment opportunities for students at EACS.

Reader's Score: **1**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/15/2018 12:54 PM

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Nueva Esperanza, Inc. (U282E180031)
Reader #3: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	6
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	4
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	7
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	7
Sub Total	100	64
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	67

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: **********

Applicant: Nueva Esperanza, Inc. (U282E180031)

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 current student body (grades 1 and 6-12 at two campuses) is 96% latino, 23% ELL, 18% SWD. The project is designed to expand the current schools to serve grades K and 2-5 in the coming years from the same geographic community. the SDP annual report indicates that the current school serves about the same amount of FRL students as the SDP, but more than double the amount of ELLs (23% v. 11%) and more SWD (18% v. 15%) than the district. (e144)
The first grade student body is 95% latino, 30% ELL, and 12% SWD, 100%FRL. (e35)
The narrative indicates that the school primary seeks to serve a North Philadelphia community that is generally low income, minority, and largely immigrant/non-english speaking. (e23)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **15**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: **25**

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The application identifies goals and performance measures for the EACS expansion to elementary grades. (e27-30) including raising achievement scores for all students, eliminating achievement gaps, providing a responsive education and developing effective relationships with parents and students. Notably, these goals differentiate for students enrolling in different grade levels and for students persisting over time.
The narrative includes a "logic model" table which identified inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes for the project.

Sub Question

(e57)

Weaknesses:

The logic model submitted appears to be incomplete. (e57) Further, the table does not appear to be properly aligned, as items in the same rows do not appear to be interconnected.
The goals and performance measures, as written, lack nuance and specificity and would be easier to understand if expressed in SMART terms.

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 notes that students entering the existing middle school enter far below grade level (e17) on foundational ELA and math, and therefore the expansion is designed to improve education for younger students over current options.
The application outlines key best-practice program elements of EACS designed to serve the identified population including:
-safe, secure environment with 100% PA certified teachers;
-culturally relevant curriculum;
-individualized instruction for all students;
-specialized programming for ELL and SWD students;
-blended learning environment; and
-career and college exposure. (e25)
The narrative also states that intervention classes will be used as part of a larger system of interventions, which may also include extended or double period classes. (e26) These classes will focus on small-group work and will be data driven. (e27)

Weaknesses:

The application does not appear to identify the specific interventions which will support SWD and ELL students beyond the normal RtI program. This is concerning given the achievement gaps noted in the authorizer report (144-155) discussed later in this evaluation.

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: 6

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:

None Noted.

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not appear to address this criterion.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Based on the resumes provided (e 68-89), the school leadership team taken as a whole, has appropriate education and job experience for their given roles with the current school. Many of the staff members identified have been with the school for more than a decade.

Weaknesses:

This section introduces staff from both the school, EACS, and the parent organization Nueva Esperanza, but does not clearly explain how they are connected nor why so many people from the parent organization are listed as project personnel. Because the parent organization is faith-based and runs numerous affiliated organizations, it is especially concerning that there appears to be a lack of clarity about who will be making decisions about federal funding designated specifically for a public school.
The narrative appears to overstate Ms. Chung's background and qualifications, given that she has a seven year gap in her teaching resume, further, there is no evidence provided for her background with Latino ESL students, and it appears that she will be leading the elementary school.
Additionally, taken as a whole the team has limited experience with grade school education.

Reader's Score: 6

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 project proposes to add coaching for the current director of instruction who appears to become the principal, which makes good sense as she has limited principal training. (e36)
The project will fund two FTE staff for a single year to recruit and enroll the glut of new students needed in five grade levels in 2020-21. (e37)

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not appear to include a detailed management plan addressing responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. Other than the director of instruction, none of the other named individuals are listed in the management plan. Additionally, the management plan does not appear to align with the logic plan, budget, or project goals.
Further, the application fails to provide the rationale for the atypical growth plan: the school has a full 6-12 cohort, and in SY2017-18 added a first grade cohort that will rise academically over the next two years, with no new students added; then, in fall 2020, the school will add the remaining full enrollment of over 650 students in grades K-3 and 5 in a single year. (e37)

Reader's Score: 4

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 narrative appears to indicate that Esperanza currently operates 4 schools, the brick and mortar elementary, middle, and high schools and a cyber school open to grades K-12.
The schools appear to have rising three-year trends on PSSA and Keystone test proficiency, all academic growth measures, and all attendance measures. (e145)
EACS outperforms the district and similar schools on measures of attendance and absenteeism (e153-54)
EACS significantly outperforms the district and similar schools on HS graduation rates. (e156)

Weaknesses:

According to the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) report card presented, the school is currently rated as "approaching standards" overall for both the elementary and high school programs. (e145)
The school appears to have a flat to falling three year trend on most financial health measures, and consistently missed compliance measures. (e146)
While EACS slightly outperformed "similar" schools on schoolwide PSSA proficiency, it significantly underperformed the district (28% v. 37%). Further, this metric reveals significant achievement gaps for ELL and SWD students. (e147)
EACS significantly underperforms both similar schools and the district on PSSA math proficiency (7% v. 12% v. 19%, respectively). (e148) While the achievement gap for ELLs persists here, SWD outperform the schoolwide average at 13% proficient, which is also higher than comparison and district SWD averages.
EACS significantly outperforms similar schools and underperforms the district on Keystone Literature proficiency (36% v. 16% v. 43%). ELLs and SWD significantly underperform the schoolwide average but outperform comparison and district proficiency averages. (e150) These trends are true for Algebra 1 and biology as well. (e151-52)
EACS underperforms the district and similar schools significantly on SAT/ACT performance and participation measures. (e155)
The SDP annual report notes three compliance violations related to student discipline, including a code of conduct that allows for expulsion of "problem" students for repeated minor violations. (e159)
Because of changes to state law with regard to school finance and pension contributions, the school has run at a significant deficit for the past two years, according to the SDP report card. (161)
The school fails to meet the standard on any of the short-term or long-term financial health measures. (e162-63)
As of June 30, 2017, there were 11 related-party transactions unresolved. (e164)
The suspension rate for black students is 34%, more than double that of latino or mixed-race students, and the rate for

SWD is 19%. The rates for black students are significantly higher than at comparison schools and the district averages, and the rate for EACS overall is above both the district and all district charters. (e166)

Reader's Score: **7**

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 narrative indicates that the parent organization has run capital campaigns and construction projects previously. (e41)

   Weaknesses:

   The school has not raised the funds for the building which will house the elementary school yet, and cannot add grades, the core of the proposed project, until the building is complete. (e41) The narrative does not outline a plan for raising these funds, which, when combined with the school's poor performance on the SDP evaluation framework across all finance domains and the current net negative position, leads to significant concern regarding the ability of the school to either execute the expansion project or continue operating charter schools. Additionally, the significant inter-organization transactions discussed previously (e164), which remain unresolved add to concerns about the overall financial management of EACS.

Reader's Score: **7**

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 current student body (grades 1 and 6-12 at two campuses) is 96% latino, 23% ELL, 18% SWD. The project is designed to expand the current schools to serve grades K and 2-5 in the coming years from the same geographic community. the SDP annual report indicates that the current school serves about the same amount of FRL students as the SDP, but more than double the amount of ELLs (23% v. 11%) and more SWD (18% v. 15%) than the district. (e144) Given the trend of high graduation rates for all subgroups, and the minimal gap between subgroups and all student graduation rates, as well as the significant outperformance of the state and SDP, (e141-42) the current school is likely improving academic outcomes for the identified high-need student groups.

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:

   EACS partners with Eastern University to offer dual credit and CTE courses. (e22)

   Weaknesses:

   The proposed expansion project is for grades K, 2-5, and therefore it is not clear whether the CPP points should be awarded as technically the project will not increase access to the dual-credit program, although a case could be made that students with a better early elementary education are more likely to participate.

Reader's Score: **1**

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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/21/2018 08:30 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Nueva Esperanza, Inc. (U282E180031)
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	8
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		10	6
Quality of the Eligible Applicant			
1. Eligible Applicant		20	15
Continuation Plan			
1. Continuation Plan		15	10
	Sub Total	100	75
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	79

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: **********

Applicant: Nueva Esperanza, Inc. (U282E180031)

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:

(e23-27) In pages e23-27 the applicant describes in general terms how it believes its current educational program, its six pillars and it the applicability of its reading program will ensure it will be successful in serving educational disadvantage students at the elementary grades, as it is at the middle and high school levels. “EACS will find success in educating elementary students identified as at-risk through a variety of initiatives that build on our own success with middle school and high school students. For example, according to recent data, about 70% of Philadelphia’s students finished high school in six years. In contrast, EACS experienced a graduation rate of 94% and a dropout rate of less than 1% over the same time period. Furthermore, 97% of EACS high school graduates are accepted to college. EACS has developed a successful program to identify, monitor, and support students identified as at risk that has significantly impacted the number of students it graduates. These monumental successes and the learnings associated with them will be transferred and integrated into EACS’s curriculum and support methods.”

The application indicates that that students will come to it in the early grades will be below grade level and will have an immediate need for a strong intervention program. It has identified as Goal 1 that students will be reading at grade level by grade 3. ((e27). Key staff identified also have significant experience in elementary grades and EL instructions (Lori Schwartz-Walinsky (e72) and Kim Yang Yu Chung (e70). It discussed aspects of the intervention program (e26).

(e49-54) The applicant also describes their approach to serve students with disabilities, their inclusion approach, the training of staff and the overall monitoring of services. It will build on the school’s existing program.

Weaknesses:

This will be the school’s first time serving these grade levels. One of its key academic goal is based on students who enroll in the school in kindergarten – to be at grade level in reading and mathematics by third grade. (e27). Goals for students entering the school at other grade levels is also needed. As the school has not served these grade levels before, the systems and approaches that have been effective in serving these educational disadvantage students at 6-12 may not readily translate to effective services at K-5.

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:

(e27-32) The school indicates that they are building on the success for EACS. “EACS’ elementary will capitalize on the success model exhibited in the historical
outcomes of EACS and create demonstrable goals regarding our commitment to academic
excellence and continuous improvement,” The school has four Goals, Rising Achievement, Eliminating the Achievement Gap, Responsive Education, and Effective Relationships. It also presents a listing of assessments it will be using to measure academic success.

Weaknesses:

(e31) The application lists a number of quality assessments but does not provide additional information regarding their use. There is a reference to an “Attachment 4: Assessment Plan that indicated that additional information is provided, but it was not included in the application.

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 school has identified an appropriate standard aligned curricular materials in each key academic area. (e49-54) The applicant has described a comprehensive approach to identify and serve students with a range of disabilities, with a focus on inclusion, but with the recognition that a number of approaches and services will be needed. (19-20) (e47) The applicant has also described a comprehensive approach to identify and serve EL learners. (e31 includes assessment that will be used with ELL students. The school is also drawing on their experience and success in serving these students in grades 6-12.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not served this grade levels in the past. This will be the school’s first time serving these grade levels. One of its key academic goal is based on students who enroll in the school in kindergarten – to be at grade level in reading and mathematics by third grade. (e27). Goals for students entering the school at other grade levels is also needed. As the school has not served these grade levels before, the systems and approaches that have been effective in serving these educational disadvantage students at 6-12 may not readily translate to effective services at K-5.

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:

No information included in the application.

Weaknesses:

No information included in the application.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

(e35-36) The management plan provides a general narrative overview of the school's progress to date (first class of first graders stated September 2017). It then describes key next steps in the development of the new school site and the implementation of the program to serve the new students.

Weaknesses:

Unclear to what extend the staff identified will be available to support the new school.

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:

(e35-36) The management plan provides a general narrative overview of the school's progress to date (first class of first graders stated September 2017). It then describes key next steps in the development of the new school site and the implementation of the program to serve the new students.

Weaknesses:

The management plan is narrative only. It does not provide enough information to understand the project's timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (e57) The logic model not reflect budget and decision making.

Reader's Score: 6

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 applicant has a strong track record of high academic achievement for its students, first in high school, and now grades 5-12. The student population is overwhelmingly students of color and is traditionally underserved. It also includes a significant number of students with special needs and EL students. The school and the overall organization is well established, with a long history

Weaknesses:

: E25-26, 39, 141, 146) The applicant has a strong track record of strong academic achievement for its students, first in high school, and now grades 5-12. The student population is overwhelmingly students of color and is traditionally underserved. It also includes a significant number of students with special needs and EL students. The school and the overall organization is well established, with a long history

Reader's Score: 15

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:

(e41) The plan discusses it plans to fund and construct the new elementary school building. It also indicates the elementary school will become self-sustaining through standard per pupil funding. Success in the past with construction projects and capitol campaign.

Weaknesses:

The continuation plan lacks detail regarding the fiscal health of the school. It also does not address how services provided under the grant will be continued or will no longer be needed.

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:

   (e23-26) The school indicates the three closest traditional are low performing, with less than 1/3 of their students proficient. EACS indicates their success with the higher grade levels provide them the capacity to create equally effective program serving elementary grades.

   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:

   (e39, 40) (e22) EACS has strong dual enrollment and AP programs.

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/21/2018 08:30 AM