

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Building Responsible Intelligent Creative Kids (U282M180003)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	23
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	13
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>96</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Building Responsible Intelligent Creative Kids (U282M180003)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

#### 1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 42

##### Sub

1. (i) **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 served by other public schools in the State.**

##### Strengths:

BRICK's replication school appears to set and achieve strong academic goals while pushing towards increased growth year over year. Moreover the majority student body is demonstrating competence across a wide array of measures, both internal and on state exams like the NWEA. (page 9 of the narrative and pages 4-13 of Appendix G). It is worth noting that while BRICK Achieve has shown great results with generally small class sizes, it is a very young school (now only K-2) with a long way to go before it fulfills its intended K-12 continuum. They have clearly demonstrated results in the early grades, but this doesn't necessarily imply academic success in higher grades later on (page 12). However their Peshine and Avon campuses have shown continued growth over the past few years (page 12) on internal data metrics, which could arguably be more difficult in a turnaround.

BRICK does not currently serve high school students to have data and results on high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates.

##### Weaknesses:

The application demonstrates that the turnarounds are performing well against expectations, yet the NJ School Performance Reports in the appendix beginning on page 19 show that there is much more room for overall improvement on state metrics at both schools. While the application shows how BRICK's schools have achieved in relation to district and state standards for turnarounds (beginning on page 18), more comparable results for state, district or even neighborhood traditional schools would be very helpful to paint the full picture of how BRICK is doing within its larger education community especially on attendance and retention. The applicant does not to Avon and Peshine's results within the overall context of the district on page 24 when it mentions how both schools' results put South Ward on the map in terms of high achievement for the first time ever.

Reader's Score: 12

Sub

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes that no charters operated by the applicant have closed.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.

**Strengths:**

The application quickly notes on page 25 that BRICK "has never failed an audit, and complies with all applicable national, state, and local educational, operational, and safety statutes and regulations". Beyond the audits, no evidence is provided of compliance.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

**1. Selection Criteria 2: Significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students**

In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:

**Reader's Score: 23**

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.

**Strengths:**

On page e60 BRICK outlines how they serve a slightly greater population of students with special needs (21%) when compared to the district (16%), state (17%) and nation (13%). On page e24 the applicant compares their student population versus the state. BRICK serves almost three times (98%) the number of economically disadvantaged population of the state (38%). BRICK's African American population is 89% compared to almost

**Sub**

16% in the state, which is likely a reflection of the district they operate in.

Their Avon and Peshine campuses regularly meet and sometimes exceed target performance on state exams for all subgroups of students for both growth and proficiency across Math and ELA (p e62-e63).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant notes that neither they nor their district serve a significant portion of English learners due to community demographics and not selectivity in who they serve (p e63), however across the state, 6% of students are English learners (p e24). Likely related to the absence of English learners at BRICK schools and the district, is the fact that only 10% of BRICK’s students are Latino compared to 28% across the state (e24).

**Reader's Score: 12**

**2. (ii) The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

On page 41 the applicant leads with a succinct chart showing how it serves a higher population of students with disabilities than the district, state and nation. This is part of its commitment to serving students of varying needs. It goes on to elaborate on its approach to provide the least restrictive environment and its means of doing so in compliance with IDEA. Overall approaches listed for students with disabilities seem to be common, good practice. The applicant notes it does not have an ELL population because of the make-up of the communities it serves and not because of discrimination or preference on the part of BRICK. While the applicant doesn’t serve a very diverse population, those they do serve are minorities, primarily African American or two or more races, demonstrate great economic hard ship, and are educationally disadvantages, in addition to a large population of students with disabilities; this is a population with great need with the community.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not outline specific plans to increase diversity across its campuses, especially around Latino students and those with ELL needs, especially since their ELL populations are well below state averages. (e24).

**Reader's Score: 11**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. Selection Criteria 3: Quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project**

**In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant’s logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

In the chart on page 46, BRICK outlines a full array of metrics and benchmarks that span achievement in all grades and also breaks out goals specific to start-up versus turnaround schools. While these benchmarks are high, they are good to strive towards. The applicant outlines how their current schools monitor and work towards these goals annually.

Goal 1 on replication seems achievable, especially given the path already laid out for BRICK. Goal 2 around improved student results is ambitious, as it should be, but it may be harder to attain such significant and markedly growth year over year in such a short time for new/turnaround schools. However the strategies associated with Goal 2 will be crucial and

relevant to this success. Goal 3 seems attainable and demonstrates some solid understanding that lends itself to the quality of the management plan.

BRICK clearly notes the individuals responsible for data collection, analysis, and evaluation as it relates to this grant and identifies a Director of Evaluation who will work with their external evaluator (Child Trends) (page 48). It appears they have a solid plan for the data they need to collect, the frequency for collection, and how they will be used as outlined by the grantee – “These reports will be used by the organization across of levels of staffing to adjust practice and modify implementation of strategy” (page 49).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan**

**In determining the quality of the applicant's management plan, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model required under section 4305(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the ESEA (5 points). (NFP)**

**Strengths:**

BRICK notes that each of their schools is sustained by the same state and federal per-pupil funding available to district schools once fully enrolled (page 51). “The CSP funding requested in this grant enables us to bridge the funding gap between the planning year and full enrollment as a network” which is common practice for charters, especially those seeking CSP funding. It is also important to note that BRICK already has two fundraising professionals employed to help fill the gap in the interim. They have also included a Project Manager and Student Recruitment Firm that are budgeted for all 5 years of the grant as per their budget narrative. This will have the added benefit of helping them achieve desired enrollment and funding levels during the grant and beyond. BRICK has achieved clean audits and has a solid projection model for its network and each campus that extends well beyond a CSP grant and the full enrollment of the campus.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (ii) 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. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

Overall BRICK's application is thoughtful, thorough and takes effective practices from other charters and partners to inform their growth and path ahead. Their staffing at the network level is already substantial enough to lead the organization into this next phase of growth and they speak to (page 54) how "A portion of CSP funding will be used to strengthen BRICK's regional staffing to support additional turnaround/replication schools and fresh start/replication schools" with lines of reporting to inform this growth.

The applicant references a breakdown of roles and responsibilities at the national office and regional level in appendix I.7 which appears to actually be I.6 and is only a listing of the roles at each office. The charts on pages 55 and 56 give a high level breakdown of key activities by month, task and department differentiated by replication and turnaround schools and works towards the school opening. While it's a good start to show that leadership has a good sense of the timeline and steps needed, I would like to see something even more detailed that overlays these two charts with each other and the ongoing work needed for BRICK's existing campuses.

**Weaknesses:**

I am concerned that the growth plans for BRICK are far too broad given scope of the work where they replicate schools, turnaround around others, open elementary and high schools and do it across state lines. I would feel more confident if their plans were a bit more focused since each school will obviously bring its own challenges compounded in some cases by venturing into high school education or the needs of the communities themselves. Their budget narrative does include a High School Turnaround Operations Consultant in year one of the grant so it is good to see BRICK seeking expertise in an area they are unfamiliar with.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**3. (iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210 (e)(3)(ii))**

**Strengths:**

BRICK's founder's work to establish the South Ward Children's Alliance demonstrates the vision and ability to establish a large scale program with many partners that drew the attention and recognition of impact through a multimillion dollar Promise Neighborhoods grant (page 50).

Goal 3 on page 48 and its corresponding strategies demonstrates how BRICK recognizes they must scale their management team and do so intentionally and with the buy-in of many to ensure organizational strength. The fact that they are already thinking about and establishing practices to get employee feedback and ultimately work towards employee retention is very promising. Their plans to work with RELAY show a recognition and commitment to human capital development as they then call out in approach 1 on page 52.

As to the qualifications of the existing staff overseeing the project, the org chart shows an already robust staff in place for SWAC, Talent, Academics, Finance and External Relations. Additionally, they have two staff members dedicated to student recruitment. BRICK has included the growth of the Operations team and the office of the Chief Schools Officer, which will be crucial as the network grows and the need to ensure a consistency and quality of results and communication within and across their schools. The C-suite (as per their bios and resumes) has strong educational experience at both charters and traditional public schools, with many beginning their careers in the classroom. There is a good balance of founding staff and others who bring years of expertise with the local government and high-quality education non-profits.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

#### **Strengths:**

I applaud BRICK for recognizing that diversity must be represented in its staff as well; their intention to recruit staff who look like and may share the lived experiences of their students is demonstrated in their staff diversity (page 6). There is room to grow, but the fact that they named this in their application implies that they likely see it as an organizational priority.

BRICK schools obviously serve a higher need population than the state, as evidenced in the chart on page 5. They are open enrollment schools and turnarounds so I acknowledge that their schools likely have established community populations, that in the case of BRICK are predominantly African American.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The application did not outline any initiatives designed to recruit and serve a more diverse student body.

**Reader's Score: 2**

### Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2— Reopening Academically Poor-performing Public Schools as Charter Schools

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

**(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and**

**(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--**

**(A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and**

**(B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

#### **Strengths:**

BRICK has shown success turning around the two schools already under its care through Avon and Peshine. The fact that they are already under contract with MPTCS to turn around 4 campuses (p 2) that span the education spectrum speaks to their desire to go where the work is needed and where the quality is lacking. As they acknowledge on page 6, this is ambitious, but they have some success under their belt and the partnership with MPTCS. I award full points for CPP2 as

they propose to do everything outlined in this opportunity by reopening poor performing schools, replicating based on past success, and serving similar, if not the same, populations served by the underperforming schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to:**

- (i) Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;**
- (ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;**
- (iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and**
- (iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.**
- (v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the ESEA, and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).**

**Strengths:**

- (i) MPTCS HS will serve a very disadvantaged population, and as outlined on pages 7-9, BRICK has thought through and planned to adopt many common best practices for charter high schools to provide access and support to post-secondary education.
- (ii) They will offer a solid array of advanced classes through AP's and beyond to prepare students for the rigors of post-secondary and deliver a more well-rounded education (pages 7-9). I welcome how they discuss the need for increased literacy support and the adaptation of student discussion based models to encourage comprehension (pages 7 & 9). BRICK recognizes that they must enhance the resources currently offered by MPTCS, and given the results of the MPTCS program, I expect they will need to improve the effectiveness of them as well.
- (iii) A very important thing that BRICK noted is that it will provide alumni affairs support for students during their first two

years of college; this will be key (page 10).

(iv) They have also noted appropriate metrics to evaluate student outcomes and success (page 46). I commend BRICK on the partnerships it is already working to form with NJIT and others (pages 10-11) to encourage college completion.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4— Replicating or Expanding High-quality Charter Schools to Serve Native American Students.**

(i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--

(A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

(B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

(C) Have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Indian organizations located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school;

(ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and

(iii) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Indian organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Building Responsible Intelligent Creative Kids (U282M180003)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	23
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	14
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>98</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Building Responsible Intelligent Creative Kids (U282M180003)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

#### 1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 42

#### Sub

1. (i) **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 served by other public schools in the State.**

#### Strengths:

BRICK Avon has met state targets for all student groups and subject areas in 2018, with the exception of math student growth for students with disabilities (p. e34).

BRICK Peshine has met state targets for all student groups and subject areas in 2018 with the exception of ELA proficiency for students with disabilities (p. e35). The school exceeded targets for ELA and Math student growth for economically disadvantaged students, as well as schoolwide for these two categories and for students with two or more races in these two categories and for the performance of African American students in ELA student growth (p. e35).

Retention rates for BRICK Achieve is 90% (p. e41).

#### Weaknesses:

Attendance rates are difficult to discern as there is no comparative data to state or district data. The applicant describes attendance as 13% missing more than five days and 87% missing less than five days (p. e40).

Retention rates compared to the state are not presented (p. e40-41)

Reader's Score: 12

2. (ii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes that BRICK has not operated or managed schools that have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (p. e44).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes that BRICK has not operated or managed any schools that have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (p. e44).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

- 1. Selection Criteria 2: Significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students**

**In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.**

**Strengths:**

BRICK's population of students with disabilities exceeds 20% across all schools it operates, and exceeds the local and state averages for those students (p. e60). On page e24 the school notes that it in 2017-18 it served more students with disabilities than the district and state averages.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

BRICK and its intended turnaround campuses do not serve a population of English Learners that meets or exceeds averages for the state or local district (p. e63).

**Reader's Score: 12**

- 2. (ii) The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes that BRICK schools will continue to recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English language learners (p. e63).

The applicant notes both the current site and the replication site's demographics will be replicated with the same commitment to serving educationally disadvantaged students (p. e63).

The applicant details numerous strategies to effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students by collaborating with families and students to design IEPs, provide all transportation as needed for students with disabilities, connecting families to external services, and hiring qualified, experienced educators who have strong records of success with children with disabilities (p. e61).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address specific strategies to recruit and enroll ELL students, significant as the BRICK population of ELL students is well below state and local averages (p. e63)

**Reader's Score: 11**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. Selection Criteria 3: Quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project**

**In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period, including setting academic, enrollment, staff recruitment, teacher and leader retention, students attendance, student retention, and parent and staff satisfaction goals (p. e64).

The applicant notes performance measures for the turnaround campuses as well as the startup campuses, some performance measures that overlap for both efforts. Each of these performance measures are accompanied by a benchmark percentile that indicates if the performance measure has been met (p. e65).

Within the framework of the logic model the applicant has established three goals (BRICK will replicate its high-quality model to turnaround four elementary schools, one high school, and open three fresh-start charter schools; By the conclusion of the project BRICK will improve student performance; BRICK will scale and improve its educational model)

and has established 14 outcomes, by year, that will measure and quantify progress towards the completion of each goal (p. e 64-68). On page e46 the applicant outlines a full range of benchmark goals as part of the evaluation plan.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan**

**In determining the quality of the applicant's management plan, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 14**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model required under section 4305(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the ESEA (5 points). (NFP)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes that the intention of having each school fully self-sustainable after year four of each school's launch, and once fully enrolled, sustained by the same state and federal dollars available to districts (p. e70-72).

The applicant notes in detail five approaches to sustainability that are practiced in the BRICK network, including HR process, ongoing academic, financial, and operational support, carefully stewarding all public and private funding, establishing and nurturing strategic business partnerships, and ensuring effective oversight and governance. (p. e70-72).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (ii) 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. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The management plan outlines personnel responsibilities, timelines and milestones, with a separate plan for the turnaround schools and one for the fresh start schools. (p. e74-75).

**Sub**

The management plan for the fresh start campuses backwards map responsibilities to ensure that milestones are accomplished prior to opening (p. e75). Page e54 addresses how funding will inform regional support for the schools. Appendix I and pages e55-56 provide specific examples of how staff will manage the turnaround and expansion efforts.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the management plan for the fresh start schools does note aligning the curriculum, resources, policies and procedures according to local laws and learning standards (p. e75,) the fact that the replication (fresh start) schools will be located in another state would seem to suggest that compliance and alignment to the new state laws would need to be an area of emphasis.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**3. (iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210 (e)(3)(ii))**

**Strengths:**

- Key project personnel are identified with the CAO serving as the CSP project director. The applicant notes that the CAO will ensure that the BRICK academic program is faithfully replicated through teacher training and support and that the network maintains and improves student academic growth and overall achievement schoolwide and for each student group (p. e77)
- The remaining five individuals with responsibility for management of the grant have extensive educational service and are well-versed with the BRICK model for turnaround and school launch (p.e76-80).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant currently serves a higher percentage of African American, Economically Disadvantaged and Special Education students than the state, as well as students in Foster Care (p. e24).

The applicant states that the school makes a point to identify, recruit, select, hire, onboard, and support staff who are members of traditionally underrepresented groups, and to have staff demographics mirror student demographics (p. e24).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2— Reopening Academically Poor-performing Public Schools as Charter Schools**

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

**(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and**

**(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--**

**(A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and**

**(B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest- achieving schools or priority schools including two schools (BRICK Peshine and BRICK Avon) that were low-performing in 2009 when part of the Newark Public Schools and were transformed into high-performing schools by the applicant when they were returned to the local district in 2017 (p. e20).

The applicant intends to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by replicating the BRICK model in all four schools belonging to the Marion P. Thomas Charter Schools beginning in the fall of 2019 (p. e21).

Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools is intended by operating the turnaround campuses in the same locations (p. e21)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students**

## 1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

- (i) Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;
- (ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;
- (iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and
- (iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.
- (v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the ESEA, and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

### Strengths:

The applicant will serve educationally disadvantaged high school students at similar rates and with comparable demographics compared to the failing school, providing 600 seats for high school students (p. e26).

The BRICK turnaround campus will offer college-formatted classes including AP classes which are not offered at the failing school (p. e26);

BRICK will offer AP training and mentoring from NMSI and will partner with the Newark City Collaborative and Essex County College to offer dual enrollment courses; (p. e26-27)

BRICK will offer support to students in their first two years of college as well as other supports to ensure that students enrolled in an IHE after graduation are successful as they establish their post secondary path (p. 28-29);

BRICK will partner with post secondary institutions including NJIT, Rutgers University, Essex County College, and the Culinary Institute of America (p. e28-29).

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

Reader's Score: 3

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4— Replicating or Expanding High-quality Charter Schools to Serve Native American Students.**

(i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--

(A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

(B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

(C) Have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Indian organizations located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school;

(ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and

(iii) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Indian organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Building Responsible Intelligent Creative Kids (U282M180003)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	26
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>103</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Building Responsible Intelligent Creative Kids (U282M180003)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

#### 1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 43

##### Sub

1. (i) 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 served by other public schools in the State.

##### Strengths:

The applicant provides data that supports academic achievement results including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates including student academic growth, high school graduation rates, and college acceptance rates for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school applicant as noted with the two schools that were turnaround district schools as noted on pages e17-e20.

##### Weaknesses:

The attendance and retention is difficult to discern according to the data presented does not provide comparable data.

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

##### Strengths:

The applicant did not operate or manage charter schools that have had their charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 15

3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has not operated or managed significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety as noted on pages e17-e20.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

**1. Selection Criteria 2: Significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students**

In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.

**Strengths:**

The applicant operates and manages charter schools serve educationally disadvantaged students as note on page e60. The percentages that provides evidence of this is 21% students with disabilities. The high school charter school serves 93.7% African American and only 1% English language learners.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address the ELL population according to the charts on pages e62 and e63.

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

- 2. (ii) The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools proposal to replicate or expand to recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students is clear in that the applicant proposes to turn around four elementary schools and 1 high school and three fresh start and replication schools in Buffalo and Bronx, New York as indicated on pages e17, e41-e46.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address specifically the recruitment and the ELL population according to the charts on pages e62 and e63.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. Selection Criteria 3: Quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project**

**In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan for the proposed project includes a logic model with specific CSP funding to support the instructional plan with academic plans as noted on pages e64-e65. The grant will have a designated project director that will assist with data collection and objective measurements with the performance officer.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan**

**In determining the quality of the applicant's management plan, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 15**

Sub

- 1. (i) The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model required under section 4305(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the ESEA (5 points).**

**Sub**

**(NFP)**

**Strengths:**

The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended is specified on pages e68-e72.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (ii) 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. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget is clearly specified through the logic model and the CSP funding plan as note on pages e71-e72.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))**

**Strengths:**

The qualifications including relevant training and experience of the key project personnel is provided on pages e75-e79. The staff is highly qualified to complete the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity**

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant intends to replicate turnaround schools in Buffalo and Bronx, New York. The schools will be open enrollment which supports the diversity component as the lottery for the high school is in high demand as mentioned on

pages e27 and e45.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2— Reopening Academically Poor-performing Public Schools as Charter Schools**

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

**(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and**

**(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--**

**(A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and**

**(B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant will turnaround four elementary schools and one high school which has been chronically underperforming as mentioned on pages e20-e27. The CMO has reached out to the applicant to take over the schools due to the previous experience of turnaround schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to:**

**(i) Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;**

**(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early**

college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

(iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and

(iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

(v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the ESEA, and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

The applicant will turnaround four elementary schools and one high school which has been chronically underperforming as mentioned on pages e20-e27. The CMO has reached out to the applicant to take over the schools due to the previous experience of turnaround schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4— Replicating or Expanding High-quality Charter Schools to Serve Native American Students.**

(i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--

(A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

(B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

(C) Have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Indian organizations located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school;

(ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and

(iii) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Indian organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not address this Competitive Preference Priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this Competitive Preference Priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 02/12/2019 05:06 PM