

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Crescent City Schools (U282M180010)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	29
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Crescent City Schools (U282M180010)

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:

Based on the state's Progress Index (e260) which measures growth progress, each CCS campus (e25) is increasing achievement at a significantly higher rate than the state or New Orleans. CCS has earned on the state report card grade of A for growth on each campus. (e26) The CCS network is outperforming comparison schools by 3% (e212) when comparison schools have similar demographics are compared.

The CCS network has high attendance rates averaging 93% for the past three years which is significantly higher than the New Orleans average of 90% this year. (e305)

The average CCS network student retention rate is 83% with campuses sustaining their growth in this critical area. There are no documented retention rates for the state or city. (e305)

Weaknesses:

Currently, the CCS school campuses are not outperforming the state or New Orleans in average achievement based on students achieving mastery on the LEAP (state assessment) performance scores for 1) economically disadvantaged students with none of the CCS schools meeting or exceeding the LEAP scores in ELA or math scores at any campus (e211-212) 2) students with disabilities with only one school (Tubman) in Math meeting or exceeding the LEAP scores; and e) English learners (e24) with Tubman meeting and exceeding the state scores in both ELA and Math and Haban in ELA. There were no ELL scores on Akili campus reported. (e212)

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 13

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:

No campuses in the CCS network have been closed or had a charter revoked or terminated. (e27) All three campuses have already met their academic requirements for renewal which will not be examined until after 2020. (e27) Two of the schools were granted six-year renewals while the Haban campus was renewed for three years.

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:

There have been no identified operational or management issues in any of the CCS network's schools. The comprehensive design of CCS' compliance oversight responsibilities assigned to the Chief Operating Officer has resulted in no compliance issues in student safety, fiscal, or operational management. (e28-29) Two other indications of an effective management plan is that there have been no audit issues identified and operationally there is a written student safety plan with procedures that are systematically reviewed.

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:

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 CCS network has higher rates of educationally disadvantaged students (94%) enrolled and served than either the state or New Orleans by a significant 25%. (e302)

The CCS network's LEAP report states that CCS is achieving more progress than other public schools in the state (e302) based on the state's performance rate which is based on individual student academic growth.

Weaknesses:

Currently, the network schools do not have academic performance rates for their educationally disadvantaged students that are equal to or higher than the state or New Orleans (e24) with none of the CCS schools meeting or exceeding the LEAP scores in ELA or math but each CCS campus (e25) is increasing achievement at a significantly higher rate than the state or New Orleans based on academic growth data.

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 CCS network has already proven their ability to restructure two turnaround campuses and design an expansion of a third campus utilizing tools such as the OneApp, well developed, targeted recruitment strategies, and the utilization of their current organizational structure and procedures for startups. (e32-34) The high retention rate of students will assist in the stabilization of future local, state and federal funding to support replication and expansion plans.

The Bellwether independent assessment documents the readiness of the CCS network to successfully recruit, enroll and serve educationally disadvantaged students based on their research-based nine dimensions. (e272-273)

In terms of recruitment, the CCS network has a proven track record and some of the highest achievement results for students with disabilities in New Orleans which will assist in recruiting, enrolling and serving this subpopulation. (e31)

The CCS network has a structured educational model that utilizes targeted assessments, rigorous academic challenges, personalized student learning plans with a dynamic system of student supports that provides educationally disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English language learners, with necessary assistance and specialized assistance such as their English immersion program. (e38-44)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my

Sub

professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 15

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 CCS network's design for evaluation uses a quasi-experimental design examining three specific elements: 1) growing enrollment and schools 2) increasing student academic achievement disaggregated across subgroups and 3) examining fidelity of implementation of the instructional model. (e45-46)

The CCS network has selected a national recognized evaluator, Bellwether Education Partners, building on the initial examination they completed. CCS has already established an evaluation working group. The network has designed a plan that will provide quarterly and annually feedback allowing for adjustments in implementation by the network's leadership. (e47,e49)

The well-defined evaluation plan including a written evaluation framework and an evaluation rubric (e361-365) that contains specified performance measures e(354-356) paired with the experience of assigned evaluators (e358-359) supports the network's ability to generate quantitative and qualitative data to share with the field.(e47)

Crescent City's logic model was comprehensive and included measurable performance outcomes personalized to each campus. The document defined actual growth measures that were ambitious based on their past growth trajectory. (e310-312)

The performance measures (e375-379) are detailed, measurable, and directly aligned to the evaluation plan.

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:

The CCS network has a documented set of management strategies and experienced staff in place to support the operation of the network and the replication and expansion. Fiscal oversight plans (e59) are comprehensive with a budget that documents that the new expanded and replication sites would be fiscally secure and sustainable. (e367-370)

The budget provided evidence of the ability of the network to establish and expand school sites that can be sustainable with current public dollars. The use of philanthropic funds is for innovation or one-time capital outlays and aren't used for operational support. (e58)

The Bellwether assessment independently evaluated the operational systems and identified the network with a high readiness to expand based on its current operational design. (e28)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

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 focused on operating procedures that were clearly delineated with staff assignments defined around operation of the network, facility management, data utilization, teacher and leader development, and fiscal oversight. (e53-57)

Weaknesses:

While the written narrative contained management procedures, a specific timeline focusing on management tasks with staff responsibility and benchmarks identified was not included in the application. (e53-57)

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:

The CCS network staff have the experience of expanding their campuses and replicating their model at two turnaround campuses with success. Their experience documents they have the training, skill and expertise to

Sub

successfully implement their growth plans. (e32-34)

The application documented the staff's direct experience in establishing and managing high poverty charter schools with academic growth for the students. (e325-238) The staff have participated in a variety of national charter leadership learning opportunities and have specific expertise and experience in their current assignments.

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:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

Crescent City Schools (CCS) successfully operates 3 schools and two of the network's current schools began as turnaround campuses. CCS will expand and replicate its model and reopen a low-performing K-8 campus. The network serves a 93% educationally disadvantaged population.(e20-21)

The school model which has been successful with turnaround campus redesign and will utilize its systematic academic assessment to target student needs in a personalized learning plan. (e38-39)

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:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Crescent City Schools (U282M180010)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Crescent City Schools (U282M180010)

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 a clear demonstration that the applicant is achieving more progress with educationally disadvantaged students than other public schools statewide. Specifically, the Louisiana Progress Index shows CCS is achieving more progress with educationally disadvantaged students than other public schools statewide. According to the state Progress Index, every school in the CCS network is growing students to Mastery quicker than schools across the city and state (e25). The applicant states a comparison of student retention data from schools in the New Orleans all-choice system would not be comparable to the data of the traditional school districts prevalent in the rest of Louisiana (e30).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not sufficiently demonstrate that the academic achievement for economically disadvantaged students served by charter schools operated by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement of students served by other public schools in the State on statewide assessments. Specifically, data presented indicates performance scores in state exams are not higher than statewide averages. For example, performance scores on state exams for targeted charter schools for students considered economically disadvantaged are Akili – 18%; Tubman – 21%; Habans – 20 as compared the state at 26%. In addition, the applicant only demonstrates that economically disadvantaged students are progressing towards a “Mastery” achievement level on state exams faster than other public schools state wide. (pg. 5 or e 24). Further, annual student attendance and retention rates are not clearly described to demonstrate academic achievement 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. For example, student attendance and retention rates are below the 94% rate of the State.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Sub

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 presents clear information specifying that no schools it has operated or managed have been closed, or had their charters revoked. Specifically, the applicant indicates it is in good standing with the school board in the targeted geographic area and the State Education Department, and that the targeted charters schools are up for renewal in fall 2020, 2021, and 2023 respectively, with each school already meeting the academic requirements for renewal (e27). The applicant provides sufficient information that the schools they operate are sound and have not been affected by closure. Rather, the applicant seeks to expand an existing school under its purview. Specifically, the applicant notes that funding from this competition would allow expansion of Tubman to serve 200 additional K-8 students and replicate the network's high-quality charter school model to turn around a low-performing school that will serve 540 K-8 students (e21). An independent analysis indicates the applicant as "high readiness" or expansion.

Weaknesses:

None 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 applicant presents clear information and documentation in support of its managed charter schools having no issues in the area of financial or operational management, student safety, or having experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter. Specifically, the applicant adheres to the financial, operational, and student safety standards set forth by the school board and is monitored for compliance annually. In addition, clearly specified procedures are in outlined to ensure compliance oversight, operational management, and student safety. For example, student safety plans and procedures are updated annually and reviewed by the school board. In accordance the city fire department, fire drills and fire drills and emergency intruder drills are conducted regularly, and a copy of the fire drill instructions and a chart showing the applicant provides sufficient information to demonstrate that it operates in a sound fiscal and operational manner (e27-29). Specific documentation is provided support sound audits, management structure, and safety procedures. This information demonstrates that the applicant has a sound structure to implement the activities described in the narrative. (Appendix 12; e27-e30)

Weaknesses:

None 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: 30

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 presents clear data to demonstrate it serves educationally disadvantaged students at a rate comparable to schools within the city and the state. Specifically, all of the targeted charter schools serve a higher percentage of educationally disadvantaged (ED) students than the statewide average (Akili- 94%; Tubman – 93%; Habans – 96%; State -69%). In addition, all of the targeted charter schools serve a higher percentage of students with disabilities than the state (Akili – 20%; Tubman – 15%; Habans – 13%; State – 12%). Two of the targeted charter schools serve a higher percentage of Limited English proficient students than the state (e30-e31). Additionally, the applicant accommodates English Learners through specific communication. For example, the applicant translates all documents that go home into Spanish and provide interpreters for all parent meetings (GEPA Statement).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

- 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 outlines a sufficient plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students. Specifically, appropriate recruitment and enrollment practices and strategies will be used to include the use of the OneApp process, whereby families fill out one single application to apply to schools; hosting parent information sessions and family nights; hosting open houses; mailing enrollment postcard to families and eligible students; attending citywide recruitment fairs; and getting involved in local communities to demonstrate the ability to serve educationally disadvantaged students. Further, the district siting process will be utilized, which involves meetings with the new community, and opportunities to engage with families and students directly. These hands-on practices and strategies are likely to yield an appropriate enrollment for the schools. In addition, the applicant provides a clear description of how the needs of students with disabilities will be met. For example, schools will offer students with disabilities the least restrictive environment possible within the guidelines of each student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and adhere to the provision of services as outline in applicable state and federal laws and regulations. Efforts to serve English Learners includes structured English immersion methodology (e32-e45).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Sub

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 presents an appropriate plan to evaluate the success of the proposed project. Specifically, the applicant will conduct quasi-experimental design study that will meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with reservations. A detailed logic model is presented that outlines multiple performance indicators that will yield both qualitative and quantitative data on the project, and also show what the program expects to achieve and how it will be achieved. (Appendix 14 Logic Model, e45-e50).

Weaknesses:

None 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:

The applicant provides sufficient narrative to demonstrate how it will sustain the operation of the expanded charter school. Specifically, the school is absorbed as part of the overall educational structure, and thusly, has the benefit of oversight and maintenance. Specifically, the applicant would assume operations of the failing school, which would be sited in a district facility. CCS has many years of experience in maintaining district-owned buildings in accordance with the maintenance and safety expectations laid out by the district lease and facility policies and applicable laws and regulations. (e51)

Sub

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

None 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 applicant provides a timeline with activities shown to be conducted on time. The timeframe is estimated based on previous years activities. The applicant shows the overall structure of the organization with positions designated on the organization chart. The applicant indicates that it will expand positions with the takeover of the new school and provide professional development to staff taking new positions (e52-e60).

Weaknesses:

The timeline is not specific as to years, only months. It is unclear as to what persons or positions are designated to complete each activity. The timeline is not structured in greater detail to provide an overview of implementation (Appendix I).

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:

The qualifications for key personnel assigned to work on the project are clearly specified and appropriate for the positions. Specifically, key project staff to include an Assistant Director; three College Facilitators; a Family Involvement Coordinator; an Evaluation Specialist; and an Independent Evaluator. For example, required qualifications for the Assistant director position include a Master's degree from an accredited college/university (or equivalent qualifications established by the university), three years' work experience in educational outreach, and experience with low-income and/or underrepresented students. The applicant makes a sufficient demonstration that key personnel working on the grant are highly qualified as information presented is detailed and specific.

Weaknesses:

None 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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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 addresses this competitive preference priority. The applicant provides sufficient narrative that it has worked with poor performing schools in a turn around model for multiple schools. Specifically, it will expand its model to include over 700 students. In so doing, The applicant will expand an existing school (Tubman) to serve 200 additional K-8 students, and replicate the network's high quality charter school model to turn around a low-performing school that will serve 540 K-8 students (e21).

Weaknesses:

None 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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Crescent City Schools (U282M180010)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	38
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	11
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Crescent City Schools (U282M180010)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 38

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 students in the three charter schools operated by the applicant have greater "Progress Index Scores" (measures of student growth) than the New Orleans school district (e25) which indicates that the applicant is on the path to achieving positive student outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students.

The applicant is serving a higher percentage of educationally disadvantaged students than New Orleans (e23-24) and moving them more quickly towards "Mastery" (proficiency) than New Orleans public schools (e22-23) showing academic growth for educationally disadvantaged students.

Using a comparison to schools with similar demographic profiles as the applicant's schools, Mastery rates are higher than for similar schools (e303) demonstrating scores exceeding those for educationally disadvantaged students attending schools with similar demographics.

Student attendance rates for the applicant's schools are slightly better than the state and district averages (e305).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's schools have lower Mastery rates than New Orleans public schools which also serves a high percentage of educationally disadvantaged students (e24), so in direct comparison to the public schools in their service area they do not exceed the academic achievement of the public school students.

Student retention rates for the applicant's schools are below both the district and state averages (e305).

Sub

Reader's Score: 8

- 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 has had no schools closed or charters revoked or disaffiliated.

Weaknesses:

None found.

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 had no significant financial, operational, or student safety issues that could lead to charter revocation (e27).

Weaknesses:

None found.

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: 25

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 serves higher rates of economically disadvantaged, African-American and students with disabilities than the New Orleans public schools (e31). In two of their three schools they serve a higher percentage of ELL students than New Orleans (e31). The applicant has demonstrated that they serve educationally disadvantaged

Sub

students at rates comparable to public schools in the State.

Weaknesses:

One of the applicant’s schools, Akili, has lower percentages of Hispanic or Latino and ELL students than New Orleans (e31), serving this subgroup of educationally disadvantaged students at a lower rate as compared to public schools in the State.

Reader's Score: 14

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’s schools will get high preference selection in the common application used by the New Orleans school district (e33) based on the applicant’s predictions.

The applicant plans to advertise its expansion through yard signs, attending recruitment fairs, visiting pre-k programs to speak to families, mailing enrollment postcards and hosting “open houses” in the neighborhood where the school is located (e34-35) demonstrating their intent to recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students.

The applicant will serve students with disabilities in accordance with local, state and federal laws (e39), indicating that they will effectively serve this population.

The applicant has strategies in place for ELL students, including English immersion, extended school day and will ensure that ELL students are not inappropriately identified as Special Needs (e41-42). The strategies indicate that the applicant will effectively serve the ELL population.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not have specific plans in place to appeal to special needs or ELL students (such as materials in other languages or marketing targeting the families of special needs children) in the strategies identified on e34-46. They do not demonstrate a clear focus on recruiting students with disabilities and English learners.

The educational elements identified on e38 are vague and don’t identify specifics of how the schools will effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students to get them to “Mastery” at rates comparable to the New Orleans district.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

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 has evaluation plans that include data to measure student performance and the impact of their education model on student outcomes. Evaluation Focus Area 2 will use student achievement benchmark data to assess the schools' impacts on performance (e346-47) as compared to New Orleans and East Baton Rouge schools.

The applicant will be using a quasi-experimental design student approved by the What Works Clearinghouse (e45) and utilize Bellwether Education Partners as outside evaluators (e48) to ensure that they have a quality evaluation plan.

The applicant's Logic Model includes the expansion of seats in existing schools and increasing "Basic" and "Mastery" scores to surpass those of New Orleans public schools (e310-311).

The Logic Model and evaluation plan includes qualitative measurements of parent and teacher satisfaction (e311-312).

The applicant has developed an Evaluation and Performance Measures Framework that relates to the intended outcomes of the project, including replicating schools to serve educationally disadvantaged students and driving consistently high academic performance for all students (e353). The applicant will use this data to analyze, report on and assess progress towards goals (e49).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has included outcomes for the as yet undetermined new school to be taken over by their charter school network. The student outcome goals do not reflect rigor (still below New Orleans scores after two years) (e311) and the "staff satisfaction goals" appear low (85% satisfaction after two years) (e311).

Reader's Score: 9

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: 11

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 is experienced in expansion, having expanded the Harriet Tubman school, and in taking over and maintaining public school facilities (e50-51). This demonstrates their ability to maintain operations of an expanded school and use public school facilities for expansion and replication.

The applicant designs each of the schools in its network to be sustainable on public dollars. The majority of its funding comes from government sources (e57) that the applicant asserts will enable them to achieve financial

Sub

sustainability.

The applicant receives financial support from some large philanthropic organizations such as the Walton Family Fund and the Louis Calder foundation as well as some local funders (e58).

Weaknesses:

The applicant makes assumptions that may or not be realized, including that the pupil funding structure determined by the Orleans Parish School Board will continue to fund general education and special needs students at the same rates (e57-58). The applicant also includes funding from a High Cost Services competitive grant and a Citywide Exceptional Needs Fund, neither of which is a guaranteed source of sustainable income (e58). The applicant also assumes \$100 per pupil will come from private and corporate funding (e58), not a guaranteed source of income.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 3

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 project management plan on e298-300 contains a timeline, milestones and responsibilities for accomplishing the tasks that demonstrate an adequate management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget.

Weaknesses:

For an existing school that is expanding, Harriet Tubman, it is late to be deciding on, purchasing and training staff on new curriculum starting in July 2019 for a September 2019 opening (e299-300) and for a new school, June before opening in September. If the existing educational model is high-quality, the timing of such decisions on curriculum do not demonstrate a completely stable and effective educational management plan.

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:

The key personnel include individuals experienced in charter school administration and in public school administration (e325). All of the key personnel have relevant training and experience, according to the descriptions on e325-328).

Weaknesses:

None found.

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 did not address this competitive priority preference.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority preference.

Reader's Score: 0

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 has had two successful turnaround schools, including Harriet Tubman (e22) and Paul Habans (e23) each showing improved student achievement outcomes such as moving from being ranked 45th in the district to 4th (e22) and being the number one school for student growth (e23).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include a specific proposal to reopen one or more academically poor-performing schools.

Reader's Score: 2

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 did not address this competitive priority preference.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority preference.

Reader's Score: 0

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 priority preference.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority preference.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM