

**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: Collegiate Academies (U282M180014)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
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	15
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Collegiate Academies (U282M180014)

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:

The Collegiate Academies (CA) are high quality high school charters that serve a student population with high needs based on the demographic data that has 95% from low income families with double the rate of students with disabilities and English language learners (e24) and retain 93% of their students annually. Even with these statistics, CA has outperformed the state with a higher percentage of students in "Top Growth" at each of the 4 campuses across the required subgroups. (e153)

CA outperforms the state in every subgroup in graduates that complete college or career credential courses. (e156) Graduation rates for students with disabilities and English language learners exceeds the state rate by double digits. (e155) Specific comparative data of CA and the state, across all subgroups, provides evidence that CA students access college/career coursework at a higher rate, have higher graduation and college entry rates with greater college persistence (e33) as evidenced that 36% of all alumni were persisting or graduated, compared to the national statistic that only 8% of low-income students graduate by age 24. (e158)

The CREDO analysis of high schools, including CA, provided evidence that supports the fact that instruction at CA campuses provided 290 "additional" days of learning in the core subjects of ELA and Math based on the quality instructional program provided. (e32)

Weaknesses:

There is variability across campuses when examining CA's data set. No strategies were provided to address the lowest performing high school campus who was consistently the only site who did not meet or exceed the state's data. (e159). What is concerning is that the achievement differences are double digit and occur across all subgroups on a specific campus. There was no mention of this significant variance in achievement and it was not addressed.

Sub

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

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.**

Strengths:

Collegiate Academies have never had a charter closed, revoked or disaffiliated. (e35) A monitoring report by WestEd provided an independent examination of administrative and implementation procedures and every CA school with an expiring charter was reviewed and renewed. (e36)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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

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:

CA has never had any charter revoked due to fiscal, management or student safety issues. CA have participated in third party evaluations by WestEd, independent auditors (e170-197), and the Louisiana Department of Education and all have provided written feedback acknowledging the strong operational and compliance standards that assure that fiscal, management, operational, compliance and student safety issues are in place. (e36) For example, in the audit statement there were no instance of noncompliance, with no significant deficiencies identified (e195) and an ending balance of \$4,362,646. (e176)

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: 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:

CA has a well-developed plan designed to expand and replicate its model. CA doubled its enrollment since 2015 (e36) based on its reputation for meeting student's needs. It has experienced growth and maintained its focus on high quality instructional methods and support for student achievement. It has a commitment to assure that 61% of all new enrollees are educationally disadvantaged. (e24)

CA has a comprehensive plan for growth at every campus and includes completing the 9-12 high school grades on two campuses, adding middle school grades 5-8 on two campuses, and to provide additional seats that would focus creating a concurrent high school with a post secondary component. Their plans are exemplary, research-based and provide evidence of their thoughtful growth that will ensure higher student achievement for the overall system while addressing the unique needs of economically disadvantaged subgroups.(e40-66)

Each of the expansion components have a research-based, written implementation plan of action. The expansion plans contain a set of comprehensive implementation strategies, identified student support components, committed community partners, operational components (e40-66), timelines (e44), and evidence of success in performance measures. (e357-359)

There is a comprehensive written recruitment plan (e283-297) supported with a financial commitment to provide transportation for every student.

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: 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:

CA has a well-developed plan designed to expand and replicate its model. CA doubled its enrollment since 2015 (e36) based on its reputation for meeting student's needs. It has experienced growth and maintained its focus on high quality instructional methods and support for student achievement. It has a commitment to assure that 61% of all new enrollees are educationally disadvantaged. (e24)

CA has a comprehensive plan for growth at every campus and includes completing the 9-12 high school grades on two campuses, adding middle school grades 5-8 on two campuses, and to provide additional seats that would focus creating a concurrent high school with a post secondary component. Their plans are exemplary, research-based and provide evidence of their thoughtful growth that will ensure higher student achievement for the overall system

Sub

while addressing the unique needs of economically disadvantaged subgroups. (e40-66)

Each of the expansion components have a research-based, written implementation plan of action. The expansion plans contain a set of comprehensive implementation strategies, identified student support components, committed community partners, operational components (e40-66), timelines (e44), and evidence of success in performance measures. (e357-359)

There is a written comprehensive recruitment plan (e283-297) supported with a financial commitment to provide transportation for every student.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

CA has a comprehensive evaluation plan utilizing a quasi-experimental design study. (e66) There is seamless coordination between the logic model (e67) and the ambitious performance measures. (e357-359) Each of the performance measures have a baseline and measurable target (e68) which makes clear the data to be collected and the criteria that will be evaluated.

One of the major focus of the evaluation model is to assess how expansion impacts the fidelity of implementation of the instructional and support services delivered to students. (e70)

A strength of the new evaluation framework has been designed by Bellwether Education Partners (e304-305) who served in this same role in a previous CSP federal grant (e72) which should allow for a seamless approach in comparing past performance, interventions, and performance measures with the new outcomes.

The evaluation timeline does provide for quarterly and annually data analysis which will allow for any necessary implementation adaptations (e53) based on the data drive decision making model utilized by CA.

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). (NFP)**

Strengths:

CA presented a concise budget analysis that addressed the sustainability of all operations based on local, state and federal sources based on a non-recurring gap analysis. (e75) There was also an Operating Forecast Summary Report which projected an ending balance of \$9,592,516 in FY 23 based on annual revenue of \$62,144,267.

The budget for CA is very well developed and the audit reports shows a healthy reserve balance prior to the initiation of the expansion plans of \$4,360,000. (e76) CA's student academic success, sophisticated instructional programming options, strong fiscal strategies and recruitment operations all provide evidence to the ability of CA to replicate, expand and sustain its operations.

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:

CA has a veteran staff who have managed previous CSP federal grants and have developed a comprehensive 5-year project timeline with actions paired with responsibilities, timelines and milestones (e77-78) which can be utilized for management of the grant with assurance that objectives can be met on time and within the allocated budget.

The budget identifies significant fiscal reserves which would be applicable to any funding shortfall and the CMO proposal budget seems adequate to fund all the activities listed in the proposal and in the project timeline. (e7)

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))**

Sub

Strengths:

Resumes for major staff positions and the Bellwether evaluation team are in Appendix B.

The veteran staff credentials are exemplary with a wide variety of charter school expertise which has been supported with leadership and training opportunities provided by national charter organizations. (e79-81)

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:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

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: 0

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 Collegiate Academies (CA) are high quality high school charters that serve a student population with high needs based on the demographic data that has 95% from low income families with double the rate of students with disabilities and English language learners (e24) and retain 93% of their students annually. Even with these statistics, CA has

outperformed the state with a higher percentage of students in “Top Growth” at each of the 4 campuses across the required subgroups. (e153)

CA outperforms the state in every subgroup with graduates that complete college or career credential courses. (e156) and graduation rates for students with disabilities and English language learners exceeds the state rate by double digits. (e155) When these statistics are paired with CA’s college persistence data that documents across all alumni 36% were persisting or graduated (e158) compared to the national statistic that only 8% of low-income students graduate by age 24. College enrollment rates for all subgroups (except at one that missed by 1%) outperformed the state average.

Programmatically, CA offers AP courses with a full time AP teacher, college support team of counselors focusing on postsecondary, career pathways approved by the state, and multiple opportunities to take college entry exams (e25) which are all documented in the logic model with measurable outcomes.(e67-68) There are plans to expand concurrent credit courses and add a middle grades component to the existing campuses to allow for systematic career and postsecondary preparation. (e26)

Currently, CA provides a postsecondary counselor for all alumni with plans to expand the tracking of student performance, support for financial aid and creation of cost-effective strategies to reduce college costs which will be the basis of the research-based performance measures in the evaluation plan for the grant. (e27-29)

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: 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:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

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: **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: Collegiate Academies (U282M180014)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	28
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
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 #2: *****

Applicant: Collegiate Academies (U282M180014)

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:

The applicant provides information to reflect that its students outperform comparable districts when data is compared among subgroups (e30-e31). For example, 3 of 4 schools economically disadvantaged students performed higher than average, ranging from the 46th to 76th percentile among all Louisiana public schools. For students with disabilities, 3 of 3 schools were higher than average, ranging from the 76th to 94th percentile. And in terms of African American Students, 4 of 4 schools were higher than average, ranging from the 58th to 84th percentile.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not sufficiently demonstrate that the academic achievement among additional indicators outperforms other state public schools. For example, it is unclear if the schools exceed in student academic growth and absolute performance on state assessments and ACT and cohort graduation rate. This information is needed to determine if the applicant outperforms other public schools based on all state measures.

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

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

Sub

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. The applicant cites that its management structure ensures activities and compliance in all areas (e35). Any expired charters were renewed by the granting agency.

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 provides specific reports that validate its good standing. For example, the applicant indicates that their Monitoring Report by WestEd (Spring 2018) indicated no grant administration or implementation issues. Additionally, WestEd spotlighted the specialized programs for students with disabilities and recruitment/onboarding processes for new members of our Board of Directors as "Promising Practices". (e36)

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: 28

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

Sub

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 data to demonstrate it serves educationally disadvantaged students at a rate comparable to schools within the city and the state. The applicant cites income data from the surrounding area (e37) As of 2016 in New Orleans, 63% of all people earning income earned less than \$35,000 and 47% of African American households earned less than \$23,237 annually, 37% of all children and 47% of African American children were living in poverty.

Weaknesses:

Attendance information was noted as a concern (e36). Noted in the narrative was that attendance was not better than non-charter schools by comparison.

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

- 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. The expansion plan, educational program, and community support strategies will allow the applicant to fill additional seats in an equitable manner. Specifically, the applicant will add concurrent enrollment seats to its high school program to provide more options for matriculation to postsecondary education and ultimate expand enrollment to 200 total students (e43-e46). The narrative is comprehensive in describing how potential students will be served as well as supports provided to such students. In terms of recruitment, the applicant commits to participating in school fairs, conducting visits to middle schools, bringing middle schools into buildings for tours, participating in community events, and engaging in door-to-door canvassing to garner interest and enroll students. These strategies are designed to produce a student population that consists overwhelmingly of educationally disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

“This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criteria. My scores reflect my 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 applicant presents an appropriate plan to evaluate the success of the proposed project. Specifically, the applicant will conduct a quasi-experimental design study that will meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with reservations and will be complemented by qualitative and descriptive quantitative analysis (e66). The evaluation plan's objectives have baselines and performance targets established according to state standards. Outcomes appear to produce both quantitative and qualitative data.

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: 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). (NFP)**

Strengths:

The financial model is sufficient to determine financial sustainability. Specifically, the applicant will use recurring local, state and federal resources to maintain operations and provide a foundation for future years. Schools will fund the central office as shared cost that is distributed based on per-pupil revenue (e75)

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))**

Sub

Strengths:

The management plan is sufficient to carry out project activities. A yearly timeline outlines specific projects, key staff responsible for each task and the objective ach task is aligned. For example, In quarters 1 throug4, the applicant will consult with community partners, government, and business leaders to implement and actualize the project with broad support across community partners. (e77-e78)

Weaknesses:

None 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 for key personnel assigned to work on the project are clearly specified and appropriate for the positions. Specifically, key project staff to include a project director, the founder and CEO, a chief schools officer, chief academic officer, chief talent officer, a director of community affairs, a direction of college completion initiatives and a director of student recruitment. The applicant's advisory board provides strong support (e80-e81).

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:

No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this 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 provides sufficient information that it will operate schools to target academically poor-performing high schools in the area. Additionally, of the 2,248 students it will serve, 94.5% are low 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.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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.

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: 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:

No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this competitive preference priority.

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: 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: Collegiate Academies (U282M180014)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	37
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Collegiate Academies (U282M180014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 37

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 supplies comprehensive data regarding academic results in Appendix G starting on e153. As a network of school, CA shows stronger performance than statewide data in terms of graduation (e12), advanced coursework, college enrollment, attendance and college persistence (e33-e35).

In reviewing the charts in Appendix G (e153), CA schools have a majority of their educationally disadvantaged students exceeding the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State. Scoring for this element is based on the data points below:

4 of 5 schools showed "top growth" on state assessments that exceed state results (e153)

For all of the subgroups, all CA schools had results above the state average (e153)

Graduation rates (e155), 5 of 8 available subgroups had graduation rates exceeding statewide figures.

All subgroups exceeded the state for college-level/career credential completion (e156)

College enrollment exceeded state figures for six of eight subgroups (e157)

Math scores exceed state scores (e159) in some CA school subgroups (e.g., students of color and economically disadvantaged in Livingston Collegiate Academy, English learners at Abramson Sci Academy)

ELA scores (e160) for economically disadvantaged students at Livingston Collegiate Academy and students with disabilities at Abramson Sci Academy.

Sub

Weaknesses:

The data supplied in Appendix G does not indicate success in all areas for all subgroups. Data points are examined below:

G.W. Carver HS only scored better than 46% of all Louisiana schools for economically disadvantaged students (e154).

In three subgroups, G.W. Carver HS scored below statewide figures in the 4-year cohort graduation rate (e155).

G.W. Carver was below statewide (and citywide) figures for all students and three out of five subgroups (e157).

Math (e159) and ELA (e160) scores were lower for almost all subgroups for G.W. Carver and Collegiate Baton Rouge schools.

Eight out of 15 subgroups had worse attendance rates (% students missing less than 15 days, (e162) than statewide figures.

The data shows figures that are under the state average in the above areas, especially concentrated in G.W. Carver and Collegiate Baton Rouge. No explanation is given by the applicant for why the figures are lower. The applicant does not provide a description or strategy for improving those outcomes. These figures indicate that there are schools in the CA network that do not fit the definition of "high quality."

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each competitive priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those priorities.

Reader's Score: 7

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:

Collegiate Academies has never closed a school, had charter revoked or had an affiliation revoked or otherwise voluntarily disaffiliated (e35).

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:

Collegiate Academies has had no grant administration or implementation issues per the CSP Monitoring Report by WestEd and there have been no weaknesses or findings on financial statements (e36) indicating there have been no significant issues in the area of financial or operational management. CA schools have maintained an exceptional track record in student safety (e36).

Sub

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: 20

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:

CA schools serve a population of economically disadvantaged students that is 94.5%, as compared to the New Orleans (83%) and Baton Rouge (76%) public schools (e22).

CA schools also currently have a 6% rate of English Language Learners, which the applicant states greater than area schools and the state of Louisiana (2%) (e39), and a rate of students with disabilities at 20%, which the applicant states is nearly double that of the state of Louisiana, New Orleans public charter schools and the East Baton Rouge Parish school system (e39). According to the applicant, the schools serves a greater number of educationally disadvantaged students, particularly those with disabilities and those that are English Language Learners.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not identify the actual comparable figures from the school districts in which the CA network school are located. No figures are given for the rate of economically disadvantaged students in those cities, nor for students with disabilities and English Language Learners. The applicant did not provide information corresponding to section (b)(i) of the Notice requesting information on the rates of educationally disadvantaged served by surrounding public schools.

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: 8

- 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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant plans to expand two of their high schools and expand into middle school grades in two high schools (e40), thus increasing the number of seats available to the educationally disadvantaged populations they serve, as described in section (b)(i).

The expansion plan includes increasing the number of seats available for dual enrollment to enable a greater number of educationally disadvantaged students to prepare for post-secondary success (e43).

The applicant's descriptions of plans to serve educationally disadvantaged students are extensive. Such plans include deliberate intervention strategies for students with disabilities and include a restorative education program to keep students with disciplinary problems in school (e42). The applicant has programs dedicated to students with emotional problems (Journey, e57), with cognitive disabilities (Essential Skills, e57) and language acquisition plans (e58) for English Language Learners.

The applicant has a detailed recruitment plan (beginning on e284) that recruitment materials in multiple languages, outreach to various community organizations (e285), calls and meetings with parents, and marketing campaigns (e287) all aimed at recruiting students in the educationally disadvantaged demographics.

Weaknesses:

Expansion plans include adding grades and seats in two schools with academic achievement figures below state levels: G.W. Carver and Abramson Sci Academy (e47) – achievement information is on e155, e159 and e160. Strategies specific to addressing these low scores are not provided so it is not known how the applicant plans to provide these educationally disadvantaged students with the advantages of a high-quality school.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each competitive priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those priorities.

Reader's Score: 12

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 provides a logic model on e67 and detailed explanations of the focus areas represented in the model and plans to evaluate achievement of focus area objectives (e70 – e71).

Evaluation focus #1 assesses how well the applicant will be able to grow quality seats in existing schools while maintaining fidelity to their model (e70). Evaluation will include leveraging existing data regarding instructional elements of CAs model and collecting feedback data from stakeholder groups including teachers, administrators, parents and students (e70). This focus is related to the logic model goal of giving more students access to quality post-secondary options (e67). The assessment will provide quantitative and qualitative information on performance relative to the logic model.

Evaluation focus #2 is to assess how well CA schools are doing compared to other schools within the network's districts (e71). The assessment will provide information to CA on what elements of their model are working best to improve

student outcomes (e72). The applicant has an independent evaluator (Bellwether Education Partners, e72) and a preliminary evaluation framework (e73) to provide quality data and data analysis (e74) to identify if the project is achieving the goals and objectives set forth in the Notice to inform on-going decision-making.

Weaknesses:

Goals stated in the logic model (e67) are not outcome oriented, and therefore, are not measurable goals that will generate objective performance measures. “Develop and share a growth mindset that proves all students and adults can grow” (e67). This goal does not have the properties of being specific, measurable or time-bound. “Generate additional evidence that open-enrollment charter schools can provide an exemplary education to all students, including those with significant special education needs “(e67) also is not a goal that results in objective performance measures. These long-term goals do not match up to the “Objectives and Indicators” in the logic model.

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: 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 describes plans to reduce reliance on public funding to increase sustainability (e75).

The applicant will leverage the added revenue from increased student numbers with sharing central office functions by having expansion plans that outpace central office function costs (e75) thus taking advantage of increased enrollment to support sustainability.

The applicant will continue targeted fundraising using positive results to encourage funding (e76).

The applicant can take advantage of low-cost facilities in their school districts and a financing and staffing model that will enable each school to “break even” by its fifth year of operation (e76).

Weaknesses:

Both ongoing increased enrollment and continued fundraising success are not guaranteed. Although the applicant has strong financial and staffing models, enrollment and fundraising are areas that may fall short during future expansion plans.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

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 has experience and success with developing and managing a CSP grant, and with charter school development and operation (e76).

The applicant provides a timeline that includes project tasks, key staff, and identification of milestones for the project (e77).

Weaknesses:

None found.

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:

Key project personnel are experienced educators, school operations managers and financial experts. The project director has experience as a managing directory of strategy for new schools for New Orleans (e79). The CEO is the founder of Collegiate Academies and is an experienced school leader, as well as a recognized leader in education (e79). The chief schools officer has a teaching background and experience as a director of curriculum and instruction (e80). Other school administrators have relevant education and school management experience (e80-e90).

The Board of Directors includes individuals from banking, government, a parent and education administrator (Teach for America) (e307).

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 did not address this competitive priority preference.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority preference.

Reader's Score: 0

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 existing schools in the Collegiate Academies (CA) network already serve a disadvantaged population of high school students. As identified on e22, 94.5% of CA students come from low-income families. This is a higher rate of such students than served by New Orleans public schools (83%) and Baton Rouge public schools (76%) where CA's schools operate.

The expansion plans for the CA high schools are intended to bring their "full array" of programming aimed at preparing students for enrollment in post-secondary education institutions. On e25 the applicants describe programming to include AP courses, college support counseling and programs to engage students in career pathways. The program includes courses in college readiness skills and ACT test preparation. The expansion will provide access for additional students (e25 and e26) to take advantage of CA's dual enrollment programming.

The applicants propose to provide all CA alumni with advising and guidance services, and will implement strategies to prepare educationally disadvantaged students for persistence in pursuing college degrees (e27).

The applicant includes performance measurement plans to obtain valid and reliable information about regarding progress in preparing students for enrollment in and completion of postsecondary degree programs. Measures such as ACT performance, maintenance of qualifying GPAs and dual enrollment participation rates, credit accumulation and FAFSA completion are described on e28 and e29.

Weaknesses:

In the response to this Competitive Preference Priority, the applicants do not identify any institutions of higher education (IHEs) with whom they have articulation or any other kinds of agreements (e23-e29). The applicants do not identify whether or not dual enrollment credits will be transferable to IHEs, and if the IHEs in which CA alumni enroll will support CA's persistence programming and data tracking.

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.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each competitive priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those priorities.

Reader's Score: 2

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