

**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: Ednovate, Inc. (U282M180015)

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	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
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	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Ednovate, Inc. (U282M180015)

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:

One of the most outstanding statistics is that Ednovate has a 100% college admission rate (which is double the school district and state rates) supporting a 97% enrollment rate resulting in a 42-52% completion of a degree. (e37) These are outstanding results and they dramatically exceed state or school district outcomes by a significant (double) measure.

Academic achievement statistics on 11th grade state assessment results documenting Ednovate outperforming the state in both ELA and Math. (e39) Each of Ednovate's subgroups had an average which outperformed the state average in ELA and Math. Ednovate utilizes ACT as a growth indicator since it is taken annually and 75% of Ednovate students meet the ACT minimum grade level benchmark. (e289-292, e42)

The number of AP assessments have grown from 30 in 2015 to 230 in 2018 (e279) documenting a commitment to expand high quality learning opportunities that also reduce costs for college tuition.

Weaknesses:

Several critical data elements were not provided including attendance data, graduation rates compared to the state average within a 4-year time period, and retention of students enrolled.

There was significant variability in student data at the various campuses and across subgroups. (e38-40) There were no details regarding how these differences would be addressed.

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:

None of Ednovate's charter schools have closed, had a charter revoked for noncompliance or been disaffiliated or terminated from the network. (e45)

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:

Ednovate's charter schools have not had any issues regarding fiscal or operational management, or student safety. (e48) The charters have independent annual audits and seek accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges which validate the quality of their fiscal operations and educational learning environments. (e48-49)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

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

Strengths:

Ednovate serves a significantly higher percentage of educationally disadvantaged students than surrounding schools or the state. An average of 85% of the student body could be classified as educationally disadvantaged while 10% are English language learners, 51% have been reclassified Fluent English proficient and 11% are

Sub

student with disabilities which are higher rates than district or state averages. (e23, e51)

Educational outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students enrolled in Ednovate charters outperform the state and surrounding schools in graduation rates, college entry and completion rates and score 40% higher academic proficiency rates. (e52-53)

Weaknesses:

There are significant differences in campus performance indicators and the application does not provide a plan to assure fidelity of implementation to narrow the gap in performance indicators for educationally disadvantaged and other student subgroups based upon charter school assignment. (e215-294)

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

The recruitment and enrollment components of the replication/expansion plan has comprehensive components. One of these is the fact that Ednovate has completed a neighborhood and community demographic analysis that indicates that the new campuses will be in a high poverty area with a projected 95% educationally disadvantaged student population. (e57)

Ednovate will duplicate its current highly successful instructional and student support services including the multi-tiered system of support at each of the new campuses (e57) as it implements its "slow growth" model adding one grade level annually (e25). Ednovate has significant experience with opening and scaling multiple campuses.

Specialized interventions specifically designed to support English language learners can serve as recruitment tools by providing details of the specialized instructional interventions and supports that will enhance the education of these students. The model has a well-developed instructional plan that includes utilization of the Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) acquisition instructional strategies supported with one to one coaching, data driven instructional decision making, Achieve 3000 and certified teachers with training in specific content instruction based on the ELD framework. (e59-60)

Specialized interventions specifically designed to support students with disabilities would provide significant recruitment value for parents seeking high quality special education services. The special education services are designed to provide personalized curriculum with built in supports that make full inclusion possible while following all regulations which has resulted in academic achievement gains.

Weaknesses:

There were no specific personalized recruitment strategies targeting students with disabilities or English language learners. It is essential these subgroups are actively recruited to meet the diversity mission of the charter school and to provide high-quality services within their neighborhood. Their involvement is also crucial to the expansion plan since students will generate funding for sustainability.

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.

Sub

Reader's Score: 14

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 Rand evaluation plan (e362-368) will utilize a quasi-experimental design and use both qualitative and quantitative data to monitor fidelity of implementation of the educational program and support services per campus, expansion and replication criteria, and student outcomes including achievement, graduation and college entry rates across the subgroups. (e62 -63) which are reflected in the performance measures. (e383-385)

A wide variety of evaluation tools will be utilized to gather formative and summative data including surveys, interviews, walk throughs, focus groups, and assessment data. The Rand staff are highly skilled in evaluation techniques and the written contract is comprehensive and details the evaluation framework. (e362-368)

Weaknesses:

The logic model (e369) included non-measurable components of Ednovate's learning framework and fidelity of implementation of the learning model is not reflected in the Rand evaluation plan. The Rand proposed plan is heavily dependent on quantitative data with less of a focus on producing qualitative outcomes.

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: 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)

Sub

Strengths:

Ednovate has a structured management plan focusing on the role of the CMO, delivery of services to the schools, and establishment and implementation of long-term fiscal plans. These three critical roles provided by the CMO is essential in the current charter environment where lack of direct fiscal support for facility acquisition and renovations and start-up costs can impede expansion and growth of charters. (e66-67)

The current CMO fee of approximately 11% per school is reasonable and in line with national standards. The network has defined specific standards of practice that all schools must meet for example, schools must maintain a positive cash flow, maintain a 5% fiscal reserve, and have no less than a % change in net assets annually. Services provided to schools via the CMO contractual agreement include back office fiscal support (e66) which is essential to allow the CMO to monitor the schools' fiscal expenditures with actual year-to-date budgets, independent audits, and internal controls.

The audit report identifies a \$4,062,346 (e311) as PMC nonprofit public benefit corporation balance at the end of the year which is a significant ending balance for the CMO.

Weaknesses:

The network has a strong governance structure with a Board who monitors all aspects of school-based service delivery, fiscal accounts, staffing, academic growth and recruitment and retention of leadership staff. Unfortunately, the only budgets submitted for review were site-based and there was no information for the overall costs of the CMO services or the actual budget for the network longitudinally over the last 4 years. (e299-301)

The lack of this fiscal accountability information makes it difficult to assess how strong the overall fiscal model is since the CMO stated that it had raised \$9.7 million in grants and other fundraising (e65) for its first five schools and there was no plan for replenishing those funds. Even with a significant ending balance, the sustainability of the network whose current budget expenditures for one year was \$19,358,413 (e309) and revenues were reported to be \$22,909,554 (e309) would be questionable without extensive grant and fundraising with the ambitious expansion agenda.

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 Ednovate network has a well-developed management structure with clearly defined responsibilities for the Board and CMO staff positions in a timeline with milestones. (e51-52) The management plan includes specific responsibilities of school-based staff in the project tasks. Both CMO organizational and site-based staff assume essential roles and perform identified duties that support the management plan. (e51-53)

The detailed budget narrative supported the timeline and milestones from the management plan and is adequate to fund the defined responsibilities. (e381) The budget process includes five years of funding with a reduction in personnel and fringe in the final year.

Sub

Weaknesses:

In review of the five-year budget narrative the line item of supplies (e5) increases significantly in the last two years of operations without a narrative explanation of this dramatic increase from \$880,000 in year three to \$1,804,700 in year five. (e381)

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: 4

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

Strengths:

The staff of Ednovate have extensive experience in a variety of charter school setting and specialized background experience directly related to their job responsibilities. Many of the staff have received national recognition or participated in specialized charter leadership development activities. (e74-78)

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:

Ednovate has developed and implemented a strong high school model that promotes diversity focusing on addressing the opportunity gap that educationally disadvantaged students face. They have an effective, detailed outreach plan producing 2500 applications for 600 seats. (e24) Their use of partnerships, parent as ambassadors, and feeder school patterns enhance their ability to recruit and enroll students reflective of the neighborhood where the school is located. Their data reveals that in the neighborhoods they are expanding into 26% of the families are living below the federal poverty level and 94 to 96% of students are identified as educationally disadvantaged. (e200)

Weaknesses:

Ednovate states that their model is carefully designed to best serve the needs of low-income and otherwise educationally disadvantaged students. (e22) While in terms of ethnic diversity, the Ednovate network schools are 99% are non-white (e23). When focusing on ethnic diversity, their plan for expansion identifies nonwhite students projected enrollment for both expansion (98%) and replication seats (99%) which provides documentation that their plan does not address this diversity issue. (e26)

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference was not addressed.

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 demographics of the Ednovate high schools include a significant percentage of 85% educationally disadvantaged students (e23) as does the recruitment areas for the new campuses where there is an estimated 85% to 90% poverty level for families. (e27)

Ednovate provides a wide range of design elements to support their students in college preparation including: personalized learning, critical thinking projects, college prep curriculum utilizing technology, accelerated courses (on one campus 27% of students took at least one AP exam), extensive college counseling assistance, test prep and intern and externships. (e26-33) These interventions have resulted in dramatically increased college admission rate (100%), enrollment rates in post-secondary (97%) and a college completion rate with a degree (42-52%) dramatically above the state and national averages. (e37)

Ednovate provides a systematic alumni support program with alumni coordinators providing graduates with mentorship activities, FAFSA workshops, one-on-one site visits, and peer support groups. (e34-35) These research-based interventions have dramatic impact on retention and completion rates in post-secondary settings.

Ednovate plans to use RAND as an evaluator to provide systematic data collection and analysis of the fidelity of implementation of the educational model with measurable outcomes regarding student achievement, college going rates and persistence. This independent evaluation will provide specific qualitative data but even more importantly it will provide an analysis of the effectiveness of specific components of the Ednovate model which can provide vital research support in defining the importance of specific design elements.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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

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

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

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

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

that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

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

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

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

Strengths:

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: Ednovate, Inc. (U282M180015)

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	24
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	2
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	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Ednovate, Inc. (U282M180015)

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 sufficient information that the applicant is achieving more progress with educationally disadvantaged students than other public schools statewide. Specifically, the applicant cites state data for schools and subgroups (e36-340). For example, the applicant helps low-income and otherwise educationally disadvantage students gain admission (100%), enroll in (97%), and complete college degrees (42%-52% projected) at far higher ratios compared to their public school counterparts. As another example, 11th graders participating in state testing dramatically outperform their peers by 12 to 36 percentage points in ELA and nine to 40 percentage points in Math (e39).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly show that attendance and retention are not an issue. It is unclear if these rates are higher than non-charter schools.

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 that it has not had any charter schools it operates or manages closed; has not had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; and has not had our affiliation with any charter school revoked or terminated, including through voluntary

Sub

disaffiliation. (e47) All charters have been renewed.

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. The applicant was diligent in addressing school culture to reduce suspensions. The applicant indicates that the culture system continues to evolve, with the elimination of automatic detentions for certain behaviors, more professional development for teachers to consistently implement a caring and accountable system of merits and demerits, new strategies for students who repeatedly receive detentions (e49).

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: 24

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 data to show that it graduates educationally disadvantaged students at a rate comparable to schools within the city and the state. Data comparisons show comparable enrollment among subgroups such as students with disabilities and English Learners (e51). Data is provided for 2017-2018 with comparisons between the local school district and state numbers. In the category of free/reduced lunch, English Learners, Special

Sub

Education and homeless youth, the applicant is comparable to the neighboring district.

Weaknesses:

Noted in the narrative is the fact that all campuses are not serving students comparable non-charter schools. In some cases, the number of students with disabilities is lower but not comparable.

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

The applicant outlines a 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. The applicant provides other support to students. For example, the applicant will promote psycho-social health among students, particularly those dealing with extreme poverty, hunger or food instability, housing instability, domestic and community violence and other traumas outside of school walls. In addition to at least one full-time Social Worker or Counselor on staff at each school, the applicant establishes partnerships with nearby social service organizations (e56).

Weaknesses:

Unclear in the narrative is a discussion of how the applicant will increase racial diversity. Specifically, it is unclear how the applicant will recruit non minority or white students.

“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

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 process based evaluation with guiding questions will provide feedback to program management (e62-e63). An independent evaluator will facilitate the process and collect both formative and summative data.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the applicant’s evaluation plan aligns with WWC. It is unclear how the applicant demonstrates that the logic model is aligned with the whole plan.

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 funding methodology is provided to demonstrate how the applicant will partially sustain the project (e65). The slow-growth model for each new school ensures that expenses outpace revenues until each school reaches capacity and becomes sustainable on standard public funding streams. Each school is an independent LEA and thus receives funding directly; each school in turn allocates revenues to the CMO (approximately 11% of non-discretionary government revenues).

Weaknesses:

Unclear in the narrative is how the applicant will secure or use supplemental funds (e27). This information is noted in the timeline; however, no further information is provided in the narrative.

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 management structure is sufficient to achieve the objectives of the project on time and within budget (e69). For example, The governing board is fully responsible for the operation and fiscal affairs of the schools, including defining and promoting the mission and vision, ensuring the school meets its stated goals including financial accountability, engaging in ongoing strategic planning, setting and approving policies, hiring and overseeing the CEO, approving the annual budget and monitoring financials and cash flows, ensuring compliance with applicable laws (including those regarding public charter school governance), and fundraising. A timeline shows activities with persons assigned (e71-e72).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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

Sub

professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.”

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. For example, key project staff includes a chief academic officer, chief of staff, chief operating officer, director of academics, human resources director, director of family engagement, special projects directors and facilities director. All positions are aligned with personnel with experience and qualifications (e74-e78).

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:

The applicant addresses this competitive preference priority. Specifically, the applicant describes the target population. Across the network, 99% of our students are non-white, 85% qualify for FRPL, 10% are current English Learners (EL) (with another 51% Reclassified Fluent-English Proficient (RFEP), meaning they previously were EL in a California public school), 11% are students with disabilities (SpEd) and 1% are foster or homeless youth (e23).

Weaknesses:

Unclear in the narrative is how the applicant will increase its number of non minority students. Specifically, the applicant does not indicate how it will attract non-white students.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or

priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and

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

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

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

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this competitive preference priority.

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 applicant addresses this competitive preference priority. The applicant will expand 3 existing high school and replicate 6 additional high school sites. Multiple course offerings including online courses and accelerated learning are provided to students. Alumni coordinators work with students after they have entered college. An independent entity will conduct performance evaluation. The applicant explains its success in administering college preparatory courses and having a high college going rate (e65).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

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: Ednovate, Inc. (U282M180015)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	39
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	21
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	2
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	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Ednovate, Inc. (U282M180015)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 39

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's "flagship school," Hybrid High, has a graduation rate of 93%, exceeding the state average of 83% (e38). 98% of the graduates enrolled in either a 4 year or 2-year IHE (e38).

In 11th grade math and ELA statewide testing the two Ednovate high schools have scores that exceed the state's (e40).

Attendance rates are strong (95-96%) and retention rates are strong (83-86%) for the network schools (e42).

Weaknesses:

Only one of the network's schools has had a graduating class, meaning the graduation rates of its four other high schools is unknown.

Only two of the network's five high schools has scores available so it is unknown if all of the schools in the network exceed the State.

One of the network's schools (because of a facility move) had only a 62% retention rate (e43).

Comparison attendance and retention rates are not provided (e220) so a comparison to state data is not available.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Sub

regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

Strengths:

None of Ednovate’s charter schools have closed, had their charters revoked, or disaffiliated with Ednovate (e45).

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:

None of Ednovate’s charter schools has had any significant issues the could lead to revocation (e48).

Weaknesses:

The district, Los Angeles Unified School District, expressed concern with high suspension rates at two of its schools (e48).

Reader's Score: 14

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: 21

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:

Ednovate enrolls educationally disadvantaged students, including SpEd and EL, at comparable rates to the surrounding public schools, and higher rates than District and State averages (e51).

Ednovate enrolls high percentages of students of color (predominantly Hispanic/Latino) at rates comparable to the districts in which they are located (e51).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Comparisons to the closest comparable public schools indicate that the Ednovate schools have lower percentages of FRPL, ELLs and Special Educations students (e51) than the comparable schools.

Reader's Score: 11

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:

Based on data about existing schools in the six target neighborhoods and community demographics, the applicant anticipates that their new schools will serve students that are, on average, 95% FRPL, 16% EL, 12% SpEd, 3% Foster/Homeless Youth (e57) which would constitute a significant population of educationally disadvantaged students.

Ednovate will effectively serve educationally disadvantaged using a Multi-Tiered System of Support which is an evidence-based model that is based on students' instructional and behavioral needs (e57-58).

The applicant has specific programs designed to meet the needs of ELL students (e59) and students with special needs (e60).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's ability to serve multiple schools of predominantly educationally disadvantaged students is not fully known as student achievement outcomes are available only for one or two out of five of the current schools.

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: 10

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 will employ an independent evaluator, RAND Corporation, to complete a detailed assessment based on four questions regarding school quality, replication fidelity, and student achievement outcomes (e62-63).

The evaluation plan includes quantitative data such as interviews, focus groups, site visits and classroom walk throughs using checklists and protocols (e63).

The summative evaluation will analyze effectiveness of the grant project on three main academic outcomes: graduation rates, A-G course completion rates, and state assessment scores. These achievement outcomes will provide reliable and valid information about the extent to which Ednovate is preparing students for postsecondary success, using publicly available data (e63).

Weaknesses:

The logic model does not address the scope of the grant program in terms of expansion and replication of high quality programs (e369).

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:

CSP funds will be used primarily as one-time start-up money for Principal-in-Residence training, school planning/development and launch time; teacher/staff recruiting/hiring/training; outreach and enrollment; facilities renovation to ensure ADA and local Code compliance (e.g., accessible ramps and bathrooms, alarm systems); and acquiring critical equipment and supplies (e65).

The applicant's Board of Directors ensures long-term fiscal planning for each school to manage finances and have sufficient operating funds (e65).

Ednovate contracts with a highly experienced non-profit charter school back-office service provider, ExED, to provide back-office business and personnel services. These include budgeting and forecasting, fiscal management and reporting, accounting and bookkeeping, cash management, payroll processing and retirement reporting, compliance and data management services, fiscal and governance trainings, and other supporting tools (e.g., online purchasing system), and other services. Such services support fiscal accountability and sustainability.

Weaknesses:

There is no information on what funding will be available past the grant. The applicant has a "slow-growth" model where expenses outpace revenues until each school reaches capacity and becomes sustainable on public funding streams (e65). There is no guarantee that each of the schools will reach full capacity, and the opening of six new schools with a "slow-growth model" and no additional funding streams does not ensure sustainability.

The timeline includes the statement "Secure private funds to support facilities development and supplemental programs" (e72). This type of income is not guaranteed and does not ensure sustainability beyond the grant.

Sub

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 applicant provides an activity plan with a timeline and individuals responsible for the activities. (e71-72)

Weaknesses:

It is not clear from the timeline how each segment of the grant proposal will be accomplished on time and within budget. The activity plan is not broken down by project (expansion and replication projects).

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: 3

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

Strengths:

Key personnel have experience in school administration, leadership development, operations, academics and other strategic positions (e74-e78).

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:

Ednovate throws a wide net, using partnerships with local charters, and attendance at more than 25 community and local events, focusing on recruiting students from racially and socio-economically diverse backgrounds (e24).

In Ednovate's current schools have a 99% non-white student population, with 85% qualifying for FRPL, 10% English Language Learners and 11% students with disabilities demonstrating nondiscriminatory recruitment and enrollment practices (e23)

Weaknesses:

The diversity in the network's schools does not reflect that of the county (e216) – the applicant should ensure their recruiting practices don't create segregated schools.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

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 applicant will expand high schools that are already serving educationally disadvantaged students; expansion seats will serve a 98% non-white, 83% FRPL, 16% ELL and 12% Special Ed population. Replication seats are projected to be 99% non-white, 95% FRPL, 16% ELL and 12% Special Ed (e26).

The applicant will prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students for postsecondary education through personalization of learning based on a mastery-based college prep curriculum (e28-29), an accelerated learning program that includes 12 AP classes (e29), comprehensive college counseling (e31), and college admission test prep (e33) and counseling (e34).

Ednovate schools have an Alumni Coordinator t serve as a mentor to support network alumni in college, hold workshops and facilitate peer support groups (e35) to support graduates to persist in secondary institutions.

Ednovate's summative evaluation will include measures of effectiveness inter terms of course completion rates, English and Math scores and graduation rates (e365) to assess progress in preparing students for postsecondary education.

Weaknesses:

The RAND Corporation will provide independent evaluation, however, they state that exploring longer-term outcomes regarding college enrollment and persistence is beyond the scope and timeframe of the project, so no proposal that measures supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from postsecondary institutions was included (e365)

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