

**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: Responsive Education Solutions (U282M180020)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	45
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	29
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>108</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Responsive Education Solutions (U282M180020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

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

Reader's Score: 45

##### 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:

ResponsiveEd has a strong student data set that documents academic achievement and other data results that outperform the state. ResponsiveEd provided evidence of success in ResponsiveEd schools with an increase – compared to the state - in proficiency in reading (3 compared to 1 points) and math (9 compared to 5 points) for educationally disadvantaged students. When all subgroups were examined, the increases were even larger growth by English language learners (10 compared to 1 points) in reading and (13 compared to 5) in math. (e35-36)

Graduation rates in ResponsiveEd schools exceeded the state rate while even more encouraging was the increase in college/postsecondary enrollment which ranged from 48% to 29% based on the specific educational model (e39) and a persistency rate of 64% TCPA and 33% PHS students still enrolled in postsecondary without any need for remediation. (e30)

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

ResponsiveEd has never had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements or had its affiliation revoked or terminated including voluntary disaffiliation. (e44)

ResponsiveEd has closed 6 of its 80 campuses. 4 of the schools were unable to recruit and maintain the enrollment necessary for fiscal sustainability. The other two merged with another nearby campus. (e44)

ResponsiveEd had a clear governance procedure in place and a plan of action to assist students in a successful transition to the new campus sites or a different educational environment. (e45) The governance procedures provide a systematic approach to any possible closures which assists in the decision-making process.

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 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**

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:**

ResponsiveEd has never had any significant issues in fiscal or operational management or student safety and has not experienced problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to a charter revocation.

ResponsiveEd has provided two sets of documentation supporting their fiscal and educational excellence. ResponsiveEd established exemplary fiscal management processes that support the BBB Standard & Poor's bond rating with an exemplary history of issuing \$135 million in bonds in Texas. (e45) ResponsiveEd is also accredited by AdvanceEd indicating an excellent educational program. (e46)

**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: 29**

**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:**

ResponsiveEd demographic data is closely reflective of the public schools in the state in terms of racial comparisons. ResponsiveED expanded the data set they reported with not just educationally disadvantaged, students with disabilities and English language learners but they also presented data on equity differences across various ethnicities and examined students who attend two different of their educational models – Texas College Preparatory Academy (TCPA) and Premier High School (PHS). (e30, e18)

The strength of their systematic data set and analysis can provide the charter sector with an example of how to use data-driven decision making in not just individual student instructional decisions but how a wider use of data can assist in building partnerships with school districts to address systematic low performance. ResponsiveEd provided evidence of success in ResponsiveEd schools with an increase – compared to the state - in proficiency in reading (3/1 points) and math (9/5 points) for educationally disadvantaged students. When all subgroups were examined, the increases where even larger growth by English language learners (10/1 points) in reading and (13/5) in math. (e35-36)

Graduation rates in ResponsiveEd schools exceeded the state rate while even more encouraging was the increase in college/postsecondary enrollment which ranged from 48% to 29% based on the specific educational model (e39) and a persistency rate of 64% TCPA and 33% PHS students still enrolled in postsecondary without any need for remediation (e30)

One of the strengths of the ResponsiveEd charter network is the six specialized educational models they can offer to a community. This sophisticated set of educational options provides the community and parents with expanded educational opportunities. (e18)

**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.**

## Sub

### Strengths:

ResponsiveEd presented an extensive recruitment plan that is designed to increase the focus on recruiting and maintaining a diverse student body (e18) by providing targeted outreach and recruitment in an intentional approach to promote racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity. By utilizing examples of successes of their educational model that was designed to focus on educationally disadvantaged, English language learners or students with disabilities with the resulting academic achievement outcomes. (e57) An example is the detailed plan for English language learners which will provide the design elements for their recruitment plans. The educational model was comprehensive, defining specialized interventions and high-quality support strategies resulting in achievement above the state average. (e52-53)

Responsive Ed has implemented six different educational models based on the community's needs and interests. ResponsiveEd will offer specific educational models for the identified expansion school sites including the Classical Academy – with its emphasis on classical education , the Foundation School for Autism – with its specially designed education intervention services for students with autism supported with ResponsivEd support services for students with disabilities, and Whole School Initiative designed to support educationally disadvantaged students focusing on additional support services from THRIVE initiative, Project PATH and the New Teacher Project (TNTP). These programmatic options demonstrate the commitment the ResponsiveEd network has to implementation of their models that have shown growth with similar student populations. (e56)

### Weaknesses:

The recruitment plan failed to provide enough details regarding the strategies and tools that ResponsiveEd would use to encourage parents of educationally disadvantaged, English language learners and students with disabilities to enroll their child. Recruitment plans with specific strategies, written materials, and media campaigns designed to address the needs of educationally disadvantaged, English language learners and students with disabilities would increase enrollment levels across these subgroups. For example, with English language learners the translation of all recruitment materials and providing translators at community meetings would facilitate recruitment.

**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:

ResponsiveEd has developed a comprehensive evaluation plan that addresses 4 project objectives with defined performance measurements. The plan will generate formative and summative outcomes, utilize multiple measures based on the current data system utilized across the ResponsiveEd network. (e60) A broad set of data will be analyzed gathered with a variety of tools, surveys, implementation logs, achievement scores, outcomes of personalized learning plans, graduation, attendance and retention rates. Currently, ResponsiveEd already has a set of data that can be utilized to set preimplementation benchmarks.

The data analysis will provide formative feedback allowing for any necessary corrective actions and a formal evaluation report will be produced biannually. (e65)

ResponsiveED has a highly trained and qualified inhouse Executive Director of research and Evaluation who will provide

leadership to the evaluation plan. ResponsiveEd will utilize Metis Associates to serve as the external evaluator (e139-141) who has experience with large (state-wide) charter analysis. (e66)

**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:**

ResponsiveEd is recognized as a well-established, successful charter management organization with an impressive 20 year of service delivery. The network has a strong infrastructure and management team who scale up new charters and sustain the network of 70 charters.

Focusing on the operational and fiscal operating models reveal that the network has an effective management structure, strong accounting and fiscal management protocols, a systematic plan for public and private fund development and a quality assurance system. (e67)

One of the standard operating procedures at ResponsiveEd is that every school must sustain by year 3 all operations solely with state funding (e69) which provides evidence of the types of protocols that have been developed and put into practice.

The extensive growth of the network has not been achieved with philanthropic dollars (e70) as so many of charter growth has been funded but instead has depended on a very focused set of fiscal policies and procedures backed by a strong set of quality assurance practices. (e72) One example of the extensive operation protocols is the Quality Standards which is utilized to review campus level policies and procedures with a determination if they meet the network's standard practice. (e937-1002) The Fiscal Management component has 19 standards. (e997-999) and provides one example of the extensive multi-year financial and operating infrastructure developed by ResponsiveEd.

Assets at the end of the year as reported in the audit report for the network is \$91,580,708 (e835) which provides support for any sustainability plan of the new schools to be implemented and supported until they are self-sustainable in the third year of operations.

**Sub**

**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:**

ResponsiveEd identifies two management tools that are essential to the success of new campuses and those are a detailed project management framework and a staffing structure with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities of positions who are designed to support and assist the campus leaders. (e74)

The management plan (e79-82) is a comprehensive document that was designed based on the 4 project objectives of the grant proposal which are aligned with the logic model and performance measurement (e1041-1044). The implementation timeline has specific activities, responsible staff and are directly aligned to annual outcomes defined in the measurable programmatic outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The ResponsiveEd staff are highly qualified and have years of experience with charter school development, implementation, operations and management. (e83-85) Each of the staff members have specialized experience and training in their specific area of specialty. Resumes document the staff's long-term commitment to charters and to ResponsiveEd. (e89-132)

**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:**

ResponsiveEd has developed a comprehensive plan to replicate and expand their campuses to increase the number of racial and socioeconomic backgrounds and provide them with a high-quality charter educational option.

ResponsiveEd have established a comprehensive plan based on analysis of census track data to identify three of their sites to expand by recruiting and enrolling student populations that are ethnically and socioeconomically representative of the school's community. (e23) The network's thoughtful approach to expanding educational opportunities in communities where the ResponsiveEd schools are already operational indicates a commitment to promoting diversity leading to educational equity. (e22)

The data driven focus on improving existing campuses is supported with a comprehensive recruitment plan that utilizes targeted outreach and marketing using a wide set of communication tools, in multiple languages supported by face to face strategies. Since each of these communities have an operational campus, the use of local community members to assist with the recruitment is an example of the commitment ResponsiveEd has made to increasing educational equity by securing more seats filled with diverse students.

### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

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

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

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

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

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

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

### **Strengths:**

ResponsiveEd is uniquely qualified to reopen academically poor performing schools since it has experience in Texas with 5 successful school reopenings. (e24-25) In each of these cases, the State requested assistance and ResponsiveEd had the capacity to address the issues whether it was fiscal issues or lack of appropriate achievement growth. Due to the comprehensive services the CMO has developed to sustain a network of 74 charter schools serving over 21,000 students. (e18)

Not only has ResponsiveEd taken over individual charters, it has also partnered with school districts to develop and implement a District-Charter Partnership which resulted in ResponsiveEd providing all instructional and student services to the campuses. This unique collaborative partnership documents the flexibility of ResponsiveEd's service delivery of high-quality education and support services but it also indicates the ability of ResponsiveEd to scale up services based on the strength of its network. ResponsiveEd has already been selected by the Beaumont School Board to take over the campus for the 2019-20 school year and it will be converted utilizing their Classical Academy model. (e26)

ResponsiveEd has created a comprehensive redesign plan that includes data analysis of the current instructional issues, initiate professional development, establish a Family and Community Involvement Initiative and create an Early Childhood Innovation Zone that would broaden the recruitment for the campus.(e27) This type of comprehensive preplanning and implementation is essential so that the school's transition will be effortless for the students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

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

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

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

**(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;**

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

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

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

amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

For over 20 years, ResponsiveEd's work focused on educationally disadvantaged students and they have established a well-documented successful model based on an individualized and data-driven 3D Learning system which is, a focus on leadership and character development, and a comprehensive support system that provides a wide range of supports including extensive career counseling services and access to concurrent and dual credit options which allows students to attend postsecondary classes for credit saving tuition costs. (e29)

ResponsiveEd has expanded its support for its high school students as they transition to alumni. ResponsiveEd's Preparing our Alumni Today with Hope (PATH) project focuses on college/career readiness with Naviance, support provided by academic and alumni counselor, building access to financial aid and the PATH Center which is a career and college exploration center. (e29) This comprehensive approach documents the commitment ResponsiveEd has for assisting in the transition from high school into postsecondary or careers for each student.

ResponsiveEd indicated performance measures 3i-3m are the identified interim milestones that produce data documenting the successful post-secondary progress of educationally disadvantaged students enrolled in ResponsiveEd's high school charters. (e1045-1046)

**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: Responsive Education Solutions (U282M180020)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>106</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Responsive Education Solutions (U282M180020)

## 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 narrative to address this indicator. Specifically, the applicant describes the model of instruction for each of its schools and describes, through supporting data, how these models have led to student achievement. The applicant operates 74 schools and programs that follow six educational models and each school model was developed with a distinct curriculum and academic program to offer a rigorous educational experience that is tailored to individual student needs and interests, yet still designed to prepare all students for college access and success (e30-e32). In terms of student performance, the proportion of all students who scored at or above a proficient level on state assessments increased by 3 percentage points in reading and 9 points in math compared with an only 1 percentage point increase in reading and a 5percentage point increase in math statewide. Even larger increases were observed among low-income students (6 points in reading and 14 points in math), English learners (10 points in reading and 13 points in math), and students with disabilities in math (e35-e36). The applicant also provided data for graduation rates that were higher than the state averages for educationally disadvantaged groups (e39).

#### Weaknesses:

Within supporting data documents, all of the schools do not show performance indicators greater than regional or state averages. For example, average daily attendance rates of one school is not greater (e40) compared to schools out of the charter organization.

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

Sub

Reader's Score: 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:**

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 cites its record of implementing charter schools. Specifically, over the past 20 years, the applicant has not had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements or had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation (e42). The applicant closed some schools due to recruitment and enrollment targets not being met (e44).

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

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 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 indicates that it is in good credit standing. The credit rating with Standard & Poor's is BBB. To date, the applicant has issued \$135 million in bonds in the state of Texas backed by the state's Permanent School Fund (PSF) Bond Guarantee program, which have been used to fuel our organizational growth. (e44)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

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

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

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents clear data to demonstrate it serves educationally disadvantaged students at a rate comparable to schools within the city and the state. Specifically, across all the charter schools, 41% of students are Hispanic/Latino, 36% are White, 15% are African American, 4% are Asian, 4% are multiracial, and less than 1% is American Indian or Pacific Islander. Data is presented specifically for brick and mortar charter schools managed by the applicant. Half (46%) of the students are low income, 15% are English learners, and 7% are students with disabilities. The high school serves equal or slightly higher proportions of educationally disadvantaged students than the local public schools—67% of PHS students are low income compared with 68% in local districts; 28% of PHS students are English learners compared with 25% in local school districts; and 10% of PHS students are students with disabilities compared with 9% in local districts. The virtual program comprises a 2% low-income student body compared with 59% in schools across the state and serves a slightly higher proportion of students with disabilities (14% compared to 9%). (e46-e47)

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

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant outlines a sufficient plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant comprehensively describes the expansion of the classical curriculum model. Within its structure, the applicant provides various supports for students. The Classical Academy program is based on three modes of learning—grammar, logic, and rhetoric (the Classic Trivium)—which are presented through a historical and integrated approach throughout the curricula (e48). Throughout the curriculum, supports are provided for learners with autism and other disabilities. The applicant indicates how it will support students through needed transportation and mentoring and other campus-based services. Recruitment will include multi-level marketing to all parts of the community (49-e60).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Sub

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 extensive plan to evaluate the success of the proposed project using internal and external evaluators (e66). Specifically, the applicant will conduct use an evaluation plan that includes formative and summative components and utilizes multiple measures over multiple groups of subjects. Formative evaluation methods will be used to answer key questions about: the outreach and recruitment strategies being used; professional development being offered and the levels of participation in these; and the collaborations within the school community and with external partners being fostered to support and sustain the schools being replicated or expanded beyond the federal funding period. Summative evaluation methods will include the analysis of data collected through program implementation logs, stakeholder surveys, applicant and enrollment data, standardized test achievement scores, individual learning and educational plans, and school records such as graduation and attendance rates (e60-e67).

##### 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 applicant provides sufficient information to meet this indicator. Specifically, the applicant provides narrative that supports 20 years of operation and expansion. The logic model supports an operation with has solid financial and managerial constructs (e67-e74). These constructs include an effective and efficient leadership and management structure, including sound accounting and fiscal management protocols and procedures; an efficient approach to public and private fund development and use to support its operations and ambitious expansion plans; and a robust

**Sub**

system of quality assurance, including training and technical assistance and staff and program performance evaluation (e67).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (ii) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a sufficient management structure with key personnel to operate the program. Each position is aligned with program objectives and activities to facilitate the operation of the project (e74-e82). For example, the Project Director, Grant Manager, and Grant Support Specialist will meet face-to-face on a weekly basis throughout the entire grant period to ensure an effective and efficient grant management process, which will entail resolving any schedule, scope, or budget issues identified (e76).

**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, multiple staff are identified to align with key objectives and activities. For example, the project director manages all daily operations at the organization, including management of all programs; direction of all administrative, financial, and operational activities; and the development and implementation of an organizational strategic plan and strategic initiatives. She has a background in policy and organizational strategy (e83). For positions not currently occupied, the applicant includes position descriptions and requirements (e83-e86).

**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 diversity of its target population. Among the current school population of 21,160, 36% of students are Hispanic/Latino, 41% are White, 15% are African American, 4% are Asian, 4% are two or more races, and less than 1% is American Indian or Pacific Islander. Additionally, twelve percent are classified as English learners and 9% are students with disabilities (e22).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses this competitive preference priority. The applicant cites examples where it has provided a model for turnaround schools with partnering districts (e23-e24). For example, in 2010, the applicant partnered with a district to operate two of the district's lowest performing high schools, Travis and Lanier.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant addresses this competitive preference priority. The applicant provides a comprehensive plan to expand its model into one high school (e27-e30). In so doing, it presents a program that provides support for educationally disadvantaged students. For example, the model includes individual plans for academic and career counseling to help each student develop a plan for high school and beyond. All students take a course called College and Career Transitions prior to graduating to help educate students and their family about post-secondary options.

#### **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:**

"This competitive preference priority was not addressed."

**Weaknesses:**

"This competitive preference priority 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: Responsive Education Solutions (U282M180020)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	28
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>80</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Responsive Education Solutions (U282M180020)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

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

Reader's Score: 28

#### 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 demonstrates that the educationally disadvantaged students it serves show growth rates that exceed the state's growth rates (pages e36-38).

The applicant's schools' graduation rates show increases larger than the statewide increases (e39).

Attendance rates are generally higher than statewide averages (e40).

Almost half (48%) of TCPA graduates and a third (29%) of PHS graduates enrolled in an institution of higher education (IHE) in Texas after graduation. One year later, almost two-thirds (64%) of the former TCPA students and a third (33%) of the former PHS students enrolled in a Texas IHE completed a full-year of postsecondary education without any remediation (e39) showing college enrollment and persistence among the applicant schools' alumni.

#### **Weaknesses:**

According to the data provided by the applicant, the applicants schools, in general, do not show academic achievement rates that exceed the state (pages e36-38). A summary of district or local community data was not provided so there is no way to identify regional or local outcome comparisons. A review of the data in Appendix G shows mixed results with all of the schools in the applicant's network. It doesn't appear that all of the schools were included in the summary data presented on pages e36-38.

Graduation rates for the applicant's schools are lower than the state (e39).

Average daily attendance rates are lower for the applicant's schools than for the state (e40).

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

**Sub**

professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

**Reader's Score: 8**

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

**Strengths:**

Two of the applicant's schools' closures resulted in mergers with other of the network's schools (e44-45) rather than complete closures.

None of the closures was a result of compliance issues (e44).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant closed six of its 80 schools. No explanation is provided for three of the closures and no description of strategic or policy changes as a result of the closures was provided (e44-45).

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

**Reader's Score: 5**

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 the charter schools operated or managed by ResponsiveEd have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety and have not otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to the revocation of the school's charter (e45).

**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:**

The applicant's schools, including their virtual program, serve proportions of educationally disadvantaged students comparable to their local public-school districts (e47).

The applicant's Virtual Academy serves a greater proportion of students with disabilities than the State (e48).

**Weaknesses:**

It is difficult to discern evidence of the applicant serving educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools from the charts provided on pages e47-48, as they appear to contradict the information in the text. PHS, in Figures 2a-b, shows proportions of educationally disadvantaged students compared to surrounding districts that are at a slightly lower proportion of low-income students. The TCPA graph shows lower proportions for the charter school than the surrounding districts for low-income, English learners and Students with Disabilities (e47).

The applicant's Virtual Academy comprises a 52% low-income student body compared with 59% in schools across the state ((e47).

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: 7**

- 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 will expand three existing schools and replicate high-quality models across seven new sites (e48) to serve an educationally disadvantaged student population.

The applicant outlines specialized programs to serve English Language Learners (e52-54) and Students with Disabilities (e54-55).

The applicant will implement a set of initiatives to address the needs of educationally disadvantaged students through the THRIVE Initiative and Project PATH (e56) and improve the quality of teaching for disadvantaged students through The New Teacher Project (e56).

The applicant will conduct targeted outreach and recruitment with a focus on promoting racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity in expansion and replication sites (e57). These efforts will include using data to place social media promotions and recruiting at community events and in locations that serve a diverse segment of the population (e58).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not specify on pages e57-58 how it will appeal to families of students with disabilities or English Language Learners (e.g., providing materials in various dominant languages and/or providing translators).

**Reader's Score: 13**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan will assess performance measures for each Project Objective. For Objectives 1 and 2 (Increase Access to High-Quality Charter Program Offerings; Promote Racial/ethnic and Socio-economic Diversity in Charter School Settings will measure outreach and enrollment data (e61).

The applicant has six performance measures for the objective of improving students' academic performance and college and career readiness using statewide evaluation data (e62).

Evaluation data for the objective to build capacity to sustain high-quality programs will be obtained from multiple sources and stakeholder groups and include qualitative (survey) and quantitative data and such process data as participation rates in professional development (e63).

The applicant will utilize both internal and external evaluators to ensure high-quality qualitative and quantitative data is collected and analyzed (e66).

The logic model contains measurable objectives and outcomes consistent with the focus of the grant program including diversity, improved student performance and increased enrollment (e68).

**Weaknesses:**

None found.

**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 applicant has been able to sustain its network of charter schools using best-practice elements of the organization's operating model. These elements include an effective and efficient leadership and management structure, including sound accounting and fiscal management protocols and procedures; an efficient approach to public and private fund development and use to support its operations and ambitious expansion plans; and a robust system of quality assurance, including training and technical assistance and staff and program performance evaluation (e67).

Expanded or replicated schools will maintain fiscal stability through sound fiscal policies and procedures that ensure an adequate fund balance surplus and cover funding fluctuations, emergency facility costs, delays in public payments, and other unexpected financial challenges (e70).

The applicant's operational model has enabled it to scale effectively without receiving extensive philanthropic support and to continue to build its financial models without reliance on grant funding (e70).

**Weaknesses:**

None found.

**Reader's Score:** 5

- 2. (ii) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The timeline includes benchmarks, milestones, and individuals responsible for tasks (e79).

The applicant provides a detailed implementation plan that establishes how they will accomplish the grant's objectives (e76-e78) demonstrating that the management plan will enable them to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget.

**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))**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The key personnel have backgrounds in education, policy (e83), finance, special education (e84-85) and research and evaluation (e85). The key personnel have the relevant training and experience to implement the expansion and replication proposed in the grant.

**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:**

Among the current school population of 21,160 students that ResponsiveEd serves, there is no clear majority demographic: 36% of students are Hispanic/Latino, 41% are White, 15% are African American, 4% are Asian, 4% are two or more races (page e22) indicating that the applicant's existing schools have a diverse population.

The applicant conducted an in the surround area and using that data to identify sites where the proportions of one or more of the student subgroups varied by 10 or more percentage points—indicating schools that could benefit from an intentional focus on recruiting new students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds (e23).

The three schools targeted for expansion have higher diversity and a larger population of economically disadvantaged students than the public schools in the communities (e23).

The applicant will conduct targeted outreach and marketing to attract more diverse populations to these proposed expansion sites using a variety of print, digital, and in-person strategies that will be informed by data analytics and community feedback (e23) demonstrating an intentional focus on recruiting ethnically and socioeconomically diverse student bodies.

**Weaknesses:**

None found.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

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

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has experience in turning around failing charter schools, including a virtual academy and moving turnaround charter schools out of an "Improvement Required" designation (e24-25). The applicant has also partnered with low-performing public schools to implement their "Premier High School" (PHS) model into the public schools (e25).

The applicant proposes to replicate their Classical Academy model into Fehl Price Elementary, a persistently lowest-achieving school, and will serve the current school population (e25).

The new Fehl Price Classical Academy will continue to serve the population of students who are geographically zoned by the district to attend Fehl Price ES and will provide free transportation for these students (e27).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not demonstrate turnaround experience with a public school (charters only) and did not provide evidence of success with the PHS partnership school.

**Reader's Score: 2**

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

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

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

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

**(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;**

**(iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but**

not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and  
(iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant is proposing to replicate their high-quality PHS model in two new sites and to expand one existing PHS (e27).

The PHS model uses a personalized program to support educationally disadvantaged students to succeed and graduate from high school. They use an individualized and data-driven instructional approach; a strong program of character and leadership development; and comprehensive, customized support services to help all students graduate at their own pace and succeed post-secondarily. The model includes individual plans for academic and career counseling to help each student develop post-secondary plans (e28).

All students must apply and be accepted to an institution of higher learning or military and all PHS schools have agreements with institutions of higher learning to provide dual credit and/or concurrent enrollment options for students (e29).

Project "PATH" is designed to help educationally disadvantaged students to graduate from high school and enroll and succeed in postsecondary education (e29).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not propose any project-specific performance measures to assess progress in preparing students for post-secondary success (e30).

**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