

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation (U282M180021)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	38
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
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	1
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation (U282M180021)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 38

Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.**

Strengths:

The data provided by the applicant indicated that overall, their students make gains in language and literacy and math while enrolled in the preschool program and perform above the national norm by the end of their pre-K4 year (p e41). The applicant reports that 83% of children met end-of-the-year performance goals, using an internal measure, in math, language and literacy, and social-emotional development goals across all network schools (p 3 42). The data is compelling, with subgroup numbers indicating that 84.8% of ELL students, 82% of Free and Reduced Lunch students , 82% of Black/African American students, and 86% of Hispanic students met end of year goals.

Weaknesses:

The data provided by the applicant is from a self-administered, internal assessment and does not include comparative data against students from local district, state or national subgroups. Additionally, students' performance data on student gains in the nationally normed assessment on literacy and language and math (p e40) is not disaggregated by subgroups in order to provide information on educationally disadvantaged students. This data is not broken down for individual school sites and the school quality review reports rely on the academic data from grades K and up (coming from the elementary school attached to the pre-K) (p. e 31). Comparative attendance and retention data is not provided by the applicant (p e 30) and this data is not disaggregated to show the statistics for educationally disadvantaged students in particular.

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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant does not disclose any past record of charter revocation or compliance problems. Additionally, the applicant reports that they have been in good standing with the authorizer since its inception (over 13 years) (p e42).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note.

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 does not disclose any past record of financial and operational mismanagement. Additionally, the applicant reports that they have been in good standing with the authorizer since its inception (over 13 years) (p e42).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note.

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: 19

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 notes that 90% of their students are from economically disadvantaged households with 58% considered at-risk (p e45).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide comparative enrollment data for educationally disadvantaged students in the surrounding public schools and does not provide a concrete working definition for the terms “economically disadvantaged” and “at-risk.”

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: 9

- 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 has a plan in place to identify and to provide necessary interventions for any students who require special education or ELL services (p e46-47). Families are asked on their application about whether their child has an IEP from another school or agency and are given a home language survey (p e46-47).. The locations of new schools are intended to target neighborhoods with large numbers of educationally disadvantaged students (p e49).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include a specific recruitment plan targeted at educationally disadvantaged students such as those with disabilities or English learners. One proposed school, to be located on an Air Force Base, is expected to have more than half the percentage of ELL and Special Education students as the other locations (p e50) which raises questions about equity.

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: 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 provides a logic model with goals for operations, human capital and instructional model (p. e53). Each goal has a measurable outcome with performance targets. Additionally, the applicant commits to evaluating the quality of the “Every Child Ready” instructional model which will be lead by an internal Director of Research and Impact and supported by a third-party evaluator (p e57). The research questions and study design is detailed in the application and includes both qualitative and quantitative measures (p e64-67).

Weaknesses:

The logic model is not sufficiently detailed and lacks milestones, timelines and roles and responsibilities. Additionally, the evaluation model appears to be an extension of an existing study already in progress and the application does not clearly notes what will be new as part of the grant program.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 11

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a sample opportunity analysis conducted for one of the potential new school sites. This analysis includes a 5-year projected budget for that individual site as well as for the organization as a whole (p e296-97). A budget narrative is provided for the first five years of the project (p e338).

Weaknesses:

The applicant only provides a sample and does not provide a comprehensive analysis for each of the proposed new schools. The operating model is not specific to the proposed new schools and is a generalized template. There is a lack of clear milestones, timelines and enrollment tables for the proposed schools.

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 has planned for start-up and has developed tools and protocols to make the process more efficient. For example, the applicant has developed a proposed partner rubric used to assess a potential partnership/co-location (p. e300-306). Additionally, the application has developed a "Play Book" which functions as a template for startup operations (p e310). A budget narrative for the grant is provided for the first five years of the project (p e338).

Weaknesses:

The budget does not include detailed costs broken down for each site. Additionally, the templates are general and are not specific for any of the proposed new schools. For example, the site to open at the Air Force Base may have very different start up cost and needs than the proposed turnaround school (site TBD).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant cites previous experience with expansion and has developed several tools designed to make new openings efficient and effective. The applicant previously managed an I3 federal innovation grant related to the curriculum used in the schools as well as a multi-million dollar private investment. (p e300-310).

Weaknesses:

Previous expansion has been at a smaller scale than what is proposed in this grant application and explanation about how the team will be able to execute a large-scale expansion is inadequate.

Reader's Score: 4

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's schools serve a diverse population that average 58% at risk and 90% economically disadvantages (p e19). The applicant's stated mission is to focus on children most at-risk and in neighborhoods where there is greatest need (p e22).

Weaknesses:

The proposed new schools are expected to serve high needs areas and at-risk students but the applicant does not provide comparative demographic data to establish the diversity of these students compared to the district averages. There does not appear to be an intentional focus on recruitment of high risk students, beyond the fact that geographic location of the school building attracts these families.

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 states that it was brought in previously to turn around the operations of two schools (p e23).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide detailed information about these takeovers. It appears that they were already designated as charter schools and were assigned a new CMO. There is no concrete evidence of plans to take over any existing poorly performing public school in this grant application.

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: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

Strengths:

This application does not address high school.

Weaknesses:

This application does not address high school.

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

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

This application did not respond to this priority area.

Weaknesses:

This application did not respond to this priority area.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:11 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation (U282M180021)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	27
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	12
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation (U282M180021)

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 sufficiently demonstrated that the school under their management have achieved academic success and growth on student performance and attendance for educationally disadvantaged students and have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the area. The DC PCSB measures the performance of all charter schools in Washington, DC, issuing annual School Quality Reports. The School Quality Reports in addition rank charter schools in one of three tiers: Tier 1, for highest performing; Tier 2 for schools of good quality; and Tier 3 for schools that may be facing difficulty. Based on a review of the 2018 School Quality Reports for AppleTree's schools in Appendix G. For example, the applicant indicated that four of their six schools were ranked Tier 1, which is the highest ranking available by DC's Public Charter School Board for SY 2017-2018. The other two schools performed well and were ranked high Tier 2. Two schools were ranked at Tier 3 and those were the two schools that AppleTree was brought in to manage the early-education classrooms as part of a turnaround strategy proposed by the DC PCSB and the upgrade to Tier 3 is connected to AppleTree's success. (pg.7)

The rankings of Tier I and Tier II indicate the schools are high-performing and contribute to the overall Performance Management Framework rankings of the LEAs for whom AppleTree is a co-CMO. On average, 83% of children met end-of-the year performance goals in math, language and literacy, and social-emotional development across all AppleTree schools. Attendance rates were above 80% at all schools and re-enrollment varied by site. (pgs. 6-8)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide comparative data from other schools in the DC area to reasonably determine if the charter schools have exceeded the average academic achievement by other like schools and students.

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 successfully demonstrated that none of the charter schools operated or managed by Appletree the applicant has closed or have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. For example, the applicant indicated that all of AppleTree's 11 schools meet the ESEA definition of a charter school and all of AppleTree Early Learning Public Charter Schools are in good standing with the DC PCSB and AppleTree's schools are regarded as models of excellence. (pg.8)

None of the schools have received any sort of warning, suspension or any other such caution as evidenced by a letter of support from the executive director of the DC PCSB. (Appendix C). AELPCS was accredited by AdvancED, an international accrediting institution, in 2012 and re-accredited in 2017. AdvanceEd's report praises the comprehensive instructional model that AppleTree developed, continuously improved upon through its growth, and continues to use at all schools

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant successfully demonstrated that none of the charter schools operated or managed by Appletree 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. For example, the applicant indicated that AppleTree has grown significantly since then, now managing 11 schools with budgeted revenues of over \$29 million for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2019. All AppleTree's schools showed a net of \$1.7 million as well as positive cash flow of \$1.7 million.

From an operational and management standpoint, AppleTree consists of two, related not-for-profits: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation, Inc. (AppleTree Institute) and AppleTree Early Learning Public Charter School (AELPCS). From an operational point-of-view, however, the two organizations operate as one entity. The two related AppleTree organizations, AppleTree Institute and AppleTree Early Learning PCS are both subject to annual audits and based on the audit results in Appendix H, each organization has consistently generated annual surpluses and received a clean opinion from its auditors. The combined net worth of AppleTree (as of June 30, 2018) is nearly \$11.2 million, each organization maintains a healthy cash balance, and each has been highly rated in the STARS report.(pg. 9 and Appendices)

Sub

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: 27

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 clearly demonstrated how the proposed program serve educationally disadvantaged students in all subgroups at comparable rate as the public schools. For example, the applicant indicated that during the school years of 2017-18, 28% of the students at the Columbia Heights school were identified as English Language Learners, with a total of eight languages represented, including Spanish, Amharic, and Arabic. 70% of the students at the Columbia Heights school qualified for free or reduced lunch and 76% of the students identified as non-white. At Lincoln Park School, 56% of the students were non-white and nearly one third of the students qualified for free or reduced lunch English Language Learners that are initially identified as being a possible EL during the enrollment process NES and LES students are provided with additional instructional support.

Beyond maintaining diverse populations, the applicant demonstrated that a variety of services are provided to meet the needs of ELL students or those with special needs and also fully accommodates the needs of any disabled students. For example, all schools are ADA accessible and social emotional support for students are available through access to wrap-around services for its families from six to nine clinicians (licensed social workers or counselors) and the ratio of clinician to students moved from 1:195 to 1:154. AppleTree serves 192 students whose families have self-identified as homeless, per the McKinney-Vento Act. Since no transportation approved for charter or public schools, the AppleTree provides homeless children to subsidize transportation. In addition, to support services, such as small group work focused on specific social skills, one-on-one therapy, and in-classroom behavior modeling. (pgs. 10-12)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide comparative data from other schools in the DC area to reasonably determine if the charter schools have exceeded the average academic achievement by other like schools and students in serving educationally disadvantaged students.

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

Sub

assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

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 clearly demonstrated that there are plans in place 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. The applicant throughout the narrative expressed that the fact that since the DC Public Schools does not allow transportation for either public or charter schools, AppleTree consciously located its schools in the areas of greatest need to ensure that disadvantaged students have access to its high-quality charter programs. For example, AppleTree has developed new preschools through partnerships with developers of low-income and affordable housing in Ward 1 (which has a high Latino population) and Ward 8. In addition, AppleTree has developed schools where most of Washington, DC's economically disadvantaged families live. All eligible students apply to AppleTree preschools through the District of Columbia's common lottery. Student-school matches are based on the number of available spaces at each school. If there are more students than spaces available, students are considered according to lottery preference group (sibling, transfer or other lottery preferences) and how each student ranked his or her school choices; and each student's random lottery number.

Further, the applicant effectively demonstrated that AppleTree intentionally locates its schools in areas where it can recruit children of diverse backgrounds. In the 2017-18 school year, AppleTree's network of schools served a student population consisting of 93% minority students, with the vast majority (90%) of them Black/African-American. Six of AppleTree's eleven schools are located in Wards 7 and 8 of Washington, DC, and over 95% of the students in these schools are Black, which reflects the demographics of these neighborhoods. (pgs. 12-15)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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

Reader's Score: 15

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 provided a detailed and comprehensive evaluation plan in which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project and aligned with the logic model. The various program components are clearly aligned with evaluation methods and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period. For example, the applicant has adopted in the logic model

has one key objective and that is to increase the number of high-quality early-learning schools in Washington, DC. To accomplish this objective, the applicant has aligned all of the key inputs (activities) and performance measures needed generate outcomes and impact.

The American Institutes for Research (AIR) will support AppleTree in program analysis and in reporting tasks for all performance measures, providing ongoing technical assistance each year on documenting and summarizing progress on all performance measures. In addition, AIR will conduct independent audits on progress to date, based on the annual reports authored by AppleTree on the performance-management measures to develop recommendations, guidance, and potential changes in the replication plan based on findings from the annual performance measure reports. AIR will conduct an independent evaluation of the replication efforts. The evaluation will document the classroom- and student-level outcomes as well as the successes and challenges of expanding high-quality preschool charter schools through the replication process. To assess student academic learning during the preschool years, AIR will use the ECR literacy and math assessments and AppleTree will also assesses student social and emotional learning, using the Positive Behavior Ratings Scale (PBRS). (pgs. 34-40)

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: 12

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 clearly demonstrated their ability to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended. For example, the applicant indicated that AppleTree has grown significantly since then, now managing 11 schools with budgeted revenues of over \$29 million for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2019. All AppleTree's schools showed a net of \$1.7 million as well as a positive cash flow of \$1.7 million. AppleTree consists of two, related not-for-profits: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation, Inc. (AppleTree Institute) and AppleTree Early Learning Public Charter School (AELPCS). The combined net worth of AppleTree (as of June 30, 2018) is nearly \$11.2 million, each organization maintains a healthy cash balance, and each has been highly rated in the STARS report. The applicant has also received grants and other private funding over the years. (pgs. 51-52)

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:

The applicant provided a limited plan consisting of mostly the AppleTree organizations rigorous process in expanding or replicating schools, such as finding a location, analyzing the competition in the market and the neighborhoods to ensure students ability to walk to school. The applicant also looks for a variety of demographic information (e.g., race, educational attainment, income and poverty levels). AppleTree consciously does not locate in better-off sections of the District of Columbia. For each identified opportunity, AppleTree will conduct formal and informal community engagement activities. AppleTree will reach out informally to other community groups or simply by meeting neighbors at community gathering spots. (pg. 53-54)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a timeline for meeting any proposed tasks and activities needed to replicate or expand on school development. The timeline is critical for determining if the project will be developed on a reasonable timeline and within budget. There were no milestones for accomplishing project tasks, thus there is no indication when the applicant will meet projected goals and objectives. The project activities and tasks indicated in the management plan did provide clearly defined lines of responsibilities. Based on a review of the management plan, it does not appear that applicant has in place locations for replicating and expanding, thus limiting the timeline for completing the grant requirements on time and within budget.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrated that the proposed project will have in place qualified key personnel, with the relevant training and experience to professional operation the program expansion and replication. The organization consists of two, related non-for-profits: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation, Inc. and AppleTree Early Learning Public Charter School. All AppleTree schools are managed from the same home office and by the same home-office staff and new school openings are managed by AppleTree's home office staff.

Based on a review of the resumes and bios in the narrative, the key personnel involved in these efforts are all experience with working and leading charter schools from an operational standpoint. For example, the Project Manager will manage the overall expansion and replication effort. Since 2012, he has been General Counsel and Chief of Strategic Initiatives for Appletree where he oversees business planning and growth initiatives. Other key staff will include the President and CEO in which he co-founded in 1996. Under his leadership, both AppleTree nonprofits have grown in impact and size to a \$28 million enterprise with 300 staff and a growing impact on early-learning research, policy and practice both in the Nation's Capital and nationally. At the current time information on key school-based staff is not available. (pgs. 55-56)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided adequate evidence that the AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation will expand opportunities for racially and socioeconomically diverse preschool students and traditionally underserved children. Currently the applicant serves 1,300 students at eleven (11) sites and 90% are economically disadvantaged. Among that diverse student population, a significant proportion are English Language Learners and Special-education students. With grant funding from the CSP, AppleTree over the next five years plans to replicate by creating nine new schools. The new schools will be located in high-need areas and expected to be serving primarily at-risk children and providing a high-quality preschool education to nearly 2,600 children annually.

The applicant effectively demonstrated that AppleTree intentionally locates its schools in areas where it can recruit children of diverse backgrounds. In the 2017-18 school year, AppleTree's network of schools served a student population consisting of 93% minority students, with the vast majority (90%) of them Black/African-American. Six of AppleTree's eleven schools are located in Wards 7 and 8 of Washington, DC, and over 95% of the students in these schools are Black, which reflects the demographics of these neighborhoods. (pgs. 4-5)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-

performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--

- (A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and
- (B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed program funds will be used to work with two academically troubled schools that AppleTree presently manages (Perry Street Prep PCS and Democracy Prep PCS). At the request of DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB), AppleTree was brought in as a Charter Management Organization (CMO) to turn around the school's operations. As evidenced by the letter of support from the executive director of the DC PCSB (Appendix C), AppleTree is well regarded by the District's chartering authority. It is presently engaged in ongoing discussions about becoming a CMO for one (or likely, more than one) future turnaround situations. (pg. 5)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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

Reader's Score: 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 did not respond to CPP 3.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to CPP 3.

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: 0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to CPP 4.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to CPP 4.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:11 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation (U282M180021)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	12
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	2
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation (U282M180021)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 42

Sub

- (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:

Programs managed by the CMO are listed as Tier 1 and Tier 2 in DCPS School quality reports (e31, e190). The applicant used i3 grant to create a preschool curriculum and assessments geared toward economically disadvantaged students (e.38). Applicant demonstrates achievement improvements over a one year period and over 5 years using their proprietary assessment tool (e40). The applicant provides data demonstrating improvement on norm referenced assessments (e41). 83% of students met end of the year performance goals for math, language, and social emotional development (e49). An average of 84.8% of ELL students, 82% of children receiving free or reduced-price lunch, 82% of Black/African- American students and 86% of Hispanic students met end-of-the year goals in math, language and literacy, and social-emotional development (p49).

Weaknesses:

The data indicate low attendance and re enrollment rates (e30). At least one of their schools achieved the lowest rating on Public Charter School Board School Quality Report (e198). The applicant does not provide nor disaggregate information comparing it to local or state programs serving similar students.

Reader's Score: 12

- (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 programs are in good standing with DC Public Charter School Board for the past 13.5 years (e42). The AppleTree@ schools contributed to the overall Performance Management Framework rankings of the LEAs for whom it is a co-CMO; both of the Rocketship schools were ranked Tier 1. e(43) The operator has "not received any

Sub

sort of warning, suspension or any other such caution". (e25). A letter of support from the DCPCS Board states "AppleTree's schools are well-regarded in the District and the PCSB has been encouraging AppleTree to further expand its footprint in the Nation's Capital." (e130)

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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 demonstrates strong financial management and positive cash flow with the financial performance chart (e33). A letter of support is included from the DC Public Charter School Board and its director (e130). The CMO maintains a home office for its 11 schools that included staff dedicated to ensuring that the finances and operations are monitored (e31), including dedicating a .10 FTE of the COO's time to the project (e339). The operator has also dedicated .10 FTE of their Director of Operations and Compliance to the project (e352). The applicants schools generated \$25 million in revenues, with a \$3.3 million surplus and cash on hand off \$1.6 million (e33).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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: 19

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:

Student enrollment at the 13 programs that CMO operates range from 60 to 100% economically disadvantaged (e20). The stated goal of the program is to close achievement gaps for educationally disadvantaged students (e44). The applicant provides data on the per cent of the student body that are economically disadvantaged, at risk, ELL,

Sub

and special education (e45). This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to provide data that show whether the CMO serves educationally disadvantaged students at rates comparable to other DCPS schools. The number of special education students seems low, but it is difficult to tell without some comparison data. 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: 9

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

Strengths:

The applicant's plan to expand targets communities with high levels of educationally disadvantaged students (e50). The logic model provides activities that are designed to improve outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students (e54), including social emotional supports, supports for homeless students, additional instruction and support for EL learners and an extensive response to intervention framework leading to specialized support plans (SSPs) (e48). The application includes a student recruitment plan that is thorough, despite not specifically mentioning educationally disadvantaged student recruitment (e323). This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's logic model does not provide actions that demonstrate approaches to recruiting the targeted population (e53). Under input #1, for example, the applicant discusses opening nine new schools and adds that the impact will be "families [will] have access to more high quality charter preschools" but does not describe how it will recruit these families (e54). Additionally, there is no mention of recruitment practices of their partner schools nor whether they will work together with the partner schools to ensure enrollment of educationally disadvantaged students. 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: 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 provides a detailed evaluation plan (e56). Several studies are in progress related to the components of the program including a social emotional learning program and it's Every Child Ready program (e57). The school is partnering with AIR to do evaluation and will receive support in reporting tasks for all performance measures and receive technical assistance on documentation and reporting of performance measures.(e57). AIR will conduct an evaluation of the replication efforts, including student outcomes through an implementation science focus (e59). The evaluation looks deeply into whether to the academic program is effective (e62). The applicant dedicates staff specifically to data

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

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan does not evaluate the program's effectiveness in recruiting and retaining economically disadvantaged students nor does it specifically analyze the impact on the target population (e57). This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 8

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: 12

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 application includes annual budgets for the first five years of operation (e297, e360). The applicant provides an audit of their CMO (e206). The applicant provides a financing scheme that focuses on sustainability. Its AppleTree@ model reduces risk and increases stability as well as providing a more efficient staffing model (e283).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

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 an "opening playbook" for opening new programs (e307). This document "walks through, in extreme detail, the steps necessary to opening a successful school, including staffing, ordering of equipment, and student recruitment(e72). Staff and their clearly defined responsibilities are included (e74).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a specific timeline that includes milestones and persons responsible. Job descriptions are not included.

Sub

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

Resumes and CVs are provided. (e83). The training and skills of key personnel align with the project plan and activities (e77).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

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 CMO plans to open schools in areas where it can recruit children of diverse backgrounds (e22). The applicant demonstrates their ability to retain a diverse student body in its current programs (e22).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a specific plan for recruiting educationally disadvantaged 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:

The applicant provides examples of academically troubled programs it took over and helped turn around (e23). The applicant provides a tentative plan for expanding into another turnaround opportunity (e23). This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's plan to reopen a troubled program during this grant cycle is tentative and may not happen. 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: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not apply under this priority. This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply under this priority. This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not apply under this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply under this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:11 PM