

**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: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M180025)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	44
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	27
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M180025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 44

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:

The applicant's schools consistently outperform NYC average and New York state averages on state assessments for ELA and Math proficiency (p e38). When disaggregated, each individual school scores above 90% on Math with a network average of 98% compared with the city average of 43% and in ELA, every school is above 84% with a network average of 91% compared to the citywide average of 47% (p e39-40). Additionally, the network serves students living in poverty with an average of 73% qualifying for Free and Reduced Lunch (p e23). ELL students enrolled in SA were 8 times more likely to pass the ELA exam as ELLs citywide (p e41). Further, SA's African American and Hispanic students outperformed White and Asian students citywide in both math and ELA on the 2018 state exams (p e42). Overall attendance and retention is stronger than the citywide average (p e45).

Weaknesses:

Retention rates for Special Education students and ELL students are lower than average for the city (p e46). There is insufficient explanation for this gap in retention and no evidence of a specific strategy in place to address it.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

The applicant has complies with all regulations and does not have any significant compliance issues within the past three years (p e49).

Sub

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note 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 authorizer (SUNY) has recognized the applicant for having consistently clean financial practices and the results of a Comptroller audit found that SA's funds were spent only on educating children (p e49). SA schools has not had any significant compliance issues or violations within the past three years (p e49).

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: 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 has a robust program for supporting ELL and special education students including Co-Teaching, Rtl and utilization of LEA resources (p e25-26). ELL students are diverse, speaking 34 languages other than English at home (p e25).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has comparatively fewer ELL students than the city wide average (8.3% vs. 13.5%) (p e50) and comparatively fewer students with disabilities than the citywide average (13.8% vs. 19.7%).

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

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 uses a lottery system to admit new students and recruits ELL students by targeted mailing and flexible information sessions for parents (pe25). The applicant uses a weighted lottery system for ELL applicants and is committed to enhancing and improving recruitment efforts for educationally disadvantaged students (p e50).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include a specific plan for increasing enrollment of special education students, although it mentions a weighted lottery for ELL students (p e50).

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:

A logic model is included and rationale supports each element with goals and objective that are quantifiable (p e69).

Weaknesses:

The logic model is not specific to the proposed new schools and expansion sites. There is no external evaluator partnering with the organization to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant project and the proposal relies on existing tools and performance measures.

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: 14

Sub

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant included information about the broad range of financial support that ensures that the organization has the ability to sustain the expansion and replication work after the grant period has ended. These sources include philanthropy which is used to fund schools until they are self-sustaining. The applicant estimates that they will raise \$42 million in FY19 from fundraising (p e77).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 includes a timeline for opening a new school and includes responsibilities of the various central office teams (p e67-68).

Weaknesses:

The timeline and management plan is general and not specific to the proposed new 6 school openings and 10 expansions.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant has previous experience with expanding the network and has opened 46 new schools over the past twelve years (p e65). The network has experience with aggressive scaling and has a central team in place ranging from Human Capital and recruitment to facilities and instructional professional development.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 makes an intentional effort to recruit students from a broad range of neighborhoods and seeks to attract all students, including ELL and special education students (p e24). They reach out to parents with children who are ELL or students with disabilities. When siting new schools, they intentionally locate schools in neighborhoods where there is consistently poor academic performance (p e24) and have been recognized for their commitment to diversity by the external organizations. (p e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 does not specifically address this component of the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specifically address this component of the competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has an existing and strong high school program in place and graduated its first class of students with scholarships to highly competitive colleges (p e31). Special programs include the Accelerated Learning Program, test prep programming, internships and summer experiences, college counseling and post-graduation support (p e 33-35). Additionally, 100% of SA seniors graduated having met the SAT college readiness benchmarks for math and ELA (p e34). The high school programming includes several specific performance measures aligned with the goals for the grant project (p e35).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note.

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:

The applicant does not specifically address this component of the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specifically address this component of the competitive preference priority.

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: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M180025)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	45
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	29
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	5
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M180025)

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:

The applicant comprehensively demonstrated the academic achievement results and growth over time, which includes student attendance and retention rates high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school. In 2009, the first year SA students were eligible to take the New York State exams, 100% of students passed the state math exam and 95% passed English Language Arts (ELA). The data provided evidenced that the charter schools have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State. For example, the applicant indicated that students have achieved tremendous academic success, ranking in the top of all schools in the city and state. On the 2018 state exams, 98% of SA scholars passed math, compared to 43% of NYC students, and 91% passed English Language Arts, compared with 47% of NYC kids. SA's ELL and special needs students outperformed their peers citywide by large margins. SA's results consistently exceed state and citywide averages: for example, in 2018, only 43% of students across NYC passed the math exam (compared with 98% of SA students) and only 47% passed the ELA exam (compared with 91% of SA students). (pgs. 30-35)

Further, 85% of SA scholars received a level 4 - the highest score - on the 2018 math exam, compared with fewer than 22% of students across NYC. 90% of SA students with disabilities met math standards, and 74% passed the English exam, compared with 15% and 16% of students with disabilities citywide.

SA schools have an annual attendance rate of 97.7%. NYC district schools reported only 91% year-to-date attendance citywide as of the end of 2016, and New York State's attendance rate 28 for 2015-16 (the last year for which data is available) was 94%. The annual retention rate of 80% approximates the city average (84%). SA schools retain students with disabilities (73%) and 30 ELLs (82%) at approximately the same levels. (pgs. 34-35 and Appendices)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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.**

Strengths:

The applicant indicated that none of the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements in the past three years, including in student safety, financial management, and statutory or regulatory compliance. (pgs. 48-49)

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 indicated that none of the 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. In December 2016, the NYC Comptroller completed a two-year audit of SA. After extensive investigations, the Comptroller did not find a single case where SA's funds were spent on anything other than educating children. The final audit report included some critiques of SA's practices, which SA refuted in its formal response, accompanied by supporting documentation. Both BDO and SUNY have consistently given SA a positive rating with respect to its financial practices. (pgs. 48-50)

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:

The applicant clearly demonstrated that the charter schools currently operated or managed by the CMO serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools. The applicant indicated that they operate 46 charter schools in NYC, serving 16,000 primarily low-income, minority students. The applicant evidenced that since opening its first charter school in Harlem in 2006, Success Academy (SA) has maintained an excellent track record for serving students of color, English Language Learners (ELLs), and special needs children. For example, the student population is composed primarily of educationally disadvantaged students and generally, reflects the NYC student population. 81% of SA scholars are Black and Hispanic 31 (compared with only 66.5% citywide), 13.8% have been classified as students with disabilities (compared with 19.7% citywide), and 8.3% have been classified as ELLs (compared with 13.5% citywide). Additionally, nearly 73% of SA students qualify for FRPL, which is comparable with the 74% of students across NYC who live in poverty. (pgs. 32-33)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not demonstrate that the CMO serves students with disabilities and ELL learners at comparable rates to other schools citywide.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided a reasonably high quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners. The applicant is proposing to support opening and expanding 1 high school, 1 middle, and 4 elementary schools and expand grades levels at 6 elementary and 4 middle schools over the next five years. Each new school opening, and grade expansion will allow SA to greatly increase the number of high-needs children that it serves across four boroughs. (pgs. 32-33)

The applicant clearly demonstrated that the CMO is proposing 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. For example, the applicant indicated that the proposed program expansion is committed to attracting and retaining a racially and socioeconomically diverse student body and will seek to attract all students, including ELLs and special education students, by directing outreach and other recruitment efforts at a broad range of neighborhoods, preschools, and community programs that serve both special education and non-special education students. The commitment is further demonstrated by the fact the current schools consisting of over 11,700 students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL), making up nearly 73% of SA's student population. At 16 SA schools, more than 80% of scholars qualify for FRPL, and at 39 schools, more than 60% of scholars qualify for FRPL. To meet this goal, the

Sub

applicant indicated their enrollment application is available in Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and French, as well as English. A variety of outreach efforts will be utilized to ensure that every family within a SA school community is aware that their child has the option to apply. (pgs. 34-36)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided reasonable objective performance measures that will enable the applicant to compare each school's performance against its prior performance, against other SA schools, and against public schools across NYC and New York State. The applicant indicated the organization will monitor performance using data for internal tracking and to ensure each school is on track to meet the goals. The performance measures detailed and clearly related to the intended outcomes included a logic model. (pgs. 51-52)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide fully developed evaluation plan that included components, such as methods of evaluation aligned with the objective performance measures. Without this information it is difficult to determine how some of the data will be analyzed and what types of quantitative and qualitative data will be gained from the data analysis. The applicant does not discuss who will conduct the evaluation and what are the potential outcomes of the evaluation.

Reader's Score: 5

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 provided a detailed plan demonstrating how the organization will sustain the expansion beyond the grant period. For example, the applicant indicated that the CMO currently receives \$15,307 in public general education funding per pupil. In addition to the general education funding, SA schools receive per pupil funding for special education that can amount to an additional \$19,049 per student, depending on the level of services provided. SA schools currently operate solely on public funding via per pupil funding from the state, previously received CSP Replication and Expansion grants, and other federal entitlement programs: Title I, Title II, IDEA, National School Lunch Program and E-rate. The applicant indicated that Philanthropy also supports innovative projects such as the Education Institute and the CMO has been successful in raising funds to support its five-year growth plan. In FY19, SA expects to raise approximately \$42 million from foundations, individuals, and fundraising events and an additional \$9 million in federal funding. (pgs. 47-48)

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 detailed management plan that detailed the timeline proposed to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The applicant included clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (pgs. 48-50)

The applicant provided a reasonable management plan that clearly demonstrated the process and procedures in place for opening new schools. For example, the CMO has various management teams in place responsible for all management operations, such as the human resources team to implement hiring policies and to recruit, interview, and hire all the faculty and staff needed for expanding schools. There are facilities personnel who can renovate a school building for the first day of classes in 30 business days. The applicant indicated that expanding to serve new grades requires significant time and resources and the teams and school staff begin working more than a year in advance to make sure each expanding school has the leadership, staff, facilities, and equipment to serve additional students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrated that the proposed key personnel have the qualifications, relevant training and experience to implement the project goals and manage to operational functions. As evidenced in the resumes and bios, the CMO has in place an experienced senior management team with experience in business and development, finance, human resources, legal affairs, and communications. The senior team is highly involved in implementing the tasks for each school expansion. The project director has been identified and she is CPA with nearly twenty years of accounting experience with the CMO. She will supervise a team of financial professionals responsible for daily financial operations, cash management, reporting, budgeting, and banking. She has an MBA from Georgia State University and a BS in Accounting from the University of Tennessee. (pgs. 55-61)

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 clearly demonstrated that the CMO is proposing 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. For example, the applicant indicated that the proposed program expansion is committed to attracting and retaining a racially and socioeconomically diverse student body and will seeks to attract all students, including ELLs and special education students, by directing outreach and other recruitment efforts at a broad range of neighborhoods, preschools, and community programs that serve both special education and non-special education students. The commitment is further demonstrated by the fact the current schools consisting of over 11,700 students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL), making up nearly 73% of SA's student population. At 16 SA schools, more than 80% of scholars qualify for FRPL, and at 39 schools, more than 60% of scholars qualify for FRPL. To meet this goal, the applicant indicated their enrollment application is available in Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and French, as well as English. A variety of outreach efforts will be utilized to ensure that every family within a SA school community is aware that their child has the option to apply. (pgs. 13-15)

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 is not responding to CPP 2.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is not responding to CPP 2.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

(iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged

students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrated that the proposed funding Success Academy will open a third high school to serve its rapidly growing population of scholars in SA schools across New York City. The new high will offer a range of supports for any student who is struggling or facing challenges in specific courses, including ELLs and students with disabilities. Teachers and leaders may partner to place students in Academic Intervention courses to supplement core courses, or to provide individualized tutoring free of cost to the scholars in subjects in which a student is experiencing challenges.

The high school design included supports to help students gain college acceptance, but also to help students graduate from college. The SA high school workload is collegiate level and many courses are taught at an Advanced Placement (AP) level, preparing students for the academic demands they will encounter at selective colleges. Currently, all juniors are required to take the AP World History and Literature exams. SA's Honors Humanities program features an online elective in conjunction with Harvard University and Poetry in America. Successful completion of the course earns scholars undergraduate course credit from Harvard. The applicant has a record of graduating scholars who were accepted into competitive colleges, including highly selective schools such as MIT, Emory, and Tufts, many with full scholarships.

Approximately 115 SA high schoolers participated in a wide range of summer programming through the SA Summer Experience program, from academic pre-college programs at schools including Stanford, Brown, Carleton, and Emory. SA also works with businesses and other organizations to identify meaningful internships where scholars can participate, develop their talents, and gain key insights outside of the classroom. Past internships have included stints at Merrill Lynch, Sotheby's, and 300 Entertainment Comprehensive Test Preparation.

Success Academy high schools provide free, comprehensive preparation for the PSAT, SAT, and AP exams. In preparation for each exam, SA currently provides students with an eight-week course, covering foundational topics for the verbal and math sections of the exam, including three or four official practice exams. In 2018, Success Academy high school seniors scored an average of 1263 on their SAT exams, beating the national average of 1068 by 195 points. The applicant provided rigorous goals and project-specific performance measures. (pgs. 19-28)

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:

The applicant is not responding to CPP 4.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is not responding 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: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M180025)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	44
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	6
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M180025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 44

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:

On the 2018 state exams, 98% of Success Academy (SA) students passed math, compared to 43% of NYC students, and 91% passes ELA, compared to 47% of NYC students (e38). SA's ELL and special needs students outperformed their peers citywide by dramatic margins (e17). The applicant provides evidence that their achievement scores are consistently within the top 10% of schools and a majority of schools in the top 5% (e38) for the past 10 years. The applicant operates six national Blue Ribbon schools (e40). SA students with disabilities were more than twice as likely to pass math exams than NYC students without disabilities (e41). ELL students at SA outperformed ELL students across NYC (e43). The applicant provides evidence that the attendance rate across their schools is 97.7% compared to 91% for NYC schools and 94% for NY State schools (e46). SA special education students outperformed NYC special education students by 75 percentage points in math and 58 percentage points in reading (e44).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide sufficient breakdown of the academic performance of racial groups compared to either NYC or NY State.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

The applicant has not had a charter revoked nor has there been any disaffiliation with specific charter schools (e48). The applicant has received 48 charters, including 14 new charters in 2014 and currently serves 16,000 students (e48). The operator works closely with the NYC public school system to implement statutory requirements of IDEA

Sub

(e27). The operator has not requested any waivers.

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 has not had any significant issues with financial or operational management or student safety. The applicant complies with statutory and regulatory requirements including Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, IDEA, and applicable State laws (e48). An audit by the NYC comptroller found that all funds were spent on educating students (e49). Both an accounting firm and SUNY have consistently given SA a high marks for its financial practices (e49). It's most recent audit found no qualified comments.

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: 26

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant's student body is comprised of 81% Black and Hispanic students compared to 66.5% citywide. The applicant presents many examples of the percentage of enrollment by subgroup for its programs (e.g., e108. e201).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide ample information regarding the subgroups attending their schools and either the local community district or the state. The applicant's schools serve less (current and former) ELL (8.3% compared to 13.5%), special education (13.8% versus 19.7%) and FRPL (73% versus 74%) students than NYC schools (e50). The applicant provides extensive student demographics but does not provide comparable numbers for the local schools or the state (e218).

Reader's Score: 11

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

Strengths:

The applicant engages in enhanced recruitment activities example, enhanced recruitment initiatives (e50). The school plans to direct outreach and recruitment efforts at a broad range of neighborhoods preschools, and community programs that serve both special education and non-special education students (e24). The school produces applications in five languages. Application information is disseminated to a broad scope of families, and the school actively reaches out to students with disabilities, ELLs, students from different racial and ethnic groups, and/or economically disadvantaged students (e24). Specifically, the applicant leaves flyers in public housing complexes, low-income communities, local newspapers, community fairs, daycares, and provides tours of their schools (e25). The school added an ELL preference to its weighted lottery (e25). The school offers strategies and interventions that assist in retaining educationally disadvantaged students, including Response to Intervention, extensive special education services, differentiated instruction for high performing students, and a language immersion program. (e29) Parent involvement efforts are extensive (e55).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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 provides and extensive list of goals for the project that will demonstrate its effectiveness in implementing the programs paid for by this grant (e69). The applicant provides a logic model that states the projects proposed outcomes (e51).

Weaknesses:

Aside from listing the goals of the project, there is very little information about the evaluation. The evaluation does not include any review of the proposed expansion, including how effective it was in recruiting the target population. The only goals presented are those that pertain to statewide testing. Some elements of the logic model that are not assessed include: assessment of diverse student body, professional development, the "love of learning and academic persistence", increases access to and ability to graduate from four-year colleges, and retention rates. The applicant does not discuss who will conduct the evaluation. The evaluations described were not specific to the new schools.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

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

Strengths:

The Senior team is highly involved with the implementation of the program (e71). The Project Director is a CPA and a 20 year employee (e71). The applicant has extensive experience in managing both grants and operating their schools after the grant is completed. The applicant provides a multi-year financial model demonstrating how dollars will be spent (e76). The applicant has developed a per pupil expansion cost for most elements of the program (e356). The financial plan includes a justification for all expenses necessary to carry out the proposed expansion and replication (e360). The applicant includes a contingency budget in the event that a school closes during the process (e363). The proposal states that the CMO will raise \$42 million in donations and \$9 million n federal funding (e77).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this area.

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 describes a management structure that separates implementation and development (e75). One board focuses on ensuring schools are properly resourced while the other guides sustainable growth and directions setting. The timeline is realistic and includes major milestones, deliverables, and the project "owner" (e66)

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provides qualifications of the key personnel, most of them are at the corporate level; there is no indication of who will be performing these tasks at the site. In addition, the timeline does not offer specific personnel responsible for the tasks and goals, only departments. Plan is very general not specific to these.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (iii) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project**

Sub

personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))

Strengths:

The applicant provides the qualifications of key personnel involved with the grant (e71). Resumes for these personnel are included. The staff proposed have extensive experience in charter schools

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses 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:

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates an intentional focus on recruiting educationally disadvantaged students. The school plans to direct outreach and recruitment efforts at a broad range of neighborhoods preschools, and community programs that serve both special education and non-special education students (e24). The school produces applications in five languages. Application information is disseminated to a broad scope of families, and the school actively reaches out to students with disabilities, ELLs, students from different racial and ethnic groups, and/or economically disadvantaged students (e24). Specifically, the applicant leaves flyers in public housing complexes, low-income communities, local newspapers, community fairs, daycares, and provides tours of their schools (e25). The school added an ELL preference to its weighted lottery (e25). The school offers strategies and interventions that assist in retaining educationally disadvantaged students, including Response to Intervention, extensive special education services, differentiated instruction for high performing students, and a language immersion program. (e29) Several of their schools recognized for their strong commitment to diversity by The Century Foundation and five of their schools have 3 or more racial groups with populations of at least 10% (e30).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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 did not apply under this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply under this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

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

(v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of

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

Strengths:

The first graduating class was accepted into competitive colleges. AP classes are offered at the school with AP World History and Literature required (e31). The applicant offers a substantial number of internships, electives, summer experiences and travel (e32). The applicant's programs provide free, comprehensive preparation for PSAT, SAT, and AP testing (e32). 100% of seniors met national benchmarks for college readiness compared with 49% nationally (e34). The school provides College Access and Persistence Counselors (e35) to assist with applications, financial aid, and other college advising needs. The applicant provides post-graduation support for students in college (e35). The applicant provides specific performance measures on students' progress on activities related to post-secondary enrollment (e36).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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:

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