

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: InspireNOLA Charter Schools (U282M180026)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	1
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CMO - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: InspireNOLA Charter Schools (U282M180026)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 43

Sub

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

Strengths:

Academic achievement data provided in the narrative supports the fact that this CMO is the top-performing CMO in New Orleans. Outside of the one charter that is not rated due to the fact that it is new to this CMO, all charter schools with the exception of one, have A or B grades. Included in this letter grade is student proficiency, student growth, graduation rate and a score for college and career readiness. These results include the subgroup of special education and ELL students, which score well above both the district and the state. Pg. e32 – e34 and e36

Student attendance rates in comparable with both the district and the state. Pg. e38

Both student retention rates and graduation rates far exceed that of the district schools. Pg. e39 – e41

Additional achievement data is given in the student progress score. This score is a measure of student growth over the course of one year. The applicant outscored the New Orleans Parish District by 11% and the state by 1% overall. Pg. e32 – e33

Weaknesses:

As noted on the table of high school assessments, the consortium schools in Louisiana do not perform as well as their counterparts at the district and the state. Pg. e36

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the

Sub

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 states that no charter school within the consortium has been closed or had a charter revoked for regulatory requirements. Additionally, the consortium has not had to remove any charter schools from the consortium for any reason. Pg. e42

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:

All charter schools operated by the consortium have met the financial and operational requirements without any issues. The member schools within the consortium have had clean audit reports. Additionally, all charter schools have been up to par relative to school safety. Pg. e42 – e43 and e359 – e373

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

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

Strengths:

The consortium services a higher percentage (33% average in all schools) of ELL students than either the surrounding schools (19%) of the state (15%). The special educational population is higher than either state or the district but only by 2% - 4%. Pg. e48

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a recruitment strategy for new charter schools and for charter schools at are “take-over” situations. In a takeover situation the applicant will meet with current students and their families to educate them about the new management strategies and to convince them to stay for the transition. Pg. e53 – e54

Recruiting efforts for new charter schools will include neighborhood meetings, recruiting parents of students that currently attend other charter schools in the consortium to serve as ambassadors for the new charter school, external marketing strategies and hosting activities at the new charter school. Pg. e53 – e54

Weaknesses:

While the recruitment plan includes a short discussion of how to recruit students that are educationally disadvantaged, there are not specific strategies aimed at these students. Additionally, marketing strategies are only written in English and Spanish, but a large percentage of Vietnamese families are within the target population. Pg. e53 – e54

Reader's Score: 11

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:

Overarching goals are defined that include specific objectives along with measurable outcomes. These goals and objectives are aligned to the Logic Model. While the Logic Model has additional activities/outputs and outcomes, the overarching goals are still the same. Pg. e70 and e58 – e59

An evaluation framework is provided that delineates baseline and end of project metrics for each measurable goal. Pg. e60

Weaknesses:

While there are many quantitative results from the monitored goals and objectives, there is not useful qualitative data to provide the soft information needed about each new charter.

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: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

The design of the management plan includes having each charter school self-sufficient on state aide by the time their enrollment is full. Any supplemental grant or philanthropic funding received will be used to assist with start-up charter schools and to purchase the "extra" items schools may need or want. This design will greatly benefit the new charter schools as they will be forced to operate within their means. Pg. e62 – e63

The consortium as a whole plans for long term needs rather than short term fixes thereby assisting the new charters by providing the assistance needed to plan for the future instead of putting a Band-Aid on a problem. Pg. e62 – e63

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:

A detailed management plan is provided that outlines tasks, milestones, responsible parties along with support staff needed for specific tasks and a general timeline. This guide will be followed with the opening of each charter school within this grant project. Pg. e63 – e67

Weaknesses:

The timeline as presented is too broad. Specific dates should be identified for all activities to ensure the project is progressing as needed. Pg. e57

Reader's Score: 3

Sub

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

Strengths:

All members of the project team have excellent qualifications for the positions they are holding. There are many years of collective experience and expertise in areas that will benefit charter school operations (education, finance, leadership) Pg. e370 – e319 and e66 – e68

Resumes indicate individuals familiar with charter schools and education in general and also reflect years of service with both partners within this particular consortium. Employee longevity can be a positive aspect in keeping the culture of the consortium in place when new charters are opened. Pg. e66 – e68 and e307 – e319

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 currently serves a population that closely mirrors that of the surrounding district. Each new charter school in the consortium will intentionally recruit students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds as state in the narrative. The goal of this recruitment is to keep the percentages close to that of the city and state. Pg. e20

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not report subgroup populations by individual charter school. Percentages are provided as a range of totals for all charter schools in the network. Pg. e24

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 has had the opportunity to take over three poor performing charter schools. Results have been very good with proficiency rates on state assessments increasing overall even though the assessment continues to become more difficult. One of the takeover charter schools scored the highest growth scores in the city of New Orleans. Pg. e25 – e27

The consortium has been awarded low performing schools as takeovers in both New Orleans and Baton Rouge that will be opening 2019-2020. These schools will have similar demographic populations as in the prior years of their operation and will be operated using the same successful model. Pg. e27

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

(iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An

applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

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

Strengths:

Expansion of a current high school will provide an additional 100 student seats. The high school model is proposed to be replicated within the grant project within geographic areas with similar demographics as current high school operated by the applicant. Pg. e27 – e28

Weaknesses:

While charts are shown that indicate percentages of students that enroll in college, there is no discussion to indicate assistance will be given to help students obtain a degree or certificate. Pg. e26 – e27

The applicant did not address sub-priorities ii, iii or iv.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this criterion.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this criterion.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: InspireNOLA Charter Schools (U282M180026)

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	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CMO - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: InspireNOLA Charter Schools (U282M180026)

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:

As evidenced by the State performance measures and grading system, Inspire NOLA outperforms the district and state in absolute performance, as well as specified progress measures (pg. e32). Further, these levels of performance were disaggregated by each school to demonstrate the academic success being achieved at each campus. Of the schools eligible for review, 80% surpassed the district and state performance scores, and 83.3% surpassed the district in student progress scores. It is worth highlighting that the takeover school, McDonogh, received a score of 90.0 and a letter grade of A on the student progress measures, demonstrating the single-year effectiveness of the Consortium on student growth in a historically low performing school.

At the elementary level, every single student subgroup with a sufficient sample size outperformed the local district and state on the most recent state assessment (pg. e36). This included students who are economically disadvantaged, students who identify as minority, students with disabilities, as well as those who are receiving services for English Language Acquisition. It should be noted, too, that these proficiency rates surpass these comparison groups by nearly 10 percentage points for students from low-income families and students who are minority and exceed these comparison groups by almost 20 percentage points for students who are English Language Learners.

High school results reflect some bright spots in network school performance (pg. e38), with subgroup performance at Edna Karr surpassing the local district and state for students from low-income families, students who identify as minority, and students identified as English Language Learners. The second high school in the existing network, Eleanor McMain, surpassed both comparison groups for students with disabilities.

Retention rates provided in the application (pg. e39) demonstrate a strong pattern of stability for Inspire NOLA. The most recent retention rate of 96% has improved from prior years and surpasses that of the local district. These rates were also disaggregated by campus and reveal comparable success along this indicator for all network schools.

High school graduation and college enrollment figures far outpace the local district and state of Louisiana (pg. e40-

Sub

41). In many cases, these rates are nearly 20 percentage points higher than these comparison groups for students who are minority and students with disabilities.

Weaknesses:

Although it was the first year of administration of the high school state assessment, high school proficiency rates do not demonstrate the same Consortium-level success as those of elementary students (pg. e36). Only one high school outperformed the local district, and neither of the high schools outperformed the state average.

Testing sample sizes were not included in the results provided with the application for elementary or high school students. This made it difficult to validate some of the statements around the impact of the service profile on testing, as not all grades take state assessments. If concentrations of the school's diverse populations rest in untested grades (such as primary grades or 11th and 12th grade), statements about performing above, on par, or just slightly below the district and state 'which serve much lower levels of educationally disadvantaged students' (pg. e37) may not be factual, as Consortium testers may not be representative of the overall population.

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

None of the seven schools currently operated by InspireNOLA, nor managed by either affiliate partner (InspireNOLA and Edward Hynes Charter School) have closed or been revoked (pg. e42).

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:

None of the seven schools currently operated by InspireNOLA have had any issues that could lead to revocation, nor have they had significant issues in the area of financial or operational management (pg. e42). These are noted as being validated by the authorizer's annual review process.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear why the application does not provide these annual reviews from the authorizer to validate its status of good standing. The letter provided by the sponsoring district, the Orleans Parish Charter Board (pg. e93) does not reference the status or financial and operational performance the schools in their letter of support. Instead, it is comprised of stock or form language that is found replicated in other letters of support (pg. e91, e95, e96).

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Reader's Score: 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 application highlights the academic demand for the network schools in New Orleans and Baton Rouge, noting that in New Orleans only 8% of schools are rated as an A, and in Baton Rouge, only 10% received that rating—meanwhile, in both districts, nearly 50% of schools received a D or F (pg. e43). These districts combined serve over 85,000 students, many of whom are educationally disadvantaged.

The schools implement a variety of interventions for students who may not be performing at grade-level, taking a holistic approach that encompasses small group instruction, tiered skills work at the beginning of each class, wraparound supports ranging from the employment of full-time counselors and social workers to specialists in trauma and grief counseling (pg. e44-46). Many of these interventions are targeted towards educationally disadvantaged students, with full-time interventionists, special education teachers, and ELL teachers prepared for implementation. These strategies and staff structure both validate the plan's proposal to enable students to meet the challenging academic standards of the state.

The service profiles and success rates of each existing network school are on par or surpass those of the local district and statewide levels of service and performance (pg. e46). Of those with larger disparities in academic performance, it is noted that they were both historically low-performing schools that InspireNOLA has worked to turnaround in the past two years, with both schools demonstrating large subgroup gains. Specific successes were highlighted in the application with regard to the performance of English learners, who have produced Consortium-level proficiency rates that are double that of the state (pg. e48).

A majority of students in the Consortium produced the highest levels of growth possible between test administrations on the state assessment (pg. e48). This growth distribution holds in disaggregation for low-income students, students who are minority, and English learners, with a majority of these students producing 'top growth' at a rate that surpasses the local district and the state. In fact, based on an analysis conducted by the Louisiana Department of Education, the InspireNOLA Consortium surpassed more than two-thirds of schools in the state in overall performance of students who are low-income, minority, and English learners (pg. e53).

Weaknesses:

Students with disabilities in the Consortium do not see the same proportion of students producing 'top growth' as other student groups or the Consortium as a whole. Less than 1 in 2 of these students satisfied this criterion (pg. e48). Although these levels are on par or slightly higher than the comparison group distribution, the application does not sufficiently address the within-network growth disparity.

Sub

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The Applicant has practices in place that it proposes to replicate around parent and family engagement (pg. e46). These activities range from in-person feedback sessions to surveying to school-specific parent-teacher organizations that serve in advisory capacity to the local boards. These will be utilized with the parents and families of the low-performing schools that the school is planning to absorb operations of, so that families can provide input on both positive aspects of the school that they wish to see continue, as well as things that could be improved. These strategies for garnering buy-in will help to promote the retention and support of the community for the new management.

Strategies for outreach and recruitment have been well-developed, with differentiation by intended outcome between retention for takeover schools and recruitment for new schools (pg. e53-54). Activities will likely reach a variety of audiences, as they include parent referrals, listening tours, presentations at local churches and community events, and external marketing that will be multi-modal.

Weaknesses:

The application proposed to translate marketing materials that are part of its recruitment strategy into English and Spanish (pg. e54). Demographic figures from target locations were not provided to determine whether this was a sufficient strategy for reaching all potentially interested families and communities. If current schools utilize translation services in Vietnamese, and part of the target location includes New Orleans (pg. e25), it is unclear why the proposed plan focuses only on the languages of English and Spanish.

The plan for recruitment does not address common the common access barriers of transportation or food service in the application. These barriers often reduce the level of interest between recruitment and enrollment.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

The application includes measurable objectives that span beyond academic performance, and gauge success in the operational and financial endeavors of the expansion plan (pg. e57). One example of this is a multi-year target of school and seat expansions that demonstrate both growth and stability at existing and additional campuses. These 5-year figures disaggregated by campus evidence the reasonableness of the overall goal to create more than 5,000 additional seats in 5 years. Sub-indicators are also included for demand beyond enrollment goals, with specifications around excess interest and lottery utility (pg. e59).

Although the overarching academic goals are qualified by enrollment duration (pg. e59), the evaluation framework provided does include baseline targets as well. This will allow the group to assess progress in Years 1 and 2, making

necessary determinations about needed interventions or adaptations. Further, the plan for tracking student performance involves advanced analytics that considers covariates like mobility (pg. e61). This will allow for more robust and specific findings during periods of evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The application noted performance dashboards that are used by the Consortium to support continuous improvement at a variety of levels, including the central office, school, and classroom (pg. e55). The appendices did not include copies of these, making it difficult to validate the statements around the 'culture of evidence-based decision-making' that exists to date.

The baseline financial target is that 57% of CMO schools will be operating within their approved budgets (pg. e60). Information was not provided to determine whether this was typical, nor is it clear why financial oversight and internal controls would not yield goals of 100% between the baseline and 2024 targets. Further, if only 57% of schools are operating within budget, it makes it unclear how this might affect the status of good standing each school and the Consortium carries with the authorizer and State, as well as its potential impact to the grant requirements.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

The Consortium currently operates on per pupil state and local funding, as well as federal entitlement supplemental funds (pg. e62). Philanthropic and grant funds are treated as supplemental, and independent of core business operations. These are utilized for start-up work until enrollment reaches a threshold of sustainability in newer schools. This practice ensures stability long-term of essential functions and prevents a reliance on soft funding. Further, 73% of funding is spent directly in the classroom, indicating that ancillary and administrative costs are kept intentionally low.

Many of the anticipated expenses in the proposal (pg. e63) are one-time, front-end costs. These include planning year salaries, as well as the purchasing of technology and equipment. Plans for replenishment will mirror existing schools and span several years to ensure the spreading of these costs moving forward.

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 management plan includes details around tasks, milestones, timelines, and responsibilities of key personnel across activities and tied to project goal constructs (pg. e64). The key buckets of planning ensure focus and progress monitoring along each of the key activities of the proposal, ranging from grant implementation and staffing to operations and facilities to actual program instruction and implementation.

Transitions in responsibilities as staff come on board are evidence in the management plan. For example, the responsibilities before and after the hiring of the head of school appropriately reflect the passing of that proverbial baton, and utilize a timeline that allows for adequate planning and flexibility if slight variations exist in the timelines for hiring key personnel (pg. e65).

Weaknesses:

The management plan lacked specificity in its plans to monitor the progress of tasks identified within the plan (pg. e65). In many cases, the timeline affiliated with monitoring practices were broad and extended or notably intermittent. This lack of specific dates and progress measures to evaluate the fidelity and effectiveness of plan implementation could delay identification of needed changes or even successes that should be expanded or replicated.

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 CEO of the network, Jamar McKneely, brings a breadth of leadership expertise to the table, including specific experience in school turnaround efforts, experience in a charter school, as well as a background in school finance. Additionally, the CFO has a specific background in charter school work, but also brings expertise from the higher education arena, where he specifically managed multi-million dollar grants. The Chief Academic Officer has experience in the district office, with a specific role in turnaround processes and requirements. Combined, the leadership team has significant and relevant experience that would support the implementation of the proposed expansion plan (pg. e73).

Weaknesses:

Although the founding team has significant experience, the lack of independent participation in some areas of review and evaluation may pose challenges in the ability of the group to objectively assess or adapt the plan as necessary. Being this close to the project and results may lead to a natural confirmation bias, wherein they search for, interpret, and recall or present information more readily that fits their pre-existing goals.

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 provides evidence of its intentional focus on recruiting students from diverse backgrounds by emphasizing existing practices, wherein a majority of students in the Consortium network schools are low-income and identify as minority (pg. e17).

Specific efforts around recruitment were referenced to emphasize a focus on diversity, including translation of marketing materials to English, Spanish, and Vietnamese (pg. e25). It is further noted that translation services are available at each Consortium location. These ensure equity in access across a racially diverse community and portfolio.

Weaknesses:

The application states that the service profiles of existing schools demonstrate that schools within the InspireNOLA Consortium place emphasis on recruiting, enrolling, and retaining a diverse group of students (pg. e25). However, the campus figures include a range in diversity where the lower end includes schools with less than 33% of students categorized as low income, only 50% identifying as minority, and having only 1% of students identified as English learners. This broad range in figures between campuses suggests that not all schools within the Consortium place the same emphasis on recruiting, enrolling, and retaining diverse groups of students.

It is noted in the application schools focus their recruitment efforts on neighborhoods and communities with the greatest need (pg. e25). This is immediately followed by a statement that they also work to increase the number of students from higher income strata as well. This makes it difficult to validate which of these two efforts is given the most attention, as well as which garners the most success.

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 proposal includes an expressed intent to reopen a chronically poor-performing school, labeled with a D rating and categorized with a label by the State of 'urgent intervention needed' (pg. e25). Further, this reopening of McDonogh 35 Senior High School under the operation of InspireNOLA was approved by the charter authorizer in December. Beyond this, the Consortium was approved by a second authorizer and the Recovery School District in the State to open and/or takeover operation of schools in Baton Rouge. Combined, these guarantee the local approval necessary to undertake this proposal has already been granted at the state level.

InspireNOLA has proven past success in working with schools designated as persistently low-achieving. There have been three examples where InspireNOLA assumed operations of failing schools in a turnaround capacity, and produced marked improvements in student performance, including some of the highest gains in New Orleans with some of the state's lowest performing schools (pg. e26).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal includes plans to expand the Consortium to include two additional high schools, with evidence of success with current high school operations (pg. e28) as rationale. The current high schools served by the Consortium mirror the state and local districts in composition, with a majority of students identifying as minority and coming from low-income families.

The objectives of the Consortium explicitly include emphasis on postsecondary readiness and activity. Both Graduation rates and college enrollment percentages were provided in the application. The existing high schools far outperform the district and state graduation and college enrollment rates. This is particularly true when the rates are disaggregated by race and income, with InspireNOLA students exceeding the district and state by nearly 20 percentage points in graduation rate and nearly 15 percentage points in college enrollment rates.

Weaknesses:

The application does not sufficiently describe its efforts around preparing students for enrollment in postsecondary endeavors. Further, no performance measures are proposed to review or analyze their efforts in postsecondary support. Discussion of how the Applicant proposed to help students remain in college and complete postsecondary programming is absent.

Reader's Score: 2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Applicant doesn't address priority.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: InspireNOLA Charter Schools (U282M180026)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
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	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CMO - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: InspireNOLA Charter Schools (U282M180026)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 43

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided convincing evidence that in the most recent year, elementary students in its consortium schools outperformed the district state assessment average by 8% and are comparable to that of the state (p. e35). Its educationally disadvantaged students, minority students, students with disabilities, and ELL outperformed their subgroup peers in both district and state comparisons in every single subgroup (p. e36).

The similar achievement pattern is evident in its high school despite the fact that the school was taken over by the applicant for one year and previously having been a struggling and academically declining school (p. e 37-38).

The consortium schools have maintained steady and comparable attendance rates over the past three years (p. e39). Each school has a Student Support Team consisting of head of school, dean of culture, social work, counselor, and nurse to identifying and responding to chronic absenteeism, which is to be commended (p. e38).

The overall student retention rate has exceeded the district average in the past two years (p. e39).

The applicant provided convincing evidence that both high schools achieved an overall graduation rate exceeding the district graduation rate by 14% and the state graduation rate by 9% (p. e40). Economically disadvantaged students achieved a graduation rate of 91% which is 18% higher than the district and state. Minority students achieved a graduate rate nearly 20% higher than the district and the state, while Sped. students acquired 40% higher than that of the district and state peer subgroup (p. e40-41).

In addition, the percentage of consortium schools students enrolled in college is much higher than their peers in the district and the state in every subgroup of economically disadvantaged, minority, and Sped. (p. e41-42).

Weaknesses:

The applicant only reported high school student proficiency on the state assessment results from each high school (p. e35), no comparison data from the local school districts and the state average were evident. The applicant provided insufficient evidence to demonstrate the performance of its high school students comparing to such students in the state.

Sub

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

No schools have been closed or revoked (p. e42).

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:

No financial, operational, safety or compliance issues were identified (p. e42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Reader's Score: 26

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided convincing data that overall consortium school subgroup students achieved higher than the district and state subgroup peers on the state assessment. Student with disabilities and ELL students in consortium schools achieved 17 % and 33% proficiency on the state assessment compared to their peers with 13% and 19% in the district, and 15% and 15% in the state respectively (p. e47-48). Every single economically disadvantaged

Sub

subgroup in the consortium schools outperformed both local district and the state (p. e48). The same pattern applies to the high school students (p. e50-51). The consortium high school students exceeded the average academic progress results for their peers in the district and the state. Students with disabilities and ELL student achieved 40% and 45% proficiency on the state assessment compared to their counter peers of 38% and 45% in the district and 38% and 40% in the state respectively (p. e. 50). In addition, the applicant quoted data from the state department of education indicating that in consortium schools, economically disadvantaged students, minority students and students with disabilities performed better than 67%, 70% and 73% respectively of all LA schools (p. e53).

Weaknesses:

Per the presented data (p. e51), the results of subgroups in one of the high schools were below the state subgroup comparisons. The applicant is aware of the struggles but did not elaborate on the strategies to assist those students to close the gap.

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposed several strategies to recruit and retain students through parent outreach and referrals, community outreach, and external marketing (p. e54). Recruitment materials and presentations will be available in English, Spanish and translation services will be available to all students and families throughout the enrollment process (p. e53).

The applicant proposed a holistic approach to meet the needs of students. Strategies include innovative period every day when all students receive small group instruction tailored to their needs, tutoring after school, weekend and summer for students who need additional instructional time. In addition, each school provides social workers, counselors, nurses, behavioral deans and parent liaisons to support and better serve students (p. e45).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not specify how to recruit and enroll students with disabilities except mentioning that all meeting and events will be held in facilities that are accessible to persons with disabilities (p. e53).

The applicant did not elaborate on strategies to effectively serve students with disabilities and ELLs.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposed two goals using objective performance measures aligned with the outcomes. All components in the logic model are aligned (p. e70).

Under each goal, multiple objectives are projected. All outcomes are measurable aligned with the objectives. The

applicant also proposed performance measures under each goal based on the baseline data (p. e58-60). Further, the applicant provided the evaluation framework explaining how data are collected addressing the evaluation questions and evaluation methods (p. e61-62).

Weaknesses:

Qualitative data collection was limited. For example, "Invest and involve the community" was one of the activities and outputs proposed. However, methods to collect qualitative data on parent involvement and school culture were absent (p. e70).

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: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposed a sound management plan demonstrating its ability to sustain the operation of the schools after the grant ends through public funding per pupil state and local funding and federal entitlement programs such as Title I, Title II, etc. (p. e62).

The applicant expected that schools will be self-sustaining through available funding from state, local, and private funding once the enrollment reaches its goal (p. e62-63), that is reasonable and achievable.

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 clear and reasonable timeline on school and seat expansion (p. e57), that is incremental and achievable (p. e57-58).

The applicant proposed a sound management plan with specified tasks including milestones, timeline, personal responsible and support staff needed to achieve the goals (p. e64-65).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Milestones provided were a task-to-do list. Products and deliverables were not specified. Timelines on some activities were general lasting an extended period of time to track its progress, for example, "Design and implement recruitment campaign for new students" – "annually, beginning six to nine months prior to new school opening", it lacked specificity to monitor the task progressing.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The applicant presented its team consisting of qualified individuals with extensive experience in operating charter schools. The team includes the founder of the organization, chief financial officer, chief academic officer, director of strategy and advancement, and principal of its partner school, who have combined expertise in nearly all the areas of launching charter schools (p. e67-68). The team has demonstrated its ability that would most likely to achieve desired outcomes as evidenced by the data and information provided in the application.

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 currently operates 6 schools serving a diverse student population with an overall average of 91% minority, 76% economically disadvantaged, 9% Sped. and 6% ELL. The applicant intended to serve a similar percentage of student population in the next five years through expansion or replication operating a total of 15 schools (p. e24). The applicant identified to take over a district school continuing to serve current student population with 100% minority, 1% ELL, and 88% economically disadvantaged students (p. e26).

In addition, the applicant intended to promote diversity within its student population through student recruitment efforts by providing school materials in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese and translation service available at all schools (p. e25).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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:

i) The applicant demonstrated past success working with poor-performing schools as evidenced by taking over three schools and turning two schools around supported by student performance data (p. e26-27). In one school, student performance has increased from 10% to 26% proficiency on state assessment in ELA and Math after the applicant taking over in two years. In another school, student performance has increased from 6% to 13% proficiency on state assessment in ELA and Math in one year after being taken over by the applicant, the highest growth of any school in the state. Student performance data were not available for the third school due to the fact that the school was taken over in 2018.

ii) The applicant proposed to request the grant funds to assume operation of 6 previously failing or low-performing district and chart schools, expanding one existing charter high school and opening two new elementary schools through replication and expansion (p. e17). The demographic of student target population will remain the same.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International

Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant intended to expand one of the high school to serve an additional 100 students and operate two additional high schools maintaining a comparable percentage of educationally disadvantages students as the district and state through replication (p. e27).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the elements of preparing students for enrollment in postsecondary schools, providing support to students in attaining degree or certificate after their graduation (p. e27-28). No performance measure was proposed to yield information about the applicant's progress in preparing students for enrollment in postsecondary institutions.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

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

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

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

(ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located

within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and

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

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

CCP was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:09 PM