

**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: Scholarship Prep (U282M180018)

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	12
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Scholarship Prep (U282M180018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 44

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides data showing that the schools have outperformed the local school district and state averages for ELA and Math overall, as well as for educationally disadvantaged subgroups (Socioeconomic disadvantaged, ELL, Students with Disabilities (p e28-29). Additionally, the growth rate between 2016 and 2018 indicates that the school is improving at a significantly faster rate than the state, county and local district (p e29). The applicant also provides data supporting strong student attendance, retention and low expulsion rates (p e33).

Weaknesses:

The county outperforms the applicant's schools for overall proficiency rates for ELA (p e29) indicating that there are weaknesses in the ELA instructional program at SPCS. SPCS Oceanside data is less consistent than the other campuses (p e128).

Reader's Score: 14

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 does not disclose any past record of charter revocation or compliance problems. They have not had any issues with compliance and regulatory matters since opening. (p e34).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note in this area.

Sub

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant does not disclose any past record of financial and operational mismanagement. They have not had any issues with compliance and regulatory matters since opening and have received clean audits while maintaining strong reserves at its flagship school (p e34). The executive staff receives ongoing professional development on regulatory matters (p e34).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note in this area.

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 mission to serve underserved, high poverty and minority, foster youth by creating a strong academic, college-bound culture (p e335). The population of SPCS Santa Ana has triple the percentage of ELL students compared to the state average (p e35). The percentage of students with disabilities is similar to comparison district and to the state (p e35). The applicant describes an educational model that is tailored to the needs of educationally disadvantaged students (p e36-37).

Weaknesses:

The comparative data about subgroup populations is not provided and the applicant only states that it "is comparable" and it is difficult to differentiate between campuses and compare to district and state averages (p e35).

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**

Sub

students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.

Strengths:

The applicant uses a lottery system to admit new students and recruits educationally disadvantaged students using targeted recruitment strategies including information meetings and tours, bilingual fliers, brochures and postcards, multiple media outlets and door-to-door visits. The applicant describes an educational model that is tailored to the needs of educationally disadvantaged students (p e36-37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include specific strategies targeted at increasing enrollment of Students with disabilities and has not identified goals or metrics for increasing enrollment.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

A logic model is included and rationale supports each element with goals and objectives that are quantifiable along with how data will be collected (p e50-56). There is a management plan for the expansion and replication that includes a timeline and roles for key staff members (p e63-64).

Weaknesses:

The logic model is not specific to the proposed new schools and expansion sites. It is unclear who will be conducting the evaluation as there is no partnership with an evaluating 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: 12

Sub

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

Sub

(NFP)

Strengths:

The applicant included information about its plans to maintain a budgetary reserve that will never drop below 10% each year and is well above the 3-5% required of charter schools (p e55). The organizational structure is designed strategically to ensure the ability of SPCS to sustain the operation of the replicated schools past the grant period (p e58).

Weaknesses:

Roughly 28% of the funds will be used at the CMO central office level (p e242) and an inadequate explanation is provided about why this is necessary.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes a timeline divided into phases for replication and development which includes responsibilities of the various central office teams (p e63-64). For example, during phase 2, Mr. Mallers will partner with SPCS to secure the facilities that meet the criteria identified in phase 1 (p e62).

Weaknesses:

The timeline could be more thorough with specific milestones that would move the organization towards the expansion and replication of their program.

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 a thorough plan for expansion and has partnered with or hired appropriately qualified people to work on the project (p e 65-67). For example, the applicant has partnered with a real-estate expert with experience in education facilities and the organization is led by a former state senator who happens to be a retired educator (p e62).

Weaknesses:

This is the first major expansion for the organization and it is unclear if their current organizational structure and personnel will meet the needs of the project.

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 founded the school network with the intent of serving educationally disadvantaged students (p e19). The data provided by the applicant indicated that there is a roughly 50/50 split between low-income and non-low-income students (p e20) with English Learners making up over half of the population at one school (SPCS Santa Ana) (p e19). When siting a new school, the applicant intends to seek out neighborhoods where is can create a mixed income and racially integrated school community (p e21).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant discusses employing a diverse staff (no data provided) and including diverse content into school events, the applicant does not provide specific examples of how it intends to target and serve educationally disadvantaged students, beyond those already enrolled.

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 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 identified target locations for high school and has identified staff members with high school experience (p e22). The applicant also plans to provide college counseling and targeted support programs (test prep, credit recovery, scholarship partnerships) for the high school students (p e23). The applicant has created performance measures to use for monitoring the high school program (p e24).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not have an existing high school program to replicate.

Reader's Score: 2

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

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

- (i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--
 - (A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;
 - (B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant 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: Scholarship Prep (U282M180018)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	44
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	28
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	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	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Scholarship Prep (U282M180018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 44

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 data that indicated the current programs in operation have consistently achieved academic growth among all students and improved on their attendance rates as compared to other public schools in the area and in the state. For example, the applicant indicated that during its first year of operation SPCS Santa Ana had a low chronic absenteeism rate of 5.8% for school year 2016-2017, compared with Santa Ana Unified at 6.2%, Orange County at 7.7%, and the State of California at 10.8%. In its second year of operation, the absenteeism rate dropped to 3.8% for school year 2017-2018, compared with Santa Ana Unified at 7.1%, Orange County at 8.3%, and the State of California at 11.1%.

The applicant further documented convincing data indicating that academic performance has outpaced local district on statewide assessments in their first year of operation. For example, SPCS Oceanside on the 2018 statewide assessment (CAASPP) had 49% of its students meet or exceed standards in ELA/Literacy compared to 44% at the local school district, Oceanside Unified. In Mathematics, 38% of SPCS students met or exceeded standards compared to 35% at the local district. Similarly, socioeconomically disadvantaged students excelled in their statewide academic achievement growth in ELA/Literacy by growing by double digits—19% in one year, significantly outperforming comparable SED students of the local district by 19%, the county by 5%, and all SED students in California by 9%. (pgs. 8-10)

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provided positive data to indicate academic growth among students, the data was inconsistent across each campus. For example, the Oceanside School data does not reflect as much growth and out performance among peers in other public schools.

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the SPCS organization is strong in its operations with no financial, operational, safety, or compliance management issues. All schools opened by SPCS continue to be in operation, with no closures or revocations. SPCS has had no significant issues in the areas of financial or non-compliance in operational management. (pg. 17)

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 convincingly demonstrated that the SPCS has experienced no significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school charters. SPCS has had no significant issues in the area of financial or operational management. The applicant indicated that the organization has good annual audits with no adverse or negative findings since opening. The applicant indicated that the organization maintains a balanced budget with positive cash flow, has developed strong reserves at its flagship school to mitigate times of uncertainty. (pg.17)

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: 28

Sub

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 successfully demonstrated that the CMO currently serve 753 students across two schools and that there is a 50/50 breakdown of low-income vs. non-low-income students at the Oceanside campus. The program primarily serves high-needs communities with educationally underserved students who are primarily low-income Hispanic/Latino and African-American students. (pgs. 2-4) The applicant is proposing to expand its enrollment in order to serve 9-12th grade students in two expanded high schools serving 750 students by the 2023-24 school year. The expansion will increase student enrollment to serve greater numbers of educationally disadvantaged students in newly replicated/expanded schools. Over the course of the grant period, SPCS will grow its enrollment from a current baseline of 753 students to 3,550 total students by the 2023- 2024 school year. The expansion will include two additional counties in Southern California (Los Angeles, Riverside) in addition to the two counties in which it currently operates schools (Orange, San Diego). The expansion will increase the geographical region service area, thus allowing for serving greater numbers of educationally disadvantaged students. (pgs. 18-19)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide comparable data to effectively determine if the educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners are experiencing academic growth at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.

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 provided a comprehensive plan to ensure that the charter organization will make every effort during the expansion to recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners. The applicant evidences that currently they have almost tripled the percentage of English Learners compared to the State of California and 17% more than the surrounding district. Similarly, the applicant has a higher percentage of high poverty students (Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, or SED) is higher than the surrounding district and State averages. To ensure similar results could occur during the expansion, the applicant will employ targeted recruitment strategies, such as hold information meetings at local venues and an open enrollment period to provide families with information about the school, its programs, mission, vision, and student support systems as well as conduct tours of the proposed school sites. All recruitment efforts, such as fliers and mailings will include an English/Spanish language translation. The applicant will include a weighted random lottery that is public

The applicant included specific strategies to support educationally disadvantages students such as, recruiting teachers who have a secondary credential as well as bilingual or ESL endorsements (state authorization to teach ELL students)

who not only have training in second language pedagogy but also have experience teaching second language learners and sheltered English classes. Other strategies include, after school tutoring programs that are coordinated with the regular curriculum, and targeted academic interventions aimed at improving performance outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students. (pgs. 20-24)

Sub

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 a detailed and comprehensive evaluation plan that is aligned with performance objectives and evaluation methods that are measurable and has the potential for monitoring and demonstrating progress toward the final objectives throughout the course of the grant period. For example, the applicant indicated that the evaluation will measure the performance objective to close the achievement gap for all subgroups in Mathematics and English Language Arts by 5% annually of the life of the grant. The performance measure will be evaluated and measure through evidence of annual state testing data and internal assessments given to students twice annually prior to testing to will enable tracking for meeting the objective.

Currently, the applicant does not have baseline data for high school students, however, the applicant through the expansion has a performance objective to increase the number of high school students (grades 9-12) by 750 over five years. The applicant is proposing that 100% will take with the SAT or ACT to become college ready and apply for college and these goals will be measured by SAT and ACT Reports. (pgs. 25-32)

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provided charts that appear to be logic models for each objective, the charts did not include common elements of a logic model, such as inputs, outputs and how the model is aligned to the evaluation. The applicant did not clearly align the evaluation with the intended outcomes of the proposed project in the logic model with methods that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.

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**

Sub

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 successfully demonstrated provided substantial evidence that the charter management organization has appropriate funding and support to sustain the charter schools after the grant has ended. The applicant indicated that the organization has and will maintain an 8-10% budgetary reserve each year. In addition, the California Charter School authorizer requires Charter schools to maintain a minimum of 3-5% in budgetary reserves annually. SPCS currently maintains a budgetary reserve of 20% across its two operational sites. In the budget narrative, the applicant indicated that they will fund a \$750,000 Working Capital Line of Credit, using CSP funding, to significantly strengthen its financial position, regarding expanding and replicating high quality charter schools. (pgs. 32-33)

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 reasonably demonstrated that there is a management plan in place to guide the organization in achieving the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities and phase-based timelines. (pgs. 33-35) The applicant provided a narrative that is divided into phases to indicate how the project will be operational managed. For example, in Phase 1 of the expansion plan, the applicant will align its mission statement and conduct a comprehensive community needs and demand assessment to assess the needs of the educationally disadvantaged communities and how the program will be able to meet those needs. (pgs. 34-36)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a timeline that can be reasonably assessed on meeting the required and needed dates for expanding the project. The timeline did not include milestones for meeting deadlines. The information would have been helpful in determining if the project goals will be met over the life of the grant.

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 provided sufficient evidence that the proposed project will be led by qualified key personnel with relevant training and experience. The applicant provided bios and resumes to evidence the experience of the key personnel. For example, the Chief Academic Officer will serve as the Project Director for the grant and will oversee and manage all new charter authorizations. He has extensive experience in working with educationally disadvantaged students and under his leadership has increased the number of students showing proficiency on the state assessment by 15% and 18%. In Phase Five of the grant, the organization will hire site specific key staff, such

Sub

as the Principal and Office Manager.

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 indicated that they currently serve 753 students across two schools and that there is a 50/50 breakdown of low-income vs. non-low-income students at the Oceanside campus. The program primarily serves high-needs communities with educationally underserved students who are primarily low-income Hispanic/Latino and African-American students. Similarly, the applicant has a higher percentage of high poverty students (Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, or SED) is higher than the surrounding district and State averages.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address how the proposed program will address an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially diverse backgrounds.

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 is not addressing CPP2.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is not addressing CPP2.

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 CMO will grow its enrollment in order to serve 9-12th grade students in two expanded high schools serving 750 students by the 2023-24 school year. SPCS plans to replicate its educational model to serve high school students, including those educationally disadvantaged. Two areas have already been identified as target locations for the high school, allowing for existing SPCS students to continue their SPCS educational careers

through 12th grade. Each location was chosen based on its proximity to pre-existing SPCS TK-8 schools and will therefore also serve a large percentage of educationally disadvantaged students. (pgs.5-7) The applicant is proposing that 100% of eligible High School Students will take the SAT or ACT to become college ready. Currently, SPCS baseline data is valued at zero, since it does not have any baseline data with regard to operating a high school.

SPCS will create student schedules that allow for all students to have access to Advanced Placement courses beginning as early as 10th grade. Each SPCS high school will employ at least one (1) full-time Counselor who will and will provide college counseling, admissions requirements and financial aid. The applicant will partner with established companies to provide SAT and ACT prep courses and coordinate and provide access to local, state, and national scholarship opportunities.

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 addressing CPP 4.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is not addressing 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: Scholarship Prep (U282M180018)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	41
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	11
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Scholarship Prep (U282M180018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 41

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 Santa Ana school exceeded the average of local and state students in all categories except one (e29). The school outpaced the state in gains by a large margin (e29). 49% of the applicant's Oceanside School students met or exceeded local school district scores by a small margin (e32). The schools had lower chronic absentee rates than the state or local schools systems (e33). The applicant provides subgroup comparisons showing how students at Santa Ana out performing students in their local school district and the state (e128).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide data disaggregated by targeted subgroup at its Oceanside school. The application does not include any information on student retention. There is insufficient information on students by grade level and by demographic. English Language learners and economically disadvantaged students attending the Oceanside program do not outperform their peers at the local or state level (e128).

Reader's Score: 11

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 has not had any charters revoked nor have they voluntarily closed any schools (e 34). The school has a strong relationship with its authorizers (e34) and the school system. The staff receive training in many areas included leadership from the California Charter School Association (e34).

Sub

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 issues in the areas of financial or operational management. This is evidence by them receiving clean audits with no adverse findings (e34). The school maintains a large cash reserve (e35) helping them manage their finances effectively.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this area

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:

At its Santa Ana site, the applicant serves ELL and high poverty students at rates that exceed the local system or the state (e35). They serve students with disabilities at a comparable rate. At its Oceanside site, the student body is comprised of educationally disadvantaged students at a rate comparable to the local system and the state. Recruitment efforts increased the percentage of targeted students from the first to second year (e36).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provides anecdotal information about enrollment and the composition of their classes, they do not provide numbers that allow for comparison. It is difficult to tell what comparable data means in this applicant and whether the rates are lower or higher than the comparison districts. The Oceanside site serves a relatively low number of low income students that is only slightly above the state average (e24, 33).

Sub

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that its goals are to reduce achievement gaps, accelerate the of the gap closure and exceed standards for educationally disadvantaged children (e36). The applicant proposes to train teachers to work with educationally disadvantaged students each year of the grant (e37). The applicant proposes a longer school day than required to provide extra learning time for students (e38). Interim assessments will be administered to ensure that students remain on pace (e39). The operator created an academic intervention program (FILMS) that focuses on students who struggle to meet grade level standards (e39). The proposed program features extensive contact with families (e41). The applicant describes a robust recruitment protocol as well as a plan to expand to new markets (e 44). The plan includes strategies for recruiting specific groups, including ELLs and SWDs (e48). The school requires all teachers to be certified in Bilingual education. The school provides after school programming.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant offers much special education friendly programming, there is no explicit plan to recruited students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides goals for five distinct areas and these areas focus on the target population (e52). The areas include program growth, achievement, pathways to college, culture, and management capacity (e55). The applicant offers specific targets for their evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a sufficient logic model that offers a theory of action. The proposed evaluation is not specific to the new sites and relies on existing tools and performance measures that do not evaluate the implementation of the proposed programs.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 11

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a multi-year financial model (e230). The financial model shows surpluses for each of the five years. The operator demonstrates an ability to raise additional funds. The applicant provides specific start up and operating costs for each program (e248). The operator presents a detailed organization chart that includes key positions for maintaining the programs (e58)

Weaknesses:

The CMO retains nearly one third of the funding as a management fee (e242), leaving only 20% of the funding available for the proposed high school programs.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides an extensive organization chart (e58). The applicant describes the leadership team and provides examples of their responsibilities within the organization (e59). In addition, the proposal describes the responsibilities of site based staff including the principal (e60). A timeline is included in the application with specific milestones (e61). The applicant includes details on procuring a site for the programming that will be situated in communities housing the targeted groups. (e62).

Weaknesses:

Submission of the charter petition to the authorizer and approval of the replication/expansion by the school's board happens after the award is made (e63). This arrangement makes it difficult to tell who proposed this application; it would be helpful to understand why the process occurred in this order. If they are just formalities or timeline issues, then it should be stated explicitly. The management plan does provide information about key staff, but there is no link to the timeline or milestones and it is difficult to recognize who is responsible for which element of the plan.

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 application includes resumes and descriptions of the relevant experience and training of the key project personnel. The backgrounds of the key personnel match the responsibilities required to implement the program. For example, the CAO will serve as the project director. In his current role, he oversees and manages current CPS grants and the drafting and writing of all new authorization requests (e64).

Sub

Weaknesses:

It is difficult to tell what is relevant since none of the grant functions are linked to the key personnel except in a general manner. This is the operator's first expansion into high school grades (e125).

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 states that it has an intentional focus on recruiting a diverse student body (e19) and includes expected outcomes that include closure of the achievement gap (e15). The applicant's current schools are located in racially, ethnically, and economically diverse communities. The applicant plans to recruit by targeting multiple high-needs communities with primarily Hispanic/Latino and African American students (e20). The applicant seeks to have a racially and linguistically diverse teaching staff (e21). SPCS Seeks out neighborhoods where it is possible to create mixed income and racially integrated school communities (e21).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe a specific plan to increase the number of racially and socially diverse student bodies for the proposed school.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not 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 applicant plans to expand its K-8 programs by adding a high school (e22). The applicant proposes to hire staff that have experience and success with college applicants, graduation rates, and scores on the SAT and ACT (e22). and to provide services that support college applications through counseling, preparation for standardized testing, application completion assistance, and links to scholarships (e23). The applicant currently follows students at college campuses who attended their K-8 programs to provide support, offer training for completing financial aid applications, and maintains a database of their graduated students (e23). The applicant provides performance targets.

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Build the Future Education Collaborative (U282M180029)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	27
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	1
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Build the Future Education Collaborative (U282M180029)

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:

BtF's FCS campus has a long record of success and achieved increasingly better performance in its first decade of operation (p e31). These results continued over all test categories over the past 5 years with FCS students regularly outscoring their district peers by of 15% or more on state exams (p e32). Further they were the only top 5 open enrollment school serving a majority low income population to rank based on 2015 results (p e32). These results extend over the past 3 years when comparing historically underperforming and disadvantaged students to their district peers; the charts on page 9 demonstrate FCS HS students consistently outperforming the district across subjects and years. The applicant notes (p e34) that their students overall have historical graduation rates outperforming the district and closing in on state results. Those considered educationally disadvantaged have shown steadily increasing graduation rates that are close to exceeding the state average (p e34). Most impressive for the population served, although it is not fully low-income (66%) is that 84% of FCS alum persist to their second year of college and are more likely (25% vs. 37%) to graduate from college within 6 years than comparable students across the nation. The results of FCS MS have improved over the past 3 to 4 years where originally their students were underperforming compared to the district across most subjects on state exams. Over time this school has steadily closed the gap with district performance, and in the case of ELA, greatly outperformed the district on state exams (p e36). Both FCS campuses have exceeded the district (with one exception in 2016-17) on retention and attendance year over year (p e38-e39), including when broken out into subpopulations by race, disability and economically disadvantages, though by much smaller margins for the latter 3 groups.

Much less data and comparisons are available for the FCSW campus, however they have surpassed state results at multiple turns, namely in ELA growth for the SAT and achieving the 14th highest scores in math growth for the entire county (p e41). This campus has also achieved the highest ELA and Math proficiency in the state for campuses serving a low-income population as large as theirs (p e43). Graduation and college acceptance data are not available for this campus yet, but attendance and retention rates have risen significantly over the past few years for this young campus (p e43).

At the TFCS campus, Freire has had to do a lot to improve proficiency among its students and is seeing significant growth in literature and algebra, though both have a way to go to best serve their students (p e44). Generally, proficiency rates over the past two years exceeded a local district school with performance margins widening even

Sub

more in 2018, the second year results were available (p e45).

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes that results exceeded the district or state in the narrative at many points on pages e36-e45, but fails to list the specific state results to better inform the reader as to what "exceeded" looks like; an example on page 15 is "for SAT results, our proficiency rate in ELA exceeded the state average." Retention rates for all schools were very low compared to the local district for the same.

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

The applicant notes that all BtF schools are and have always remained in good standing with their authorizers (p e47).

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 BtF's three campuses have any significant compliance issues or significant findings from past reporting (p e47).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Reader's Score: 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 chart on page e27 demonstrates how all BtF campuses exceed the requirement to serve a minimum of 40% low-income students to qualify for grant support. At all BtF campuses, low income students account for a slight (51% at FCSW) to large (73% at TFCS) majority of the student body. Serving students of need is part of the organization's founding purpose. For the past 3 years, BtF's campuses have been on par or served a slightly higher percentage of special education students (p e48).

Weaknesses:

BtF schools do serve a large population of need that is predominantly African American (87%), as they acknowledge on pages e48-e49, which is not the population that English learners typically stem from. While this makes sense and informs the low numbers of ELL across their schools, which serve ELLs at a rate much lower than comparable schools, the applicant provides little beyond offering their application in other languages and contracting translation services to attract more ELL students. As we see at Lea school and in the Philadelphia School District, there are higher numbers of ELL students to be served (p e49).

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes the many elements, programs and resources that make up their model, which includes multiple programs to support social-emotional health in response to trauma and behavioral supports to help students move beyond a place of misbehavior or violence to growth (p e50-e51). On pages e52 through e57 that applicant details their approach to students with IEPs, those we may have undiagnosed special needs, and English learners to ensure each student gets the supports they need to achieve academic success. It is apparent that the applicant has a robust and established approach for students with unique needs that continue to grow as BtF expands.

Weaknesses:

None 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 identifies 3 key objectives for the grant and has supplied a logic model for each objective which demonstrates true understanding of the unique inputs and outcomes of each objective. An even more robust logic model is provided in appendix I 12 with more detailed metrics for measuring short and long-term outcomes. On pages e59-e60 Freire highlights the data systems and Performance Management team in place to monitor and share out all relevant formative and summative data to inform both school results and project outcomes. Finally the grantee has planned, budgeted and selected an external evaluator to measure the impact of an intervention model that will be implemented at the new expansion campuses (e62). The charts on pages e63-e65 detail measures, targets, baselines and context to direct a very developed plan for ongoing evaluation tied to relevant and realistic measures.

Weaknesses:

The only thing the applicant doesn't fully clarify is the oversight for each of the objectives; they do this by naming the evaluator for objective 3 and referencing the Performance Management Team for presumably all of objective 2, but their model could benefit from a "responsibility" column to clearly articulate ownership (p e63-e65).

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: 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 clearly outlines a plan for spending at each school across the grant period that winds down BtF's reliance on grant funds in the later years of the grant before it has officially ended (p e67). Their fundraising projections to support each campus are based on minimum results over the past five years to take a conservative approach to budgeting. The grantee has also added full-time fundraising capacity to the management team and has the backing of established donors and lending partners who have thrown their support behind BtF's expansion (p e68). BtF has a proactive vision for the resources needed and the growth it will sustain to grown their networks.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant goes so far as to provide the job descriptions for new network and school-based positions to be added under the grant and network and school org charts showing growth over time at each location under BtF (appendices I.3 and I.4). They also have a letters of support from their Delaware and Philadelphia authorizers voicing their confidence in BtF's expansion (appendix F). The management timeline on pages e70-e72 details, down to specific dates, the tasks to be completed to ensure the proper opening, expansion and even final reporting on the grant over the full project period; this provides a clear plan, with every activity assigned to a team member, that demonstrates true understanding of the steps and time needed to achieve the goal.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant has identified and will convene a team of network and school leaders to support the grant and subsequent expansion (p e72) that seems adequately staffed with a variety of experienced leaders. This team includes members who have come up through the classroom, managed previous CSP grants before and should clearly understand expectations, have a variety of private sector experience and experience and other high-quality charter networks (appendix B).

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 seeks to expand two campuses in Philadelphia and Wilmington. They anticipate that the Philadelphia campus will continue to serve the predominantly African American that it has established a strong reputation within (p e28). The applicant demonstrates a solid understanding of the surrounding FCSW community, which is admirable and likely helpful in understanding the community (p e29); they finally also provide stats that reinforce what they have been eluding to, that this campus largely serves African American students, but does have some diversity within their student body (p e33). They seek to racial diversity and have conducted informal market analyses to have a better understanding of different racial pockets throughout the service area that they can target their efforts to. Freire anticipates maintaining a low income population around 50% despite the planned growth.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant intends to take measures at one of the proposed expansion schools, just by the placement of the building, to intentionally diversify the population, they admittedly have no plans to do this at their other expansion schools (p e28-e30).

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

students to take standardized college admissions tests;

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant acknowledges how their existing FCSW campus serves high school students, 50% of which are economically disadvantaged and the TFCS campuses serves a higher percentage at 73%. The FCS campus as a whole serves 66% economically disadvantaged students, though it is unclear what this breakdown is between FCS's middle and high schools (p e27).

(ii) No strengths identified.

(iii) No strengths identified.

(iv) The applicant notes numerous quantifiable performance measures for college enrollment, persistence and graduation with targets identified for each year of the project period (p e65).

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant will focus on expanding into elementary school at their campuses already serving high school students.

(ii) The applicant acknowledges a college prep mission on page e50 but doesn't go on to elaborate on explicitly college focused programs (suggested under the priority as AP, dual enrollment, financial counseling, etc) that actually help prepare their high school students.

(iii) While the applicant goes into detail throughout the application on the approaches and tools that fuel their elementary and middle school programs, they don't offer detail on the resources for their current and future graduates to support their path to a college degree.

(iv) The applicant notes a baseline at the flagship campus for college enrollment of 76% and projects how the number will shift in the years ahead (p e65), but they don't provide baselines or much on rationale for college persistence and graduation.

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 competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Build the Future Education Collaborative (U282M180029)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	40
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	90

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Build the Future Education Collaborative (U282M180029)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 40

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:

In regards to the applicant's extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessment and student academic growth 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, FCS-HS students in Philadelphia that are HU (historically underperforming) exceeded both the local district and state averages for 2016-2018 for Algebra, Literature, and Biology as measured on the Keystone Assessment (p. e33).

FCS-MS performance for HU students exceeded the district and state averages for ELA and Science for the years 2016-2018 (p. e36). The applicant notes that in Wilmington, FCSW ELA scores represented growth three times that of the state average in ELA and two times the state average in math in 2017 on the Smarter Balanced Assessment with results in 2018 again higher than the state average (p. e40).

The performance of FCSW students in relation to all Delaware schools on the 2016-17 DSSF in math and reading notes a growth score significantly above the state average for the percentage of low income student population (p. e40).

FCS-HS students exceeded the local district attendance average for African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities by an average of 1-5 percentage points for 2018 (p. e38)

FCSW SAT ELA rates for low income students exceeded the local district and state average for 2018. (p. e43)

Attendance rates for FCSW were only available for all students but the 94.1% in 2018 matched the state's average attendance rate (p. e43)

TFCS saw growth in student proficiency in Literature, Algebra, and Biology in 2018 for educationally disadvantaged students, exceeding the Philadelphia district average for similar student groups (o. e44-45).

Weaknesses:

FCS-MS performance for HU students was below the district and state averages for math for the years 2016-2018 (p. e36).

Proficiency rates for the low-income group at FCSW was slightly (1%) below the average for the same students in the local district for 2018 (p. e40)

FCSW SAT math rates for low income students were below the local district and state average for 2018 (p. e43)

Retention rates for all students at TFCS were 63% in 2017 and 72% in 2018, compared to an overall rate of 82% in the local district for the previous year (p. e46).

Attendance rates for 2016-17 for TFCS for educationally disadvantaged students were below the district and state average (p. e46).

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The applicant reports that there have been no charter schools operated by the CMO that 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 (p. e47) with evidence of renewals for FCS and FCSW in Appendix F of the application.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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 notes that charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have not 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 as evidenced by renewals, audits with no findings, and no notices of deficiency (p. e47).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

Sub

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Reader's Score: 24

Sub

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

Strengths:

In regards to 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, the applicant notes that special education student enrollment at FCS, TFCS, and FCSW exceeds the state and district averages for 2018, with the percentage of this population growing larger from 2016-2018 (p. e48).

The percent of English Learners at TFCS increased from 2016-18, although it remained below the state and district averages (p. e49).

Weaknesses:

The percentage of English Learners at FCS and FCSW decreased from 2016-18 and the overall percentage of students served was well below district and state averages at FCS, TFCS, and FCSW (p. e49).

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 notes strategies 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, including streamlining the application and enrollment process by participating in a common application (Philly) and providing application and enrollment materials in the parent's native language (p. e54-55).

The applicant also notes that they will continue to locate schools in areas that are accessible to a large number of educationally disadvantaged students (p. e55).

The applicant notes a number of detailed strategies to effectively serve special education and English Learners at

Sub

the expanded campuses including daily individual teacher interventions, numerical and reading fluency practices, scaffolding to activate prior knowledge, and the use of data to inform instruction (p. e55-57).

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes that because the schools are located in areas that serve a large number of African American students that the schools have and will continue to have a lower percentage of English Learners than the surrounding districts (p. e49)

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 describes 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, including three objectives (expansion, quality, and knowledge) which are described by specific activities with short/midterm outcomes and long-term outcomes (p. e57-59). These outcomes are quantified by specific performance measures with measurable annual targets, a baseline, and a rationale.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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: 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)**

Sub

Strengths:

A multi-year financial and operating model is presented that has the goal of each expanded campus as self-sustaining in the long term with annual rate increases on average of 2% in Philadelphia and 1% in Delaware (p. e67).

FCSW has a higher student recruitment budget than the Philadelphia schools to ensure that enrollment projections are met at the Delaware schools.

Personnel costs linked to the CSP grant are at the beginning of the grant with additional student enrollment revenue expected to cover the costs of personnel by the mid-period of the grant at the expanded campuses (p. e66).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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 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 is noted by a linear description of 25 milestones with discrete tasks listed under each milestone to be accomplished during the period of the grant. Each of these tasks are directly linked to project personnel involved in the implementation of grant activities (p. e70-72).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The individuals listed as key project personnel include 13 individuals who will have various responsibilities during the grant project. The vast majority of these individuals currently serve at MaST and have significant responsibilities for the successful operation of the current (p. e55-62).

Six additional individuals aside from the key project personnel are listed as having responsibilities during the grant project, bring the total number of staff to 19 who have specific, non-teaching duties related to successful completion of grant activities (p. e62).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

Sub

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 notes strategies to foster an intentional focus on enrolling students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools including locating in the cities of Wilmington and Philadelphia where the majority of residents are low income and maintaining the current four-year average of 70% African American, 12% white and 12% Hispanic students (p. e28-30).

Weaknesses:

Aside from publishing promotional materials and applications in more languages and seeking bilingual recruitment staff (p. e30) the response does not list any specific recruitment strategies to foster an intentional focus on enrolling students from racially and socioeconomically diverse background, aside from locating building in areas that are considered to have the potential of enrolling a diverse population.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address 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 did not address the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Build the Future Education Collaborative (U282M180029)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	42
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	28
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	1
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
Total	112	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Build the Future Education Collaborative (U282M180029)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 42

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides data that supports academic achievement results including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates including student academic growth, high school graduation rates, and college acceptance rates for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school applicant as noted on page e27 with current racial compositions and low income percentage.

Weaknesses:

Proficiency data rates and retention rates are noticeably lower than the district and state average groups as noted on page e40.

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

The applicant has not operated or managed charter schools that have been closed or revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements as noted on page e47.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

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 operated or managed any charter schools that have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety as noted on page e47.

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: 28

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 charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students as noted on pages e29,e48, and e49. SPED population outperformed the state's average as note on page e48.

Weaknesses:

English learners did not perform the state's average in this category.

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 quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to expand to recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners by replicating the model and expanding to serve elementary students as noted on pages e32-e35.

Sub

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 quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project clearly outlines the objective performance measures as described in the applicant's logic model to produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period as noted on pages e57-e62 with bimonthly internal evaluations and a fiscal sustainability plan noted on page e65.

Weaknesses:

There is not clear oversight for objectives 1 and 2.

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: 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 ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated and expanded charter schools after the grant has ended as noted on page e65 and e66. Private fundraising plans will be to raise funds of \$1 million to \$2 million dollars beyond the CSP grant funding period.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

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 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 as noted on pages e70-e72. The CSP funding is designated for specified actions.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The qualifications including relevant training and experience of key project personnel is a strength for the applicant as noted on pages e73-e76.

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 proposes to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools with a focus on socioeconomically diverse backgrounds and racially diverse backgrounds as noted on paged e27-e29.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specifically address the how to recruit students from diverse backgrounds.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

- (i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and
- (ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--
 - (A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and
 - (B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address 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 plans to expand the high-quality charter schools to serve high school students over time with students in the replication model and expansion model of the elementary schools that the CSP grant intends to fund as noted on pages e27-e29.

Weaknesses:

The applicant acknowledges that the English Language Learner population has been lower than the district average at all of the campuses and that the schools in which the applicant pulls students has 0% English Language Learner population. The applicant does not address a clearly identified plan of support for students if the population should increase as noted on page e49.

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 the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:06 PM