

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ASU PREPARATORY ACADEMY (U282M180030)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	28
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	2
Total	112	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: ASU PREPARATORY ACADEMY (U282M180030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 43

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant acknowledges that current data for the newly acquired charter school supported by this application, ASU South Phoenix, is not available but provides data from their elementary and middle school ASU Prep campuses – also a turnaround serving similar demographics. As per the charts on page e29, ASU's campuses generally outperform their local district counterparts, with some ASU campuses having a much larger margin of success than others, namely Polytechnic versus the Phoenix campuses. The former has greater outperformed district comparables and surpassed state scores on ELA and math proficiency on the most recent state exams. On the state letter grades issued by the Arizona State Board of Education, ASU's campuses all score a's and b's versus a "c" and "d" from local counterparts showing a consistency of high marks across schools operated by the applicant. (page e29).

On attendance, ASU's schools all report in the 90's and average 96% as a whole and graduation rates are in the high 90's for ASU's high school campuses. These data points are strong and consistent, especially around attendance and graduation (page e30).

Weaknesses:

The applicant demonstrates a great deal of room to improve retention across its campuses as this data point ranges from 52% to 93% across the portfolio. As requested in the NIA, the applicant didn't provide district or state data for comparison on attendance, retention or graduation rates. (page e30).

Reader's Score: 13

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant notes (pages e30-31) that no ASU school has ever closed, nor has their charter been revoked. They indicate numerous key areas of reporting and oversight to their authorizer and the Auditor General indicating ongoing oversight in the schools' operations.

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:

On page e31 the applicant notes that it has no significant issues or problems with compliance that risk the revocation of its charter.

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 chart on page e32 outlines how ASU overall serves a population of need in line with the state demographics. In the case of the Phoenix and South Phoenix schools the population served is more in line with but not exceeding their district, whose students have even greater challenges and disadvantage.

Sub

Weaknesses:

ASU serves a lesser number of ELL students (p e32) than the district and the state.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

The applicant details on page e33 the techniques and staffing used by the school currently to attract students and widely share enrollment opportunities with the surrounding community. Their techniques range from media promotions (e.g. tv, radio, print and media buys), to in person recruiting at local businesses, and engagement with feeder schools and community organizations. The applicant also has techniques designed to target local communities served by the school, which is largely Latino with ELL needs. Their use of a bilingual Recruitment Coordinator from the same target community demonstrates how they have recognized and attempted to remove enrollment barriers for non-English speaking students and families. The applicant expands to demonstrate the percentages of their current population that are ELL or have disabilities, and the systems in place to meet those needs, while also complying with IDEA. The applicant provides even more detail on pages e50 and e51 of the measures in place to support students with special needs.

Weaknesses:

The applicant doesn't identify specific strategies to target and attract IDEA students (pe50-e51).

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 clearly outlines a plan for ongoing and regular program assessment that identifies the data to be measured, baselines, personnel responsible and the frequency for data reporting in the charts on pages e35 to e37. Clear goals are listed for relevant performance measures requested through this application, namely for performance on state assessments, retention and persistence. The applicant also clearly understands how this data will be reported to the Charter School Program and used to inform internal tracking and performance reporting. The applicant also has selected an independent evaluator to measure ongoing performance and areas for program improvement (page e37). The applicant provides a detailed logic model on page e60 that includes assumptions and external factors impacting their work and clearly notes the flow of inputs, to outputs and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not identify goals for attendance over the grant period, thus they did not provide all requested information.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant uses a major objective of their recently completed I3 grant to demonstrate how they were able to take the resources afforded by grant funding and transition them into sustainable functions to live beyond the scope of grant support (page e40). The applicant also notes that they seek a three year grant, which by the end of the grant period, will have the campus fully scaled; at this point they project the campus will be sustainable on the public funding from student enrollment.

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 includes on pages e39-e40 a chart listing management activities over the course of the summer, fall and spring. The partnerships explained throughout the application (Creative Solutions page e37, ASU iTeachELL pg e33, ASU Officer of American Indian Initiatives pg e33), student recruitment systems already in place (page e33), practices for supporting ELL's and students with disabilities (pages e33-e34) and detail into the academic approach, cadence and follow-through of ASU's assessment plans and blended learning approach (pages e40-e42) do indicate that the applicant has numerous established practices from their other campuses that have already been put into practice leading up to and in the first semester of their turnaround campus.

Weaknesses:

The chart on pages e39-e40 does not include more detailed timelines, clearly defined responsibilities and only very high level milestones. For example, the chart lists "Student Enrollment analysis" but not deadlines, milestones, inputs or any sense of who will manage this. The Grant Budget Worksheet included in the appendix clearly lays out project expenditures, however the applicant has allocated 30% of annual CSP funding to personnel, not including benefits, and equipment expenses in years 2 and 3 of the grant are for maintenance, not acquisition; both items will need review to ensure the spending plan for grant funds aligns with federal requirements.

Sub

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 leadership team responsible for leading the ASU network and overseeing the success of this turnaround school has a wide range of experience in education at charters and traditional public schools across all levels of education, in government and private industry (pages e78 - e97). The leadership team is appropriate given the size of the ASU network. Pages e63 to e65 articulate clear lines of oversight between the board, the staff and the authorizer, and understanding of charter management policies and best practices; for example charter law flexibilities that benefit the populations served (page e65) and requirements for open meetings (page e64).

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 is focusing on a recently acquired turnaround school that serves the local community with a range of challenges and needs. The population of the South Phoenix campus is generally representative of the surrounding district, yet serves slightly more Latino students and a noticeably higher percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch and ELL – demonstrating even greater economic hardship.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes support for a recently reopened campus that will continue to serve the representative population of the surround community. ASU turned its first failing school in 2010 (page e25) with ASU Prep, raising District ratings from a "D" to an "A" in just 3 years. ASU went on to establish a high school at this same location that also received top marks of an "A" rating (page e26). The campus supported by this application was most recently graded as a "D" by the district. The applicant has a clear track record of managing successful schools and turnarounds. The applicant goes on to note the past results of the turnaround school that have gotten it to the point of turnaround.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The 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 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 recognizes that the 1.3% of the population of the school that is Native American does not reflect the need of the surrounding community and local Gila River Indian Community and Pascua Yaqui tribes (page e27). As per the applicant "there exists tremendous opportunity to serve more students with an improved educational program through our collaborative work with ASU's Assistant Vice President (AVP) of Tribal Relations". The AVP has provided a letter of support and has an entire team dedicated to supporting the education of Arizona's 22 tribes; this will be an amazing partnership clearly positioned to help the applicant make inroads in serving a higher number of Native American students. Though they did not provide a letter of support, the applicant notes that they have relationships with a number of Pascua Yaqui tribal leaders through another ASU campus which serves a higher percentage of Native American students (page e27). ASU also plans to create a consultative body of advisors which will include ASU's AVP of Tribal Relations. They do not mention Native American representation on their governing board.

Weaknesses:

The Notice Inviting Applications notes that applicants must aim to serve a "high proportion" of Native American students, which would require a substantial effort to go from 1.3% to a goal unnamed by the applicant with no formal plan in place to achieve that "high proportion". The advisory committee also does not function in a formal governance capacity.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ASU PREPARATORY ACADEMY (U282M180030)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	43
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	13
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	2
Total	112	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: ASU PREPARATORY ACADEMY (U282M180030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 43

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant notes that the four schools in the ASU Prep network all achieved an overall grade of either A or B for the 2018 accountability year, with the grades and the percent of total points earned far exceeding the district comparison schools (p. e29).

ELA proficiency exceeded the state proficiency level except at Phoenix Middle, and math proficiency met or exceeded the state at all campuses except Phoenix Middle (p. e29).

Attendance rates at all ASU Prep schools were 95% or higher; five-year high school graduation rates were 100% at all ASU Prep high schools and four-year graduation rates were above 95% at the respective high school. (p. e30)

Weaknesses:

Retention rates at ASU Prep Casa Grande high were significantly lower than other ASU prep schools at 52.1%. Achievement results are not available for the turnaround campus.

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant states that ASU Prep has not had any schools that 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 (p. e31).

Sub

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 states that there have been no schools that have been 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 (p. e31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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 charter schools operated by ASU Prep serve slightly more students with disabilities (12%) than the Arizona state average (11.8%) and approximately the same percentage as the local district (13.8% RESD) (p. e32).

The current and future enrollment of the school indicates that the school will serve higher percentages of students with disabilities than the state average (15% to 11.8%), ELLs (33% to 13.3 % state) and FRL students (95% to 57%) (p. e50).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Schools operated by ASU Prep currently serve fewer English learners (6%) compared to the state average (13.3%) and the RESD average (19%) as well as fewer Economically Disadvantaged students (54% ASU compared to 57% state and 87% RESD) (p. e32).

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 describes strategies to recruit educationally disadvantaged students, including the use of a bilingual recruitment coordinator, the use of various media strategies, and the outreach efforts to the Gila River Indian Community through the ASU Office of American Indian Initiatives (p. e33).

The applicant notes that students with disabilities are served in accordance with federal IDEA guidelines (p. e34). The applicant also notes efforts to remove barriers from facilities and programs that may affect participation in these programs by students with disabilities (p. e51). Tiered intervention activities are described (p. e70-71) that provide additional assistance to students who are not meeting state academic standards as measured by benchmark assessments.

Weaknesses:

There are no strategies described that specifically detail efforts to identify students with disabilities under Federal Child Find efforts as part of IDEA.

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 notes four objective performance measures that are constructed quantitatively including parent engagement, academic improvement on standardized tests, student persistence and retention, and teacher and leader retention, with qualitative and quantitative intended outcomes clearly linked to the objective performance measures, a general guideline when the outcomes will be generated, and personnel responsible (p. e35-37).

Baseline data is also described for academic improvement and teacher and leader retention objectives (p. e35-37). Outputs in the logic model are described in short term (6 months planning), medium (54 months implementation), and long range (5 year) impact (p. e60).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear what the specific duties of the Director and Network Staff are for each objective performance measure as they are listed as the personnel responsible for each measure (p. e35-37).

In addition, an evaluator (Creative Solutions for Education Partners) will conduct a "thorough and timely evaluation

process (p. e37) but it is unclear if CSEP will be evaluating the programs conducted or the data systems tracking the performance measures (p. e37).

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant notes previous experience with a federal grant as evidence that it can sustain and operate after a grant award has expired (p. e38). The logic model also describes a 5 year, long range impact of grant activities (p. e60).

The applicant describes a robust fiscal management plan which will continue through and after the completion of grant activities, as well as investments in a number of tools and technologies including human capital, financial management, and student information systems that will assist in tracking data related to long range impacts (p. e38, e 60).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses evident 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 management plan lists specific tasks (milestones) that are to be accomplished in the spring, summer, and fall (p. e39). The financial management plan is described in narrative form on pages e71-72 and describes specific costs for each year of the grant under specific categories including personnel, equipment, supplies, contracted services, and other expenses.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the management plan is linked to project objectives and the financial management plan as the applicant does not note specific responsibilities of staff to accomplish tasks related to the milestones, not do the tasks relate directly to the financial management plan (p. e39).

Sub

The spring, summer, and fall designations are not broken down by years in the grant project (p. e39-40).

The financial management plan does not list personnel responsible for accomplishing the tasks on the financial management plan (p. e71-72)

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:

Key project personnel include ASU Prep Chief Executive, Chief Operations Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief of Staff, Chief Talent Officer, and Director of Elementary Learning (p. e44-46). The applicant notes that the team possesses a combined experience of over 100 years and has been involved in the successful turnaround of a perpetually failing school in downtown Phoenix (p. e44).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

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 that ASU Prep has always had an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socially economically diverse backgrounds and attempting to maintain that level of diversity in the school's student body (p. e24). The applicant reports that the South Phoenix campus is closest demographically to the Downtown Phoenix campus and has a student population very similar to the closest district (Roosevelt) with 87.2% of students Hispanic compared to 80.3% of district students, with slightly fewer Black students (7.83% compared to 13%) (p. e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

Strengths:

- (i) The applicant notes success in turning around a failing middle school in 2009, implementing a new curriculum, staff, and mission in two years, moving the school's rating from a "D" in the Arizona accountability system, to an "A" (p. e25-26)**
- (ii) The applicant notes that the turnaround school (formerly Phoenix Collegiate Academy Elementary and Middle School) will serve more students in K-8 than the previous charter school (p. e26) and will serve a student population that represents the same, if not greater level of diversity than the previous charter (p. e24-25).**

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in the applicant's response.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this 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 notes the desire to increase the number of Native American students served at the campus, leveraging current relationships with Native American tribes and the experience the network has in serving Native American students, currently comprising 13% of the ASU Prep network (p. e27-28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes that a consultative body of advisors will be created that will include ASU's AVP of Tribal Relations, but this body of advisors is not described as a governing board. A letter of support from an Indian Tribe or Organization was not included in the application. (p. e27-28)

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ASU PREPARATORY ACADEMY (U282M180030)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the eligible applicant		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	44
Significance		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	28
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting Diversity		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
High School Students		
1. High School Students	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	2
Total	112	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: ASU PREPARATORY ACADEMY (U282M180030)

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:

ASU Prep South Phoenix was in its 1st year of operation and while there is not a state grade, the data chart on page e28 shows progress and achievement letter grades of B and A which supports out performing other charter schools in math and English language arts. In Appendix G, the data shows students in all of the other schools that ASU preparatory schools out performing other students in other public schools.

Weaknesses:

Retention low in one of the high schools with 52% on page e30 which is not as high as the other high schools.

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:

ASU Preparatory has never experienced any closures, revocations, or terminations. Evidence to support this can be found on pages e31 and e32. The audit reports also supports this.

Weaknesses:

None 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:

ASU Preparatory has not experienced any issues with financial or operational management or student safety as noted on pages e31 and e32 and according to the auditor's report in the appendix of the application.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Reader's Score: 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:

Currently, ASU Preparatory educates 12% students with disabilities, 6% of English Language Learners, and 54% economically disadvantaged students. The table on page e32 outlines where ASU Preparatory compares to public schools in the state and in some areas their percentage is either higher or on par with the state average.

Weaknesses:

The English Language Learners district average is higher than ASU currently.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

ASU Preparatory will use a recruitment coordinator to assist with recruitment and enrollment by having open houses and local community events. The coordinator will be bilingual in order to ensure communication and access. The applicant also will use outreach efforts by the Arizona State University Office of American Indian Initiatives as described on page e33.

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not describe efforts to identify students under Child Find under the federal law of IDEA.

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:

ASU Preparatory will hire an outside evaluator, Creative Solutions for Education Partners to assist with the data collection and analysis of the objectives and performance measures as noted on page e35-e37 which fall under parent engagement, academic improvement on standardized tests, persistence and retention for students and teacher and leader retention. A project director will also be hired to evaluate the grant throughout the life of the grant as noted on page e34.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the Creative Solutions for Education Partners will assist with data for CSP grant project or education data analysis.

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: 14

Sub

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

Strengths:

ASU Preparatory currently finances and operates 12 successful charter schools as noted on page e57 of varying types of urban, suburban, online for all grades of K-12. There do not appear to be compliance or auditing issues.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

In the management plan beginning on page e39, there are specific strategies for data analysis and action planning. The plan was adequate with objectives and proposed project timelines and budget. The details reflect the systems that have proven to be successful.

Weaknesses:

The chart on pg39-e40 only provided high level milestones for the objectives. The budget provided 30% for personnel.

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:

All personnel are qualified through relevant training and experience of key project personnel found in resumes beginning on page e78.

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:

ASU Preparatory is actively ensuring a diverse student body through outreach efforts by the Arizona State University Office of American Indian Initiatives on page e33 and e34. Also, their previous student bodies reflect diversity higher than the state average on pages e31-e32.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools

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

Under this priority, applicants must:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative beginning on page e21 suggests that the applicant would like to take over Roosevelt Elementary which has a diverse student population with 84% of students receiving free/ reduced lunch. Last year, ASU Preparatory took over Phoenix Collegiate Academy and is showing on progress in achievement as noted on page e28.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

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

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

students to take standardized college admissions tests;

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

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

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

Strengths:

The 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 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 reaching out to recruit Native American students as they are currently working with the Arizona State University of American Indian Initiatives on page e33.

Weaknesses:

There is not a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization in the application.

Reader's Score: **2**

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