

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/11/2016 03:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Carmen High School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160030)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	45
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	9
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Total	108	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Charter Management Organization - 1: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Carmen High School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

Strengths:

The applicant presents clear data comparisons both within schools and also across the district and state with some comparisons to local MPS schools. Performance is broken out by subgroupings to further illuminate performance that exceeds district norms. Solid evidence of achievement across campuses in more recent years demonstrates academic stability with the current model. (pages 30-32 and Appendix F)

Weaknesses:

Although there has been inconsistency in distract-mandated tests, it would have been good to see more data from the applicant around performance in years past to leave no doubt around the strength and consistency of their results over time, even if data sets are incomplete.

Reader's Score: 18

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

Strengths:

Carmen has achieved strong and consistent results around college enrollment with clear comparisons to district, state and national results that show obvious achievement in closing gaps around college access.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

Limited evidence is presented around results at the middle school grades, but the data presented around compliance metrics is compelling. It would be good to see more evidence showing progress over the past three years.

Reader's Score: 12

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

Strengths:

Carmen present data going back three years or more to demonstrate both network and school-level results that have consistently surpassed local traditional public schools, the district and state. Trends show stability and, in many cases, continuously improved results around key indicators of participation (attendance and retention) and outcome-oriented metrics (college enrollment and persistence). (Appendix F and pages 33-34)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

The application details a wide array of academic programs designed to expose and build competency in core subject areas, while also preparing students for the rigors of post-secondary education (pages 37-41). Procedures are highlighted that ensure equal access and remove barriers to participation for disadvantaged students (i.e. AP fees on page 38). The CMO has impressive collaborations with local colleges to expose students and help them get a head start on college credits; all of which will encourage college enrollment and persistence (page 38).

Weaknesses:

The applicant addresses the proposed locations and student populations to be served, but it would be good to have more insight into the elements of the model that are believed to provide the best supports for Carmen's future students - to demonstrate a deeper understanding of the populations' unique needs. Little was said around how the model accommodates SPED or ELL students.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides clearly defined SMART goals that set high, but achievable expectations relative to the performance of the founding campus, the populations to be served, and district and state performance (pages 49-52). The timeline included in the management plan outlines responsibilities and parameters that demonstrate applicant's understanding of the process for and challenges with opening new schools.

Weaknesses:

Carmen has set ambitious and possibly overreaching goals for their partnership with Pulaski High School (pages 51-52). Even if objectives aren't met with the time frame of the grant, the partnership will likely result in progress for the high school.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 19

Sub Question

1. **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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The application demonstrates thoughtful planning and procedure to transition its growing organization in the coming years. Evidence is provided of necessary internal structures to support the organization through its growth (pages 53-56).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 4

2. **The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant details key teams at the network and their role in leading the growth of Carmen (pages 57-62). They acknowledge that over the past few years they have been bolstering central office administration in preparation for significant growth (page 59). They also note a "positive working relationship with MPS" which assumes facilities support in the charter's favor in the coming years.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

3. **A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant includes detailed, multi-year projections that account for proposed campuses in addition to campus specific five year projections in Appendix G. These projections do acknowledge a CMO deficit for each of the next four years and identify a \$5.4MM cash infusion during these early years of growth until enrollment catches up.

Weaknesses:

The model assumes a supportive district and favorable funding in the years ahead (page 58). While this is reasonable, just a few sentences before they noted that Carmen has operated under three leadership changes within MPS and a shifting school board over the past ten years. Given substantial transitions within their authorizer, they may be too optimistic about the future landscape.

Reader's Score: 3

4. **The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a plan for the closing of schools detailed on page 505 in Appendix H that shows clear responsibilities and roles in the event of the dissolution of a Carmen school.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

5. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

Carmen has qualified staff in place with experience and skills appropriate to execute their business plan and growth with competence (pages 67-72). They bring an understanding of varying educational models, including experience from some of the nation's best CMOs.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 project.**

Strengths:

The applicant has plans to conduct a quasi-experimental design or RCT at two of the new school sites (pages 72-74) and is already in the planning phase with qualified analysts. The evaluation's aim is on-point to provide finding that would allow for best practice sharing and model implementation outside of Carmen's schools, most likely with Pulaski and other struggling MPS schools.

Weaknesses:

The application does not speak to evaluation plans in place separate from an external study to abide by reporting components required of CSP applicants. In regards to the third party study, little is said about the timeline of the study, nor buy-in from Pulaski high school to ensure the study can proceed as designed with full participation from all parties. No details on how data will be received on the students in the control group for the RCT. It's a strong start, but there is much to be determined around the evaluation.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. **This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.**

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one

or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility, and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisезones. The certification form is available at https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

The application clearly outlines partnerships planned throughout the district and community as evidence that they are taking steps towards school improvement in Milwaukee. For example the note their participation in Schools That Can Milwaukee to share their best practices with others that have been determinants of Carmen's success (page 21). They provide evidence of the impact of past collaborations and speak to true partnerships with the district and local community based organizations that are already in play at the Carmen Northwest campus. Finally, the lay out clear plans for knowledge sharing and development of Pulaski High School.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --

- (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing

policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Strengths:

The applicant is clearly aware of how and why their SPED population may be slightly lower than the district, and appears to be working within charter parameters to increase services to this population. They have a record of success serving and transitioning student out of ELL status. Additionally they have made realistic efforts to promote diversity among their campuses despite segregated communities in MPS.

Weaknesses:

I would like to hear more about their efforts to reach families of students with special education needs and how they ensure there is no bias in the enrollment process against these students.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/11/2016 03:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/05/2016 11:47 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Carmen High School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160030)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	32
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	8
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	8
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Total	108	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Charter Management Organization - 1: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Carmen High School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 32

Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

Strengths:

Over the three year period of 2013-16, the applicant has demonstrated consistent growth in achievement, evident in NWEA MAP math and reading when averaged over the three year period and compared to MPS, especially given the high percentage of students from low income homes that Carmen serves relative to the entirety of MPS. ACT Junior testing for 2015 and 2016 at Carmen, especially in comparison with available 2015 data for MPS and specific surrounding area schools, is evidence for increasing academic attainment and college readiness for its students. Carmen's percent of graduating seniors having passed one or more AP exams in high school is remarkable, especially relative to Wisconsin and MPS over the past two years. College enrollment following graduation for Carmen's class of 2015 is also remarkable, especially relative to Wisconsin and MPS.

Weaknesses:

Over the three year period of 2013-16, the applicant does not address the substantial drop in number of students meeting or exceeding MAP growth goals from the original 6th grade cohort, from 58% to 49% in math. There is not a three-year track record available for examination in each of the referenced data sets. Subgroup data breakdowns appear incomplete.

Reader's Score: 12

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

Sub Question

Strengths:

In the context of its middle school charter with MPS, Carmen is evaluated on a gap closure formula targeting, at minimum, a 15% gap reduction to remain compliant. Carmen outperformed the district and exceeded the target with 64% closure in math and 19.5% in reading, compared to 1% MPS-wide in both (p. 16). Table 6, Appendix F shows substantial gap closure for middle school African American students for 2015.

Weaknesses:

The applicant doesn't present a three-year track record of evidence in Table 6. While table three, referenced in the narrative shows a three-year track record relative to senior ACT scores relative to MPS, table four has two years' data – although that data is contextualized in comparison to area schools and is very strong. The applicant does not address all subgroups; noticeably absent is students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 8

3. **The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

Strengths:

Student attendance and retention rates as well as graduation rates presented by applicant (p.16-17) all outperform state over three years, as do the middle school NWEA MAP assessments (p.13). College attendance and persistence rates also outperformed state (p.17). Applicant clearly serves low-income and educationally disadvantaged students – 89.5% FRL compared to the state's 39.5% FRL (p. 3).

Weaknesses:

Statewide testing requirements have changed annually over the last three years as reported by the applicant and characterized as "making it virtually impossible to compare schools with district or state outcomes over time."

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

The applicant currently operates in low income zip codes, serving largely African American and Hispanic families – zip codes with low high school completion rates and marginal college completion rates. Its plans to open additional schools are for similar communities including two of the city's zip codes serving youth from the lowest income families, the vast majority of which are African American. The curricular requirements of Carmen high school students are more rigorous than public schools in the state. Four years of lab science and three years of Spanish in addition to four years of mathematics culminating in at least pre- calculus and five years of English language arts represent a curriculum more rigorous than most public high school systems in the country.

High school student access to PLTW accredited engineering electives, AP courses, dual enrollment opportunities and career and technical programs in the context of an extended school day over more than 180 days represents a concentrated effort to provide valuable opportunities for high school students to graduate college- and career-ready. Double ELA and math programming in 9th grade, 6th and 9th grade bridge programs, and an advisory inclusive of a comprehensive character education program and eight abilities framework is part of a strong and thoughtful school-wide intervention model.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not present data or research that compels one to see the effectiveness of Achieve 3000 - a computer-based reading intervention program, or ALEKS – a computer-based math intervention program. There is not data presented that the engineering pathway in partnership with PLTW has successfully enabled students to access scholarship and pursue engineering studies in college. There is no program level data offered for each of the enumerated program elements justifying their inclusion in your comprehensive model. Co-teaching model begins to address plans for meeting the needs of students with disabilities, but applicant doesn't make clear a plan to serve a spectrum of need beyond an inclusion model – there is no articulated plan to serve students with more severe needs.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

Strengths:

The plan has clearly defined goals, measurable and suitably ambitious outcomes that are attainable (p.33-5). Within goal 1, 85% staff retention and 90% open positions filled by mid-June represent impressive ambition in human capital target setting. Further, within goal 2, 90% of first graduating cohort admitted to 4-year college, and 70% college persistence from year 1 to 2 for a cohort is certainly ambitious given state and local district achievement.

Weaknesses:

Applicant is providing evidence of adequate preparation for expansion of a model serving more students with disabilities and doesn't include outcomes for this subgroup specifically. It doesn't seem clear how the applicant plans and/or intends to scale the school service model or back office support model to manage school finances or data management, manage operational support, source and hire school leaders, teachers and other staff, or scale professional development and academic supports to schools relative to the included teaching framework. Further, there seems no mention of a community engagement plan for new communities.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

1. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

The management plan (p.36) has specific tasks broken into multiple milestones with corresponding timelines and teams of responsibility. For example, the applicant thoroughly breaks down the task of hiring and developing staff into five separate milestones with different responsible teams. Five task areas are identified: secure needed approvals; hire and develop staff; enroll students; prepare facility and secure materials; and external evaluation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).

Strengths:

The business plan assumes sustainability on only public per-pupil funding (p.39-40). Carmen presents a plan for collaborating with MPS to identify and lease future facilities, and presents a contingency plan for facilities in private commercial facilities (p.40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).

Sub Question

Strengths:

Financial plan appears viable and represents foundation support in start-up years combined with CSP funds. Schools operate on the public dollar sustainably (p.43 and appendix G: p. 174-197). Carmen Southeast, for example, is sustainable on public dollar by 2020 (p.188). There is strong evidence of broad stakeholder and community partner support for Carmen and its plans for replication, found in letters of support(Appendix C: p.31-48). Supporters include MPS, Charter School Growth Fund, Burke Foundation, Teach for America, Schools That Can, and Stellar Collegiate among others.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

Strengths:

The School Dissolution Plan is thorough and clear. The applicant has an annual school audit process included in appendix H. The Dissolution plan, also included in appendix H, includes provision for communication to parents and partnership with MPS to transfer records. The plan references working with families to ensure that information for other school enrollment is provided (p.49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).

Strengths:

Leadership is well established and highly qualified to execute the replication and expansion of Carmen schools (p. 50-55). [REDACTED] led the planning team for the first Carmen school and served as its founding school leader, and led the opening of Carmen Northwest in 2013. Her practice as both a school leader and an organization leader through board development, development and fundraising, budget development and management, and school expansion initiatives set the organization up well for further expansion. Of the 13 organizational leaders highlighted in the application, 6 have been part of the organization for more than 5 years, providing a deep understanding of the organizational culture necessary to scale its replication and expansion.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 project.**

Strengths:

Carmen presents a strong plan for evaluation conducted by The Children's Research Center and a further study specifically of the Carmen-Pulaski partnership conducted in collaboration with The University of Wisconsin.

Weaknesses:

The Applicant doesn't provide detailed information regarding its approach to internal evaluation or the infrastructure and methodology of in-house data tracking.

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students**

1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility, and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a

Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The certification form is available at https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

Relative to (b) School Improvement, it is clear that the intention of the applicant is to partner with MPS schools to assist the district in interventions to serve students attending an MPS school identified for improvement under section 1116 of the ESEA – Casimir Pulaski High School, a priority school on Wisconsin’s SIG eligibility list, although currently ineligible as it has already received SIG funding within the last five years. Further, collaborative work is reportedly already underway. Throughout the application, it becomes clear that much work –including gaining support from MPS for transfer of practice and model components evaluated and shown effective – has established a momentum for the ‘Carmen-Pulaski Partnership.’ A position within Carmen management has been established to supervise the work of multiple work groups. Facilities arrangements have been established in partnership with MPS. A strong evaluation component is built around the effectiveness of this partnership.

Weaknesses:

In as much as the “Carmen-Pulaski partnership” has already launched with 5 five working groups, including teachers, school leadership, students, parents and community members from Carmen, Pulaski and the surrounding neighborhoods, and the partnership is anticipated to provide a new strategic model for future charter-district partnerships and facilitate the direct transfer of specific components and practices to be adopted by Pulaski, what seems missing is a letter of support or other indicator from MPS that there is intention on their part to provide accountability for the adoption of new practice and/or strategic components of the Carmen model at Pulaski High School. The MPS letter of support indicates good standing and expresses interest in continuing partnership with Carmen for the purpose of having a diverse portfolio of high school options for families – even points out the achievement of Carmen. It does not in any way provide evidence that there is shared interest in the “Carmen-Pulaski partnership” as described by the applicant or intentional support of the effort displayed in the establishments of the mentioned work groups. Further, the composition of the work groups – in terms of measurable participation by MPS or Pulaski school leaders and teachers – is unclear.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

- 1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --**
 - (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;**
 - (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and**
 - (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.**

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Carmen is not presenting evidence that it is taking active measures itself to serve students with disabilities at a rate at least comparable to that in public schools in the surrounding area. The data table included and explained in narrative references substantially lower current rates of service than both Wisconsin and MPS – average rates across large areas - and does not provide rates for schools like Pulaski in a more immediate and comparable surrounding area for more specific context. While special education rates are changing, it seems the result of passive practice – an action of MPS. Special Education policies are not referenced in the applicant response.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/05/2016 11:47 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2016 11:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Carmen High School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160030)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	36
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	8
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Total	108	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Charter Management Organization - 1: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Carmen High School of Science and Technology, Inc. (U282M160030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 36

Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

Strengths:

In 2013-14 and 2014-15, the applicant's MAP growth rates in English and Math exceed those of the enrolling district (MPS) at all grade levels except one (30). The applicant's ACT achievement is higher than neighborhood schools.

Weaknesses:

Growth rates do not appear to be significantly higher than those of MPS. In another comparison group Carmen achieves growth at rates less than the average but may or may not compare favorably when controlling for demographics (e31).

Over the period, some students dropped in performance.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

Sub Question

Strengths:

According to ACT data provided, the applicant does not have significant race-based achievement gaps between subgroups of students served by the schools (e237).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide evidence of gap closure by all subgroups – namely, by SPED and ELL students. Data is not available for ELL students because of small n size, according to applicant (e33). Students with IEPs are omitted from subgroup breakdown. MAP analysis does not do a subgroup breakdown.

Argument is adequately developed but not well-developed.

Reader's Score: 9

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

Strengths:

The Applicant achieves college acceptance and persistence rates that exceed that of national averages. In some other indicators, including academics, applicant appears to compare favorably to state averages (33-34).

Weaknesses:

The applicant mentions that there are some areas where comparable data is not available.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

The applicant provides highlights of an academic program where high school graduation requirements are more extensive than those in other Milwaukee high schools (e37). The applicants describe multiple pathways to achievement including dual enrollment and career and technical education. Math/reading intervention programs mentioned. Co-teaching

strategies mentioned. Rigorous curricular model.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly describe how all students, in particular students with IEPs or severely disadvantaged students, are able to (in current schools) or will be able to (in future schools) access a free and appropriate public education. However, the applicant provides a general description of co-teaching strategies employed at the current schools, which includes co-teaching by special education students, although it is not clear how extensive the program is or whether all students with IEPs are able to access it. Students may require services beyond the inclusion model; these issues are not comprehensively addressed.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear management plan that includes goals, objectives with a timeline and methods for measuring progress (50). The applicant provides evidence that they've already managed campuses that serve different populations. The design is typical of a school expansion, growing a grade a year.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not adequately address how it will engage its community, especially given its proposed co-location. How will the co-location be achieved effectively and managed?

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 19

Sub Question

- 1. 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear management plan that includes goals, objectives with a timeline and methods for measuring progress. Structures for onboarding new staff are provided. The board of the organization has developed a business plan and model that will enable a replication (53).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

Strengths:

Solid developed program materials indicate an organizational readiness to replicate and expand (57)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

Pulaski partnership woven into their design. The school has support from high profile foundations. The budget model indicates a clear move towards sustainability (62).

Weaknesses:

Some additional evidence would strengthen the degree to which the partnership with Pulaski is part of this expansion. Demonstrated evidence of a broader base of support would be useful in evaluating the likelihood of success of the plan.

Reader's Score: 3

- 4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan for supporting the closure of charter schools managed by the applicant (65).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

5. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of skilled and experienced personnel to manage the proposed project (67).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, 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 project.**

Strengths:

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee will conduct an evaluation of the success of the replication. MOUs are in place. The applicant has plans to evaluate their own progress against some clear goals of the grant (72).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. **This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.**

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility, and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The certification form is available at https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

Plans to partner with a MPS school the replicated Carmen school will be co-located within. Ev: "the Carmen-Pulaski partnership will involve the direct transfer of specific components and best practices of the Carmen charter model to a traditional public high school..." (21). The partnership is an MPS initiative. The applicant makes the case that the proximity, and the interest of MPS, will result in a positive collaboration. In addition, Carmen has shared some evidence of experience with successful dissemination activities.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --

- (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant acknowledges that Milwaukee is a largely segregated city but does not put forth a replicable plan, and does not provide evidence that they've implemented a plan on this issue in the past (24-25).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/12/2016 11:42 AM