

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2017 05:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Eagle Academy Public Charter School (U282M170038)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	40
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	20
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
Sub Total	100	86
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 1	3	0
School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	8	0
Total	108	86

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Charter Management Organization - 4: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Eagle Academy Public Charter School (U282M170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. Comments should support your recommendation according to the Selection Criteria. Please address each section and provide your scores for each section separately.

Reader's Score: 40

Sub Question

1. The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students and for each of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, attending the charter schools the applicant operates or manages.

Strengths:

Eagle Academy serves students in which Ward 8 in D.C who have the lowest state standardized test scores in reading and math (p.2). In an attempt to improve achievement for these economically disadvantaged students, Eagle Academy has placed academic emphasis in early childhood education that teaches science, technology, engineering and math (STEAM) through the arts for all students, typically not part of an early childhood curriculum. "In 2012 the LEA established the first early childhood STEAM program in the district. Nationwide, STEM and STEAM programs rarely serve children before fourth grade and almost never in pre-school" (p e20). Evidence of impact through increased academic achievement for educationally disadvantaged students on the model is strong and convincing to the reader that replication of the model can produce desired academic achievement results for general education students. Proficiency data for 4 years shows increases in both math and reading for Eagle Academy's Congress Heights and Capitol Riverfront Schools through the 2013-2014 school years (p.6).

Weaknesses:

Data for the two inaugural schools, Congress Heights and Capitol Riverfront is not provided for the 2015-2016 school year.

It is unclear as to how the school plans on meeting the needs of their Special Education students as there is limited description of program elements that reflect differentiation, use of UDL strategies and/or other such evidence based curricular adaptations (p e31).

Reader's Score: 11

2. 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 in the State.

Sub Question

Strengths:

Eagle Academy has demonstrated positive academic achievement on annual assessments showing statistically significant increases in math and reading when compared to District averages (p. 5) for educationally disadvantaged students. Their placement in Tier 1 system (65% or above) as measured by the DC Public Charter School Board School Quality Report over two years for Capitol Riverfront who achieved 76.4% is commendable. These rankings are related to excellent academic achievement (p.7) and are attributed to evidence based practices. For the past 4 years Eagle Academy Schools have surpassed national averages as measured by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (p. 7)

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes a decline in attendance and re-enrollment rates at Congress Heights resulting in a Tier 2 ranking when compared to neighborhood and District schools (p.12).

Reader's Score: 14

3. **The extent to which charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have not been closed; have not had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; have not had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation; have not had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management; have not experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter; and have not had any significant issues with respect to student safety.**

Strengths:

Eagle Academy PCS has no reported record of compliance or management issues since its inception in 2003. In June 2013 the DC Public Charter School Board granted Eagle Academy PCS a 10 year charter continuation (p. e67).

Weaknesses:

There is no evidence of weakness in this area.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **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. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary**

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

1. **The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools; and**

Strengths:

In order to demonstrate that the Eagle Academy replication serve educationally disadvantaged students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools Eagle Academy has provided demographic data for Ward 8 in which the proposed replication model will be housed. According to this proposal "Ward 8 children have the lowest state standardized test scores in reading (19% proficient) and math 17% proficient) in the nation's capital"(p e.84). The focus on training for teachers in Common Core Standards and the accountability system currently in use in their

Sub Question

inaugural schools (weekly data analysis of student performance, curriculum based assessments, NWEA-MAP fall and spring and PARCC analysis-p.52) is evidence that they are able to implement a model of successful outcomes for students who are educationally disadvantaged.

Weaknesses:

Suspension rates for Special Education subgroups for one of the inaugural schools (Congress Heights) is slightly higher than for all other subgroups reported (Table 4. P. 51). Special education rates as compared to surrounding public schools (Orr ES) are lower at Eagle Hill's Capitol Riverfront School by 3 percentage points

Reader's Score: 10

2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students.

Strengths:

The Eagle Academy proposal outlines a strategic plan for marketing and recruiting and enrolling educationally disadvantaged students. This plan includes surveying and analyzing parent data, developing talking points or scripts for each step of engagement in the enrollment process, insuring that all inquiries are responded to promptly, holding Saturday "mini-mornings" for authentic experiences at the school sites, build marketing relationships with media, writing articles, press releases specifically for recruitment and school events, developing and purchasing radio ads and providing cultural competency and sensitivity training for staff (Marketing and Recruiting Plan, p. 32-36). The enrollment process will be set up using MySchoolsDC.org in partnership with DC Public Schools and DC Charter Schools that promotes school choice for all DC families. Eagle Academy has provided a comprehensive plan for providing evidence based Professional Development to insure that instructional pedagogy is addressing the needs of educationally disadvantaged students to close this achievement gap (pp. e46-48). By providing students with a model that infuses STEAM curriculum and project based learning opportunities in combination with strategies for teacher and student recruitment the Eagle Academy team's proposed project provides detailed descriptors that demonstrate an educational model that will expand learning opportunities for the educationally disadvantaged students they intend to serve

Weaknesses:

While the Wards 7 & 8 are primarily Black/African American communities with a small percentage of Hispanic students it is unclear as to whether or not any of these students are ELL or whether recruitment efforts are being made to identify ELL students. Evidence that recruitment will focus on middle schools where there are populations of students with special needs is not provided.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the alignment of the evaluation plan to the logic model for the proposed grant project and 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 grant project articulated in the applicant's response to application requirement (c) and will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the performance period.

Strengths:

Eagle Academy proposes to partner with an external evaluator, Youth Policy Institute (YPI) who will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of this educational initiative focusing on how well the proposed model serves educationally disadvantages students. The Eagle Academy PCS logic model is provided for teacher and student recruitment and enrollment, teacher training and retention. YPI has developed a framework that is aligned with the logic model that includes measurable outcomes p..20)

The DC PCSB Performance Management Framework provides annual data on all DC charter schools using a 3-tiered ranking system measuring achievement, attendance and enrollment.

Table 3: Core Summative Evaluation Questions (p. 24) provides a framework for measuring the impact of PD and instructional coaching on academic achievement as compared to the baseline school

Weaknesses:

There were no noted weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

- 1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools under the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

Reader's Score: 16

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

Strengths:

There is a Project Time line with Benchmarks, Indicators, Action Steps, Project Costs and Persons Responsible for 2 of the 3 project goals: Goal 1- Recruit and select high quality teachers and teacher assistants and, Goal 2- Ensure that instructional staff receive sufficient PD and coaching to implement the Eagle educational model (pp e47-49).

Weaknesses:

While all other indicators are present in Goal 3: Marketing and Community Engagement in the management plan, Project Costs are not included.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2. 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; and

Strengths:

The proposal includes the strategy of promoting from within staff that has a proven track record for supporting the scope of work outlined in the proposal. The personnel described have experience in charter schools in general and

Sub Question

in Eagle's model in particular. The qualifications of the CEO and Deputy CEO who will be managing this grant are sufficient for a project of this size and scope. (pp.e52-60 and Appendix B). There is sufficient evidence that the qualifications of the top level managers are sufficient to insure that the project tasks will be accomplished

Weaknesses:

There are no noted weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 10

3. **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 included in the applicant's response to application requirement (g).**

Strengths:

Eagle Academy has demonstrated the ability to sustain program using the per-pupil funding formula and the economies of scale that allow for operational costs to be shared across all schools. Upon expiration of the grant the will operate on the DC per student funding formula having experience the adequacy of this formula in schools with 240 students (p. e73). Additional funding is provided through Title I, II, II and IDEA (p. e74).

Weaknesses:

There are notes payable in the amount of \$15,113,069 due June 30, 2017 with no explanation as to how payment will be completed prior to the granting of this application. (p. e172). A multi-year financial model is not included in this application.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. **This priority is for projects that will provide for the replication or expansion of high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting and retaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies (see Section 4305(b)(5)(A) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA).**

Note: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department's Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf).

Strengths:

Eagle Academy is committed to serving the students within the Ward 8 African American community in Washington, D.C.. This proposed expansion, located in the predominately low-income neighborhood will serve educationally disadvantaged students where reading and math scores are significantly deficient as compared to the national average (p. 2). They have strong, intentional marketing and recruitment strategies for students that involves all stakeholders. These include: Parent Surveys, creating a Community Outreach team that includes school and Administrative leaders, community representatives and parents, conduct individual school tours, create and share virtual tours for parents/students unable to

attend, involve local education reporters, create op-ed pieces, distribute press releases, use print ads, radio spots and social media as recruiting tools (p. e48-52).

Weaknesses:

This application would be improved if intentionality in focus was evident on recruiting a diverse staff. There is little evidence that creating an instructional team that reflects the community to be served and/or the students to be recruited has been considered. Additionally, the team should consider recruitment efforts that include ELL and students not of color to build a truly diverse student body. While the application states “Eagle closely monitors neighborhood and school demographics and is prepared to begin development of appropriate ELL programs as needed” (p. 18) there is no evidence in this application that as to what pre-preparation steps have been taken to insure readiness. Consideration should be given to producing bilingual recruitment materials in an attempt to promote diversity.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts

1. This priority is for applicants that both:

(a) Demonstrate past success in improving the academic performance of one or more academically poor-performing public schools by taking over the operation of the school or restarting the school as a charter school; and

(b) Propose to use CMO funds to restart as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools during the project period, to do so by replicating a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success, and to do so by targeting a similar student population in the replicated charter school as was served by the academically poor-performing public school. In accordance with section 4310(2)(B) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, students who are enrolled in the academically poor-performing public school at the time of restart are exempt from the charter school’s lottery.

For purposes of this priority, academically poor-performing public schools may include, but are not limited to, persistently lowest-achieving schools, as defined in this notice and the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program under Title I of the ESEA (<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>); and priority schools in States that exercised flexibility¹ under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) (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 December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>).

Note: For applicants proposing to use CMO grant funds to replicate a high-quality charter school by restarting as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools, the CMO’s proposed charter school must be newly created and operating under a separate charter and governance than the academically poor-performing public school.

Footnote 1: As of August 1, 2016, States may no longer exercise flexibility, except in the limited circumstances where they implemented interventions previously in priority schools under the SIG program. For additional information related to ESEA flexibility and interventions in priority schools, see section B of the Department’s June 29, 2016 guidance entitled, “Transitioning to the Every Student Succeeds Act – Frequently Asked Questions,” at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essafaqtransition62916.pdf>.

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2017 05:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/05/2017 04:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Eagle Academy Public Charter School (U282M170038)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	39
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	21
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 1	3	0
School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	8	0
Total	108	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Charter Management Organization - 4: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Eagle Academy Public Charter School (U282M170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. Comments should support your recommendation according to the Selection Criteria. Please address each section and provide your scores for each section separately.

Reader's Score: 39

Sub Question

1. The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students and for each of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, attending the charter schools the applicant operates or manages.

Strengths:

Achievement in math on the DC-CAS standardized test more than doubled from 25 to 57 percent and exceeded the district average, while ELA scores increased from school year 11-12 to 12-13. School year 13-14 ELA scores exceeded the district average (P e21-22). Composite scores for Capitol Riverfront earned the school a district Tier One rating for 2016 (P e23). 2016 PARCC standardized test scores indicated improvement in reading for both campuses (21 percent to 26 percent) at Congress Heights and 30 percent to 33 percent at Capitol Riverfront. The applicant reports 2016 scores were significantly higher than the DC average (P e142-159).

Weaknesses:

Math scores at both campuses decreased on the PARCC standardized test from 2015 to 2016 (35 percent to 29 percent) at Congress Heights and 40 percent to 25 percent at Riverfront. Congress Heights received a district Tier Two rating in the 2016 DC rankings. Reading scores on the DC-CAS standardized assessment showed no growth from the 2012-2013 school year compared to the 2013- 14 school year (P e142-159). The performance of economically disadvantaged students on the PARCC standardized assessment at Congress Heights dropped slightly in math from 14-15 to 15-16 (27 percent to 25 percent) as well as in reading from 14-15 to 15-16 (32 percent to 30 percent.) Capitol Riverfront performance for all students in math on the PARCC as listed on the school report card dropped from 80 percent to 66.7 percent from 14-15 to 15-16. Reading scores for ED students on the same assessment rose only slightly from 40 percent to 41.7 percent.

Reader's Score: 12

2. 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 in the State.

Strengths:

Capitol Riverfront attained a district Tier One ranking for the 15-16 school year. Growth on the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC-CAS) for Eagle Academy students saw math performance improve from 25 percent in

Sub Question

2011-12 to 57 percent in 2013-14, while ELA performance also improved from 38 percent to 46 percent in the same time period, with performance in both subject areas exceeding the DC Public Charter Schools district average for the year 2013-2014 . Performance on the PARCC assessment in 2014-2015, which replaced the DC-CAS, revealed that the percent of third graders scoring proficient in math and reading exceeded the District of Columbia average.

Weaknesses:

Congress Heights attained a district Tier Two ranking for school year 15-16 with growth in reading and math on NWEA MAP receiving 55 percent and 80 percent of possible points respectively. Attendance at Congress Heights received 40 percent of possible points on the DCPCS 2015-16 report card (89 percent compared to the district goal of 95 percent) compared to 67 percent of possible points at Capitol Riverfront as the attendance rate (91.7 percent) fell below the district goal of 95 percent (P e157-159; e142-144).

Reader's Score: 12

3. **The extent to which charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have not been closed; have not had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; have not had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation; have not had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management; have not experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter; and have not had any significant issues with respect to student safety.**

Strengths:

There have been no reported issues of noncompliance, closure, and statutory and regulatory compliance with Eagle Academy schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **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. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary**

Reader's Score: 21

Sub Question

1. **The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools; and**

Strengths:

The percent of economically disadvantaged students, special education students are very similar to the two neighborhood schools identified (P e29-30). There are no ELL students described either in the applicant schools or in the neighborhood schools described. The applicant reports that subgroup data is not provided for Eagle Academy subgroup populations because DCPCS does not report data for subgroups that have student populations that are all less than 25 students (P e66).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

Capitol Riverfront (8 percent) has a lower special education identification rate than Congress Heights (15 percent) as well as the two neighborhood schools which have a rate of 11 percent each (P e29-30).

Reader's Score: 9

2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students.

Strengths:

The plans detailed on pages e34 and e48 detail a marketing plan to ensure enrollment of economically disadvantaged students, and is indicative of a concerted effort to target this particular demographic to increase the likelihood that the parents of economically disadvantaged students will consider enrolling their students in an Eagle Academy school. Grant dollars are allocated to pay for expenses associated with this effort, key personnel are identified to implement the initiative, and marketing strategies are described including traditional advertising, use of social media, and community engagement efforts.

Weaknesses:

Outcomes are described for the marketing plan (P e69) but no other specific strategies are mentioned to evaluate the effectiveness of the marketing plan.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the alignment of the evaluation plan to the logic model for the proposed grant project and 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 grant project articulated in the applicant's response to application requirement (c) and will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the performance period.

Strengths:

The model described has specific performance measures for teacher recruitment and training and the creation of 240 seats related to the replication of the Eagle Academy model that are measurable and directly linked to the intended outcomes. The outcomes will produce both quantitative and qualitative data (P e35).

Weaknesses:

No targets are described to measure the percent of economically disadvantaged students that will be enrolled at the end of the grant period (P e47-52).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools under the proposed project, the Secretary considers—

Reader's Score: 16

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**

Strengths:

The management plan describes a marketing and community and engagement plan on page e48 that lists strategies, a timeline, project costs, and personnel responsible.

Weaknesses:

The professional development timeline on P e47 does not describe allocations of grant funds to conduct the activities listed in the timeline or in the logic model.

Reader's Score: 4

2. **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; and**

Strengths:

The personnel listed have relevant training and experience linked to the accomplishment of grant objectives (P e52-59).

Weaknesses:

The narrative indicates that 10 percent of the management staff salary is paid out of grant funds. The grant narrative is unclear, however, of the actual percent of time management staff will devote to grant activities. If, as one might assume, 10 percent of personnel time will be dedicated to grant activities, then questions may arise whether this is an adequate amount of time for staff to accomplish grant objectives (P e188).

Reader's Score: 8

3. **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 included in the applicant's response to application requirement (g).**

Strengths:

Information listed on page e74 notes that the school uses the benchmark of 240 students as the threshold for financial viability based on previous experience in starting up the two existing campuses. The use of this previously established benchmark for enrollment in establishing financial viability leads to the assumption that this same benchmark will be successful for the replication. Grant financial support for teacher professional development and marketing and engagement will decrease significantly in year four of the grant, which will allow opportunities prior to the end of the grant period to determine if the marketing plan is effective in meeting enrollment targets and the professional development plan has resulted in increased student achievement due to better trained teachers.

Weaknesses:

Because the narrative does not address the likelihood that the management staff or positions created will remain in place after the end of the grant period, it is unclear if grant management staff will continue with the school or assume other duties at the conclusion of the grant period and ultimately if activities associated with the grant will be sustainable.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for projects that will provide for the replication or expansion of high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting and retaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies (see Section 4305(b)(5)(A) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA).

Note: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department's Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-2011111.pdf).

Strengths:

The applicant details strategies to increase economic diversity through a wide variety of recruitment and enrollment efforts (P e34-35). This is an intentional strategy by the applicant, as evidenced by the enrollment marketing plan outlined by the applicant that seeks to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students enrolled in the schools.

Weaknesses:

There is limited evidence that ELL students are identified or recruited (p e34) beyond an acknowledgment that ELL student enrollment should be monitored. Although ELL describes the student's level of language acquisition and not race, it could be assumed that racial diversity would increase with a more intentional recruitment of ELL students.

Racial diversity is not evident in the current school demographic makeup of 94 percent and 99 percent African American (P e18) and there is a lack of evidence provided that racial diversity will increase at the new site, and the applicant does not describe efforts to increase racial diversity.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts

1. This priority is for applicants that both:

(a) Demonstrate past success in improving the academic performance of one or more academically poor-performing public schools by taking over the operation of the school or restarting the school as a charter school; and

(b) Propose to use CMO funds to restart as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools during the project period, to do so by replicating a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success, and to do so by targeting a similar student population in the replicated charter school as was served by the academically poor-performing public school. In accordance with section 4310(2)(B) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, students who are enrolled in the academically poor-performing public school at the time of restart are exempt from the charter school's lottery.

For purposes of this priority, academically poor-performing public schools may include, but are not limited to, persistently lowest-achieving schools, as defined in this notice and the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program under Title I of the ESEA (<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>); and priority schools in States that exercised flexibility¹ under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) (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 December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>).

Note: For applicants proposing to use CMO grant funds to replicate a high-quality charter school by restarting as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools, the CMO's proposed charter school must be newly created and operating under a separate charter and governance than the academically poor-performing public school.

Footnote 1: As of August 1, 2016, States may no longer exercise flexibility, except in the limited circumstances where they implemented interventions previously in priority schools under the SIG program. For additional information related to ESEA flexibility and interventions in priority schools, see section B of the Department's June 29, 2016 guidance entitled, "Transitioning to the Every Student Succeeds Act – Frequently Asked Questions," at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essafaqtransition62916.pdf>.

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/05/2017 04:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2017 04:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Eagle Academy Public Charter School (U282M170038)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	40
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	18
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 1	3	0
School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	8	0
Total	108	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Charter Management Organization - 4: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Eagle Academy Public Charter School (U282M170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. Comments should support your recommendation according to the Selection Criteria. Please address each section and provide your scores for each section separately.

Reader's Score: 40

Sub Question

1. The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement, including graduation rates where applicable, for all students and for each of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, attending the charter schools the applicant operates or manages.

Strengths:

The applicant notes that math proficiency doubled and exceeded the district average with the ELA 3rd grade scoring higher than the average score across Washington DC (p. e21). An External evaluation of the quality of teacher interactions with students administered by D.C.'s Office of the State Superintendent of Education (CLASS system) ranks schools above national average (p. e23)

The evaluation supported strong achievement with a score of Tier 1 and Tier 2 across all schools (p. e28). Additionally, the School Quality report provides sufficient data for academic growth on NWEA over time, attendance and re-enrollment (p. e147). Further supporting evidence is in the Subgroup achievement levels noted in appendix (p. e67).

Weaknesses:

The trajectory of academic growth across all campuses over time is unclear and there are some fluctuations and decreases in proficiency rates (p. e23, e142-e159). For example, Congress Heights did not attain Tier 1 status in SY 2015-16 (p. e23). The applicant does not present subgroup assessment results adequately by failing to note growth over time or variance by grade level. (p. e66)

Reader's Score: 12

2. 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 in the State.

Strengths:

Evidence supporting the schools' academic performance as it relates to educationally disadvantaged students includes their Tier status (p e28), rankings compared to other comparable CMOs and the School Quality Review Reports included with the application (p. e147). For example, the percentage of students proficient in math more than doubled, from 25% in SY 2011-12 to 57% in SY 2013-14, far exceeding the District's average of 39%. During

Sub Question

the same period, Eagle DC-CAS ELA scores increased from 38% proficient to 46%, again exceeding the SY 2013-14 District-wide average of 41%. Last school year, Eagle Academy PCS third graders were assessed using PARCC and again, the percent of students scoring proficient in math and ELA were significantly higher than the average across the District of Columbia (p. e21).

Weaknesses:

There is a lack of data comparing Eagle's achievement and growth for each the metrics required in the selection criteria and there appears to be an attendance problem at one campus (Congress Heights) (p e28).

Reader's Score: 13

3. **The extent to which charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have not been closed; have not had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; have not had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation; have not had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management; have not experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter; and have not had any significant issues with respect to student safety.**

Strengths:

The applicant's charter has been successfully reauthorized and has met its annual goals (p. e29). The applicant does not note any compliance problems.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **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. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary**

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

1. **The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools; and**

Strengths:

The applicant's geographic location serves educational disadvantaged students and the school participates in the lottery system (p. e35). The applicant demonstrates a commitment to serving Special Education students. Additionally, the demographics support expansion of opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students (p. e30).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides insufficient comparative data on special populations and surrounding schools.

Reader's Score: 6

Sub Question

- 2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students.**

Strengths:

The applicant's recruitment plan is detailed and reasonable (p e35). The applicant submitted a marketing plan that is thorough and reasonable. Recruitment and enrollment efforts will focus on data collection, research, community outreach, school tours, participation in city- and ward-wide events such as EdFest, traditional advertising including radio and print, social media advertisements, and leveraging business relationships (p. e35).

Weaknesses:

The application lacks a contingency plan if enrollment is not met during grant years and there is a lack of sufficient information about recruitment for ELL students (p. e35).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan

- 1. In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the alignment of the evaluation plan to the logic model for the proposed grant project and 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 grant project articulated in the applicant's response to application requirement (c) and will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the performance period.**

Strengths:

The applicant has already secured a partnership with a respected external evaluator and the management plan is aligned with a strong logic model (p e36). A Formative evaluation plan is included with the application (p e38). The evaluation plan includes data sources which are qualitative and quantitative (p e39). Through a partnership with Youth Policy Institute, the applicant has developed a conceptual evaluation framework that is fully aligned with the logic model. It will use objective performance measures related to the project outcomes and, in its formative and summative activities, produce extensive and pertinent qualitative and quantitative data for stakeholders both on an ongoing basis and at the end of the performance period (p. e36).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

- 1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools under the proposed project, the Secretary considers—**

Reader's Score: 17

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**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The management plan submitted by the applicant includes a timeline, which is clear and realistic in scope (p e49). The plan includes clear roles and responsibilities for staff (p 349). The applicant submits a reasonable and detailed management plan and supports an on time and within budget completion of the project (p. e188).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. 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; and

Strengths:

The applicant's CEO has experience with new school development and project management of operational growth and the organization has previous experience managing grants (p e53).

Weaknesses:

The applicant demonstrates less expertise in operational management although the staff has a vast amount of educational experience (p. e86-e110).

Additionally, the amount of time dedicated to grant duties on the staffing plan appears inadequate. (p. e188). The budget lacks sufficient details for specific costs.

Reader's Score: 8

3. 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 included in the applicant's response to application requirement (g).

Strengths:

The applicant already has a Development Officer on staff. Additionally, a facility has already been secured, which is further evidence of the likelihood for long term sustainability after the grant program is complete (p. e43). The applicant's business plan supports sustainability of growth (p e. 61-62). The budget narrative details how proposed expenses will be front-loaded in the initial years of the project (p. e188-190).

Weaknesses:

The application lacks a detailed timeline for post-grant period and the budget narrative does not clearly detail expenses for each project year separately (p. e188-190)

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for projects that will provide for the replication or expansion of high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting and retaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies (see Section 4305(b)(5)(A) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA).

Note: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department's Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf).

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts

1. This priority is for applicants that both:

(a) Demonstrate past success in improving the academic performance of one or more academically poor-performing public schools by taking over the operation of the school or restarting the school as a charter school; and

(b) Propose to use CMO funds to restart as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools during the project period, to do so by replicating a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success, and to do so by targeting a similar student population in the replicated charter school as was served by the academically poor-performing public school. In accordance with section 4310(2)(B) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, students who are enrolled in the academically poor-performing public school at the time of restart are exempt from the charter school's lottery.

For purposes of this priority, academically poor-performing public schools may include, but are not limited to, persistently lowest-achieving schools, as defined in this notice and the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program under Title I of the ESEA (<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>); and priority schools in States that exercised flexibility¹ under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) (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 December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>).

Note: For applicants proposing to use CMO grant funds to replicate a high-quality charter school by restarting as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools, the CMO's proposed charter school must be newly created and operating under a separate charter and governance than the academically poor-performing public school.

Footnote 1: As of August 1, 2016, States may no longer exercise flexibility, except in the limited circumstances where they implemented interventions previously in priority schools under the SIG program. For additional information related to ESEA flexibility and interventions in priority schools, see section B of the Department's June 29, 2016 guidance entitled, "Transitioning to the Every Student Succeeds Act – Frequently Asked Questions," at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essafaqtransition62916.pdf>.

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2017 04:12 PM