

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2017 02:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: East Harlem Tutorial Program (U282M170019)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	28
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	25
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Sub Total	100	80
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	80

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: East Harlem Tutorial Program (U282M170019)

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: 28

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 provides evidence that thoroughly demonstrated success in increasing academic achievement for all students and for the subgroups of free and reduced lunch (FRW), students with disabilities (SWD), and Hispanic students. The applicant provided charts that displayed the achievement increases from 2014 to 2016. For example, the applicant documented that the increase in the percent proficiency on the Grade 3 NYS ELA assessment from 2014 to 2016 for FRL was an increase of 47 points; SWD experienced an increase of 36 points, and Hispanic/Latino students experienced an increase of 39 points). In addition, the applicant provided evidence that shows from 2015 to 2016 of each experiencing increases on the Grade 4 NYS ELA assessment with FRL (19), SWD (15) and Hispanic/Latino improving by 25 percentage points. The applicant documented that over the three years, Scholars experienced an aggregate growth of 28 percentage points for both FRL and Hispanic/Latino students and 19 percentage points for SWD in ELA proficiency (pgs. 15, 16, e34, e35). Further evidence indicated that Scholars students outperformed the 3-5 students in NYS in math proficiency by 20 percentage points. (pgs. 7-14, e26-e33)

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence of academic improvement for other subgroups and provided evidence for only FRL, SWD and Hispanic/Latino subgroups. The applicant failed to provide data for African American Students at the school. (pgs. 8, 9, e27, e28)

Reader's Score: 8

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:

The applicant demonstrated how the students served (excludes excluding high school) have exceeded the average academic achievement results for the State. The applicant provided data, and tables that provide evidence of academic achievement of all East Harlem Tutorial Program (EHTP) students, on the 2014 to 2016 NYS ELA Assessments for FRL, Hispanic/Latino and SWD subgroups outperformed NYS students. The applicant provided a data chart as evidence that Scholars FRL, SWD and Latino/Hispanic subgroup performance on the NYS Math assessment has outperformed the NYS at-risk subgroups. In addition, the applicant provided attendance and retention data for the most current school year that indicated percentage rates for Scholars/Scholars 2 students in the subgroups of Black (95/95), Hispanic (94/90), SWD (94/95), ELL (91/92). The applicant presented retention percentage rates for Scholars/Scholars 2 students in the subgroups of Black (89/91), Hispanic (92/95), SWD (98/93), FRL (87/92), and ELL (87/91) (p. 40, e59)

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide comparative data for attendance and retention in comparison to State. In addition, the applicant failed to provide more than one school year of attendance and retention data. (p. 40, e59)

Reader's Score: 8

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 indicated that the East Harlem Tutorial Program have not had any identified compliance issues for any of the schools under its operations. The applicant provided suspension and expulsion rates for the past three years for the subgroups of Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD, and FRL students, and documented that neither campus experienced the expulsion of any student. (p. 40, e59)

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide evidence of not having any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management, have not had any affiliation revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation, and have not experienced any issues with statutory or regulatory compliance that may lead to revocation.

"This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion and priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria and priorities ."

Reader's Score: 12

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: 25

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 provides data that clearly indicates that it serves educationally disadvantaged students at rates comparable to surrounding schools in the district. The applicant provides evidence of the demographics (enrollment data) for the 2015-2016 school year. The ELL preference helps to ensure that the schools can attract a significant number of ELLs (p. 40). The applicant documents and provides evidence of serving a comparable portion of ELLs, SWD, and FRL as well as Latino/Hispanic and African-American/Black according to the proportion of these subgroups in the district (p. 21, Demographics).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 applicant presents a thorough plan for recruiting and enrolling educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant includes a lottery preference to ensure students are recruited from population that has a large percentage of ELLs, SWD, and FRL as well as Latino/Hispanic and African-American/Black given the prevalence of these student populations in the district. In addition, the applicant documents other strategies and outreach efforts to ensure recruitment and enrollment of students from the different subgroups. For example, the strategies include posting flyers and placing notices in local, supermarkets, communities of faith, community centers and apartment complexes; leveraging the relationships and network of community contacts of EHTP; displaying advertisements on NYC public buses with routes in East Harlem; and canvassing neighborhoods in East Harlem to reach interested families. (pgs. 21-24 , e40-e43)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 provides an evaluation plan that will include two main goals to include expanding Scholars and Scholars 2 that include adding a high school that replicates the EHSA model. The applicant indicates that the second goal is to offer a rigorous academic program that is student centered, and primarily for the educationally disadvantaged by providing

each with academic skills, strength of character, social and emotional well-being (pgs. 24, 25, e43, 44). The applicant provides a Logic Model for the proposed project purposed to determine the alignment of the evaluation plan to the logic model for the proposed grant project. The applicant provides a model that includes goals, objectives, activities, and outcomes and measures (qualitative and quantitative) (pgs. 25-27, e44-e46). The applicant has assigned the Project Director in collaboration with the Director of Data and Research to carry out the project evaluation. (p. 28, e47)

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide regularly scheduled intervals for the data collection, and failed to provide thorough procedure for analyzing the data.

Reader's Score: 7

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: 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**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a comprehensive management plan that demonstrated the project could meet proposed objectives on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks. The applicant provided detailed information in table that provided milestones and timelines, and documented the specific person (s) responsible for each task for the proposed project (pgs. 30-33, e49-e52). The applicant provides the name of the key staff and responsibilities for the proposed project. For example, the managing director of planning and administration supports and oversees financial planning, reporting, and budgeting (p. 33, e52).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant provided thorough information that demonstrates that the key personnel that will provide project and financial oversight for the proposed project are qualified by education and experience to implement the tasks and effectively carry out the activities for the proposed project. The applicant provided roles and responsibilities for key staff (e.g. EHSA Managing Director, Executive Director, Managing Director for Planning and Administration, and Managing Director of Development and External Affairs for Academics) (pgs. 33-36, e52-e56). In addition, the applicant provided resumes/curriculum vitae for key positions in that align with the proposed Management Plan. (Appendix B)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

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:

The applicant provides evidence that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant documents that by end of the five-year project that it will be fully financially sustainable due to a diversified funding base that includes shared service fees, foundation, corporation and individual donors, major fundraising benefit events. In addition, the applicant indicated that in FY2016 EHTP raised \$2.8 million in foundation, corporation and individual grants and contributions; in addition, its annual fundraising event netted \$3.1 million (pgs. 37, 38, e56, e57). The applicant documents other successful financial initiatives as evidence of sustainability of the project beyond the five-year funding period. The applicant provides a Five-Year Financial Model for the proposed project. (pgs. 38, 39, e57, 58)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address 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 address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2017 02:41 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2017 05:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: East Harlem Tutorial Program (U282M170019)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	30
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	25
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Sub Total	100	81
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	81

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: East Harlem Tutorial Program (U282M170019)

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: 30

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 demonstrates success in increasing academic achievement for all students. For example, students significantly outperformed their at-risk public school counterparts in the state and the Community School District 4 on the 2016 Grade 3, 4 and 5 state English/Language Arts (ELA) and math assessments and Grade 4 state Science assessment (p2). Subgroup data (e.g., free or reduced price lunch, students with disabilities, Hispanic) is clearly provided and also demonstrates growth over three years for grades 3, 4 and 5 (p9).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's rationale (p8-9) for not including other subgroup data beyond Hispanic/Latino, English Language Learner (ELL), Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL), and Students With Disabilities (SWD) (i.e., subgroup not large enough to be included in academic reporting) is not fully justified (p8). For example, the applicant states that 29% of the student population is African American (p14) so it is unclear why subgroup data is not provided.

Reader's Score: 8

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:

The applicant provides academic achievement results on annual student attendance, retention and student academic growth for educationally disadvantaged students that have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State. For example, data is provided that demonstrates stronger performance on state assessments in terms of overall achievement and growth compared grade level peers. The applicant provides attendance and retention data for two cohorts of students by race, free/reduced-price lunch, students with disabilities and ELL(p.40).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide comparative data for attendance and retention data (p40). An assessment against state performance cannot, therefore, be made.

Reader's Score: 10

- 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 provides a single statement indicating the conditions do not apply to schools in its network (p18). Student safety is alluded to through suspension and expulsion data provided (p40). No students have been expelled in either cohort and 2015-16 suspension rates for both cohorts are beneath 8% and similar to the prior year's data (p40).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a clear discussion regarding each component of the criteria. The broad statement does not provide data or specifics indicating school status. A statement expressly addressing each component may have strengthened this section of the narrative.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion and priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria and priorities.

Reader's Score: 12

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: 25

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 intends to serve educationally disadvantaged students. For example, the applicant serves a population that is 75% and 92% free or reduced priced lunch (p14). The state rate is 80%, so this is comparable. Similar data is noted for ELL, SWD, Hispanic and Black/African American students.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None noted

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 applicant intends to draw from the district in which sites are physically located. Lottery preferences in this district clearly represent the inclusion of educationally disadvantaged students and recruitment materials in multiple languages facilitate varied enrollment (p21). The applicant intends to use standard methods of recruitment to ensure broad outreach and parental awareness of the school and its enrollment period. For example, website, print and door-to-door recruitment yield appropriate outreach to targeted areas (p23).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

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 methods of evaluation provided will ensure a balanced project evaluation. The logic model includes performance measures that are both quantitative and qualitative. The Project Director and Director of Data and Research will create action items for program improvement based on data. Evaluation results will be shared in evaluation reports distributed to the Project Team, EHTP Board, East Harlem Scholars Academies Board, the school community and the larger East Harlem and local community. (p25-27)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly indicate the interim steps regarding data collection. For example, end-of-year data will be measured, but it is unclear who will collect the data, when it will be available or the methodology used to analyze the data. The logic model also does not clearly indicate intended inputs or how outcomes relate to intended activities. Structured alignment of components in the logic model may have provided needed clarity.

Reader's Score: 7

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: 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**

Strengths:

The management plan has components that will support effective management, including a detailed timeline and scope of work. Persons responsible for executing tasks and deadlines are clearly noted (p28-32). For example, the Executive Director will participate in activities related to operations and human resources. The management plan supports meeting objectives on time and within budget given the extent of network support (e.g., finance, data/research, human resources/talent team) and formative action steps based on project data (p28).

Weaknesses:

None 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 identified project director has the appropriate experience to guide the project (p33). She is the school's founder and understands growth strategies linked to expanding network campuses. Key project personnel are also adequately suited for the project. For example, the EHTP Director of Data and Research will provide appropriate support/guidance for the project's evaluation given experience with longitudinal evaluations and data management (p28, 36).

Weaknesses:

The project director's percent effort contributed to the project is not clearly noted (p e235-e236, e244). Given the duties of project director are in addition to her current duties as CMO Managing Director, clarity regarding the amount of time available to this project may have strengthened this section.

Reader's Score: 9

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 currently executes high-performing schools and will likely continue once grades are expanded. For example, \$2.8 million in foundation/corporation/grants/contribution funds were raised in 2016 and \$45 million was raised to support the CMOs capital campaign (p37). The degree of network support and history with providing instruction in specified grades also increases the likelihood of continued operation (p37-39). The applicant provided a five-year multi-year financial model that results in positive net income (p38-39).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

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 address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address 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/essafaqstransition62916.pdf>.

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2017 05:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/11/2017 03:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: East Harlem Tutorial Program (U282M170019)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	33
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	25
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Sub Total	100	84
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	84

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: East Harlem Tutorial Program (U282M170019)

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: 33

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 discussion of how the schools have increased academic improvement of English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students begins on e24, and demonstratives that these groups of students have experienced double digit growth on the state assessments as they proceed from year to year within the EHTP schools. For example, between 2014 and 2016, third grade students' achievement went from a 10% percent passage rate to 33%. And then to 55% in 2015. For fourth grade students, the rates increased from 12% in 2014 to 38% in 2015. Those numbers reflect different pools of students. Yet, one can also track movement from the same "cohort" of students as they proceed to the next year. While third grade students only had a 10% passage rate in 2014, that same cohort had a 12% passage rate in 2015, and a 24% passage rate in 2016. The application describes retention rates for these students at an average of 89.5 for FRL, 95.5% for SWD, and 89% for ELL for the 2016 school year, so the cohort analysis of improvement is relatively accurate. See page e59.

Weaknesses:

While the growth and improvement data are strong, the proficiency rates remain very low, with the highest passage rate being 59% for FRL in 2016. Also, The proficiency for the Hispanic/Latino subgroup did fall by 6 percentage points on the Grade 4 assessment in 2016. On the Grade 4 ELA assessment in 2016 no SWD achieving proficiency. These weaknesses e28 and e29.

Reader's Score: 8

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:

Page 21 provides a table and narrative that describes the rates at which the schools serve educationally disadvantaged students, and pages 16-18 show subgroup performance data for English Learner, Free Reduced Lunch, and Students with Disabilities. These data show that those three student groups are outperforming their

Sub Question

peers in other state schools. Attendance rates and retention rates are shown on page 40. The application describes retention rates for these students at an average of 89.5% for FRL, 95.5% for SWD, and 89% for ELL for the 2016 school year, and attendance rates of 94 for FRL, 94.5% for Students with Disabilities, and 91.5% for English Learners. Graduation data and college data were not applicable due to the fact that the schools serve elementary grades only.

Weaknesses:

Retention and attendance rates were provided on page 40, but comparable rates were not provided. Performance data were not provided for African American students.

Reader's Score: 10

- 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 application states that none of these have applied to East Harlem Charter Schools. Page 18. And, on page e59, the application again provides that in addition to not being closed, there have been no compliance issues for the school. The charter document on e117 shows that the chartering entity monitors for compliance in the areas of finance and safety, and that the school was allowed to expand by the authorizer after the authorizer had monitored school 1.

Weaknesses:

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion and priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria and priorities .

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: 25

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 application focuses on service to economically disadvantaged students (75% and 92%)(district = 80%) , students with disabilities (28% and 26%)(district = 11%) and English Language Learners (9% and 13%) (district =11%). The percentages in the preceding brackets represent the percentages at the two schools which are all similar or higher than the district percentages.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None

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:

Page 22 describes their recruitment plan. It has several methods designed to generate awareness have provide in-person information throughout the community. The proposal describes how they will specifically use marketing materials and communicatians at community/neighborhood locations of supermarkets, faith-based entities, community centers and apartments. The application also describes methods of marketing on public buses in the neighborhood and canvassing neighborhoods. Importantly, the plan mentions providing applications to the Committee on Specil Education for the community so that families with students with disabilities will be aware and have ready access as well as head start programs, which will also target subgroups.

These activities demonstrate an understanding of the community as well as reaching out directly to educationally-disadvantaged subgroups and ensuring that they feel comfortable and confident about being served at the school.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 15

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 description of the evaluation plan begins on page 25. There is a thoughtful accountability/performance framework described, which includes measures that are student-based, individual school-based, and network-based outcomes.

Weaknesses:

Although page 27 mentions formative evaluation, essentially no description of formative or interim evaluation practices or benchmarks are described. Thus, the model is largely an accountability model focused on summative targets. There is no interim progress monitoring, which would enable the monitoring of improvements throughout the year. The "logic model" is not laid out in a way that describes how certain indicators are expected to yield particular results, and appears to focus on summative, annual, performance metrics.

Reader's Score: 7

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: 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**

Strengths:

The description of the management plan begins on page 28. They have thoughtful milestones and a reasonably-planned team to monitor and execute completion of the milestones. A table of growth (page 30) and timelines (page 31) are provided. They also describe their history of successful startup.

Weaknesses:

None

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:

There is a strong team that covers experience and expertise in education, finance, project management, human resources and recruitment, data and research, school start-up, fundraising, finance, and teaching. The biographical sketches begin on page 33, and resumes are provided in Appendix B. The following is a summary of combining resume information and the descriptions on page 33. For example, [REDACTED] Executive Director, has Master's Degree in Public Policy from Harvard's Kennedy School of Government and multiple years of nonprofit management. [REDACTED] Managing Director for Planning and Administration, has a B.A. from University of Pennsylvania and multiple years of communications and management experience. [REDACTED] Managing Director of Development and External Affairs, has multiple years of fundraising, business analytics, and project management experience and an MBA from Columbia. In the education sphere, [REDACTED] has several years of experience in data and research for schools, and a Master's in Education from George Washington University and a M.A. and Sociology and Education from Columbia. [REDACTED] EHSA Managing Director, has an Ed.M. from Harvard, 15 years of teaching experience, and multiple years of experience in school leadership/administration.

Weaknesses:

There are concerns that the individuals, albeit qualified, will not have capacity to perform all of the responsibilities placed upon them. For example, the Project Director is already the EHSA Managing Director and the applicant did not provide details on how this person would manage both roles or be able to fulfill the responsibilities of both of these roles that require much time commitment. The accountability lines are unclear as well.

Reader's Score: 9

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 proposal describes that the school is sustainable after the grant because they have a funding model that includes multiple different funding sources, including shared fees from the other schools, and fundraising. To

Sub Question

support that reliance on future philanthropy is not unreasonable, the proposal describes EHTP's strong track record in raising private philanthropy to support its work. A reasonable 5-year financial plan was provided (p. 38) and other school finances were positive in the appendices. (p e197).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

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 address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address 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-

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/essafaqstransition62916.pdf>.

Strengths:

Applicant did not address and wrote that it was not applicable (page e22).

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not address and wrote that it was not applicable (page e22).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/11/2017 03:40 PM