

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2017 12:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Great Oaks Foundation, Inc. (U282M170047)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	38
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	21
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
Sub Total	100	83
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 1	3	3
School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	8	3
Total	108	86

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Management Organization - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Great Oaks Foundation, Inc. (U282M170047)

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: 38

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:

In addressing this criteria, the applicant provide some examples of academic acheivement, such as having experience in designing, implementing and working with charter, including graduation rates in subgroups of educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant provides an overview of success in one of the schools they operate noting the Newark Legacy Charter School and its students' success rate. In addition, it is noted that the school engaged in a merger which combined the applicant's Tutor an Corps. This merger is specified to have resulted in increase of all students' achievement at an average rate of 1.5 years of growth. This is substantiated in referencing students scores on the Fountas and Pinnell literacy assessment and the NWES- MAP assessment in mathematics Pages 6, 7

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

Weaknesses:

Adequate information is lacking to sufficiently address all elements in the criteria. For example, the applicant provides data for only one school year. Therefore, it is not possible to assess if the achievement data in effect is an increases or decrease. The applicant identifies some data as Math and ELA Growth, SGP, however, SGP is not clearly articulated to defined it as success over school year, p. e119, p. 7-8.

The applicant fails to articulate any data on graduation rate information for all students and for subgroups. One school is identified as a K-12 school. , p. 17.

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

Sub Question

have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.

Strengths:

The applicant addresses the criteria effectively, by describing academic achievement results on their student's statewide assessments, annual student attendance and retention rates, including in specific high schools, increased graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates specifically for educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant. For example, in the GO-NYC charter school operated by the applicant, is the applicant states that 8th graders outperformed their peers across the state in the New York State Language and Math assessment by margins of 10% and 9% respectively. In all schools operated by the applicant it's stated that preference for admission is given to students who are educationally disadvantaged. The applicant provides a concise chart identifying the rates of performance among all students and then disaggregates the data and identifies the growth rate among low income and among students challenged with disabilities. This is evidenced in referencing the GO-NYC campus where all students grew at an average of 29%, compared to statewide data indicating an 11.9% overall growth in academics. In a specific view of low income students, those attending the applicant's school in New York grew at an average of 35%, as compared to a 12% statewide growth. Pages 7, 8

The applicant schools are identified as enrolling a significant sub population of English language Learners. It is specified that in the New York City the schools operated by the applicant demonstrated student data of 60% of English language learners demonstrating proficiency in state assessments as compared to 8% of a similar population in other New York city schools. Page 9

Weaknesses:

None are noted.

Reader's Score: 15

- 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 addresses the criteria clearly describing the fact that the charter schools they operate continues to perform successfully and have not been closed, or have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. The applicant identifies that their organization has established financial planning procedures and a fund-raising strategy to ensure long term sustainability of their network of schools. It is further noted that financial audits consistently assert the applicant's operation and maintains appropriate accounting procedures. Pages 10, 11

Weaknesses:

None are 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 applicant addresses elements in the criteria that detail the expanding of proposed charter schools and an increase of educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students, enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. This is evidenced by defining that the Great Oaks Charter Schools are framed in high expectations and implementing support services, interventions and individualized attention to ensure students' progress. The cities in which the applicant operates charter school are researched and educationally disadvantaged the sub groups of English Language Learners and youth challenged with disabilities. The applicant narrates evidence substantiating their success in working with educational disadvantaged youth. The four-charter schools operated by the applicant are identified and their services to subgroups outlined. For example, the Great Oaks Bridgeport Charter School enrolls 16% of their population determined as English Language Learners. This is compared to the Bridgeport Public Schools educating a 14% student body who have been identified as English Language learners. Of note, the applicant's charter school operated in New York City enrolls a student population in which 31% of students have been diagnosed and having a disability and with an Individualized Education Plan. In that same area, the public schools enroll a student body with 18% diagnosed with disabilities. Page 11

Weaknesses:

Adequate information is lacking to detail serving ELL and students with disabilities . From the data provided it appears that students in these subgroups were served at a rate lower than their surrounding public schools; students with disabilities (Newark), ELL (Newark, Wilmington and NYC), low income (Bridgeport and NYC). p. 11.

Reader's Score: 6

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 proposes to expand their successful operations by positioning itself to effectively recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students. In expanding the current charter schools, the same highly successful initiatives will continue. For example, in the schools the immersion model is described which is used for English Language Learners which is a strategy which is research based to rapidly prompted learners to gain language skills. In addition, tutors are employed who are fluent in over 18 languages to communicate with students and their families The Great Oaks Tutor Corps are identified and their major role in supporting learning needs is clearly described. The work of the Tutor Corps is described to offer two hours of tutoring daily and work with teachers and instructional leader to remediate student's needs. It is clearly narrated that the applicant is focused on continuing to actively recruit educationally disadvantaged students. This is evidenced in producing communication, such as enrollment information and media in varied languages. In addition, community outreach engages the applicant's staff in informing families of the program offered and the support to be provided to students with IEPs or academic deficits. In addition, it is well noted that the applicant works with community groups to advance communications and understanding, striving to specifically reach low income families. Pages 13, 14

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None are 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 narrates a well-developed evaluation plan for the proposed project which is in alignment to the logic model and methods of evaluation which include the use of objective performance measures related to the intended outcomes. It is asserted that the program's self-evaluation will provide reflect input and a "growth mindset. A rigorous annual self-evaluation is schedule to determine program strengths and discover areas in need of improvement. A well-structured Annual Metrics for Project Evaluation chart is presented outlining goals, the metric for assessment and alignment with long term goals. One goal is articulated as focused on students progress to the level of 1.5 years as indicated on the NWEA, RiT or the Fountas and Pinnel Reading Score. It is also proposed for program goal oriented activities focus to attain 95% daily attendance to increase instruction time as a key predictor of long germ success. Increased graduation rate to the 95% level is in goal focus to enable student's matriculation and a path to a college degree. Page 16, 17

A well-developed Logic Model clearly outlines the framework to evaluate program success and areas of need. It is clearly aligned to the goals and objectives articulated throughout the proposal. This is evidenced in specifying that 300+ college graduates will be recruited to serve as Oaks Tutor Corps to provide high dosage tutoring. Tutoring is proposed for the five years of the program focused on midterm goal for 75% of grade 8 students to demonstrate proficiency in mathematics and English language Arts. In addition, the Logic Model identifies the input of establishing community partnerships to mutually benefit the schools and the community and generate fiscal and operational sustainability. Page 37.

External evaluation is clearly narrated to be conducted by school leaders and researchers outside the school network. A reference to an external evaluator with whom the applicant has engaged in a discussion of conducting a randomized control trial to determine the impact of high dosages tutoring.

Weaknesses:

Information is lacking delineating the scope of assessment related to specific measurements to gather quantitative and qualitative data and the person responsible for collection, data analysis and reporting.

Reader's Score: 8

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:

One element notes a plan structured to achieve the objectives of the proposed project to replicate and expand services of their network charter schools and to sustain a robust organization through full enrollment. The management plan is clearly focused on three areas: preparation of students for success through college, providing professional development to advance teachers effectiveness and advancing community investment into the operation of the schools. Page 19

An innovative approach in structuring a management plan is evened in outlining four major actives, noting the staff person responsible and aligning each to a timetable. Milestones are delineated as focused on the areas for: project goals, and priorities; systems for project evaluation and data collection; human capital and facilities and materials; financial tracking and developing key personnel. For example, focused on attaining milestones related to project evaluation and data collection are specified to determine program leadership and hire staff for program expansion. Pages 20 21

Weaknesses:

The applicant narrates a brief response to the criteria. Throughout the management plan, the applicant fails to provide information related to outreach and collaboration with parents. A milestone focused on engaging parents is lacking.

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 applicant responds to the criteria in a well-developed overview detailing the experiences of the project director, executive director and key personnel. The Project Director is well qualified for the position based on his extensive experience in the Central Oaks network and developing partnership which accomplished a \$145 million-dollar redevelopment project. He is noted as a Champion for Education and his success as the Director of the New York City Department of Education's Charter School Office. Pages 22, 23. The founding Executive Director of Great Oaks Wilmington is noted for her experience referencing beginning her career in Teach for American and connecting community organization in leadership for the Forum to Advance Minorities in Engineering. Page 27

Qualifications related to educational backgrounds of key personnel are noted for most managerial staff. For example, the Chief Academic Offices at the Great Oaks Foundation attained his Bachelor's degree in Elementary and Early Childhood Education and a Master's degree in Educational Leadership. The Chief Financial Officer of the Great Oaks Foundation is identified as a Certified Public Accountant with degrees in Accounting and theology. Pages 22, 23

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There is detail lacking in the description of the educational background of the person selected to serve as the Project Director.

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 states that by the end of the grant period the network of school will operate strictly on public revenue and not rely on grant funds. This is substantiated in the fact that the next five years will provide program elements and professional development which are key to sustainability. In addition, the applicant asserts the intention to develop meaningful local partnerships to ensure longevity of the program model. Page 27

The applicant articulates an overview of collaboration with organizations to drive program development and educational excellence. It is noted that a partnership is engaged with NYU Steinhardt and the Relay Graduate School of Education to recruit Tutor Corps members as a component in earning teacher credentials. It is identified that partnerships exist with the Newark's Teachers Village, the Bridgeport's Cherry Street Lofts and with Wilmington's Community Education Building for providing facilities to host the applicant's programs and to serve to revitalize the communities. Pages 34, 35

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide enough detail into the specific partnerships they will seek, regarding the criteria. The applicant fails to provide a multi-year financial and operating model focused on ensuring program sustainability.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

This applicant proposes an initiative that will provide for the expanding a network of charter schools that currently focuses on recruiting and retaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies. This is evidenced in specifying that the currently student population served ranges at 86% of economically diverse student population, as defined by applicant. Specifically, a second Pre-K to grade 5 will open at the Great Oaks Legacy School and the Great Oaks Charter school in Wilmington will expand through high school, adding a grade level each year. Currently the Great Oaks Legacy School reports serving 90% African American and 10% Latino. It is evidenced that the applicant is committed to serving a diverse student population as specified in the Great Oaks Tutor Corps which recruits tutors who are fluent in various languages to connect with students and their family in their native language. Pages 2, 3

Weaknesses:

None are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

None are noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to effectively describe each of the required areas sufficiently,

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2017 12:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2017 01:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Great Oaks Foundation, Inc. (U282M170047)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	31
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	20
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Sub Total	100	79
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 1	3	3
School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	8	3
Total	108	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Management Organization - 2: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Great Oaks Foundation, Inc. (U282M170047)

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: 31

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 a significant amount of student achievement data for 2015-16. This includes subgroups and all students, p. e119-e129. Data for all charter schools includes: grades 6-10, ELA and math for 2015-16 and HS Algebra and Geometry. The subgroups are low income, students with disabilities, ELLs, Black and Hispanic.

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

Weaknesses:

Since data for only one school year is provided, it is not possible to determine whether the achievement data represents increases or decreases. Data labeled Math and ELA Growth (SGP) is included, but SGP is not defined and it is unclear if growth is defined as over the previous year or growth during a school year, p. e119, p. 7-8.

The applicant does not provide graduation rate information for all students and subgroups. Even though one school includes high school grades, it is confusing why graduation rates were not located, p. 17.

Reader's Score: 7

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:

Attendance and retention data is provided for one school year, p. e121.

Suspension and expulsion rates are included for a three year period; these appear relatively stable, p. e121.

Some tables (for specific schools and selective grades/subjects) present evidence of increased student achievement; examples:

a) GO-NYC, grade 8, ELA. Low income and IEP subgroups exceeded state subgroups, p. 8.

b) GO-NJ, grades 6-11, Math and ELA: Low income student subgroup performance exceeded state subgroups at all grade levels, p. 9.

c) GO NJ, HS Algebra 1 and 2: performances exceeded state (Legacy: 50%; state 41% and Legacy: 56% and state: 25%), p. e121 and p. 6.

Weaknesses:

Several of the student achievement data tables include cells labeled as "growth", but this is not defined, p. e122.

Some disadvantaged subgroups at some schools had academic achievement results below their state comparable subgroups. Examples:

- GO-Delaware Grade 6, Math and ELA (Low income and Black disadvantaged) subgroups academic achievement was lower than the state subgroups, p. 131-32.

- GO-Bridgeport, Conn. All grades, Math and ELA, Low income and Black subgroup achievement data were lower than the state subgroups, p. e128-29.

Student attendance rates are provided for only one year. No comparison to prior years or state data is located so it is not possible to determine the significance, p. e121.

Some disadvantaged subgroup growth cells are reported as negative or minus growth, such as: GO-NY: Math all grades, Low income (-16%) and ELL (-10%), p. e124.

The narrative states that growth rates for Black and Latino students exceeded state averages in math and ELA in large numbers (p. 7), but this is not located in the data tables.

High school graduation rates, retention, college attendance and persistence rates are not located, p. e119.

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:

No school has had its charter revoked or its affiliation with Great Oaks terminated, and no school has been closed and each school has received or is on track to receive charter renewal from its authorizer p. 10-15. Extensive audit and accounting reports are provided and there do not appear to be any significant issues in the operational or financial management areas, p. e133.

Weaknesses:

No information was located with respect to student safety.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 14

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:

The four Great Oaks charter schools serve disadvantaged subgroups at a rate comparable or higher to surrounding public schools for these groups, p. 11:

- Students with disabilities: Wilmington, Bridgeport and NYC
- ELL: Bridgeport and NYC
- Low income: Newark and Wilmington

Weaknesses:

Students in these subgroups were served at a rate lower than their surrounding public schools: students with disabilities (Newark), ELL (Newark, Wilmington and NYC), low income (Bridgeport and NYC), p. 11.

Reader's Score: 6

- 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 states they will continue to actively recruit educationally disadvantaged students, p. 14. This will be done by: active recruitment, disseminating recruitment materials in multiple languages, working with community and faith-based organizations and canvassing low-income neighborhoods, p. 14.

In order to expand and replicate their program, the applicant proposes to provide the following strategies to recruit disadvantaged students: quality instruction, support, ongoing and interim assessments, benchmark exams, data-driven instruction, well trained teachers, immersion models and bilingual tutors, p. 12.

Weaknesses:

Their project goals (p. 16-18), expected outcomes and recruitment plan (p. 29-30) do not clearly address how or whether they will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students, p. e17.

Reader's Score: 14

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:

A thorough set of 13 specific and measurable project goals are described together with assessment metrics that are well aligned with their long-term goals, p. 17-18. This should facilitate the evaluation plan. Most goals are appropriate to the overall plan. The purpose is to close the achievement gap by enabling low-income students to graduate from college at rates that exceed those of their wealthier peers.

The logic model appears well aligned with the project short and long-term goals. It includes thorough inputs and outputs, p. 37.

Metis Associates, a national research and consulting firm, may include a randomized control trial to determine the impact of high dosage tutoring, p.19.

Weaknesses:

None of the goals clearly proposes to increase student diversity, p. 17-18.

It is unclear who will lead the evaluation process.

Reader's Score: 8

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 mission is: to prepare students for college success, to train highly effective classroom teachers, and to invest in the communities in which their schools operate. Their management plan is well aligned to carry out their mission, p. 19.

Their management plan includes clear activities, milestones, responsible staff and appropriate timelines, p. 20-21.

Their management system consists of the overall Foundation and local school boards of trustees. The Foundation supports its schools with academic, recruitment, human resources, operations, finance and professional development services. These staff members will provide direct support to schools: The Director of Teaching and Learning will support classroom instruction at all schools with the Director of Curriculum and Assessment, P.45.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 qualifications, training and work experiences of the lead staff are well described in over 15 complete resumes (p. e521) and bios, p. 22-26. They include successful and relevant work experiences and formal training.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the schools after the grant ends is complete and thorough because it includes the following: support and commitment of the Foundation staff, centralized services and leadership, public/state funds for achieving authorized charter school status, AmeriCorps support, philanthropic and programmatic investments, continued teacher professional development and community and educational partnerships, p. 31-40.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 will actively recruit educationally disadvantaged students to enroll at their schools. This will be done by: active recruitment, disseminating recruitment materials in multiple languages, working with community and faith-based

organizations and canvassing low-income neighborhoods, p. 14.

The applicant reports that they are serving socioeconomically diverse students because 86% come from low-income backgrounds as determined by their eligibility for free and reduced lunch subsidies, Abstract, p. e17. The racial and ethnic diversity (at their four schools) ranges are: African American: 48 to 90%; Hispanic: 10 to 47%, p. e21.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a clear commitment that they have an intentional focus on recruiting and retaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies. Their project goals (p. 16-18), expected outcomes and recruitment plan (p. 29-30) do not address CPP 1, p. e17.

Reader's Score: 3

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 states that one of the Great Oaks charter schools merged with another (non-Great Oaks) charter school. Prior to the merger and prior to 2014-15, the non-Great Oaks school engaged in a turnaround effort with Madison Elementary, p. 4-5.

Great Oaks appears to have a positive track record in improving academic achievement for low performing students.

Weaknesses:

It is confusing whether the applicant actually took over the operation of an academically poor-performing public school and restarted it as a charter school. It appears that the Great Oaks charter school did not actually take over Madison, a failing school, p. 4-5.

The applicant does not propose to use CMO funds to restart as a charter school one or more academically poor-performing public schools during the project period, p. 4.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/27/2017 01:41 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2017 10:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Great Oaks Foundation, Inc. (U282M170047)

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	21
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Sub Total	100	89
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 1	3	3
School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	8	3
Total	108	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Charter Management Organization - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Great Oaks Foundation, Inc. (U282M170047)

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:

Students attending Great Oaks schools saw increasing achievement in many cases provided in the application. At the Bridgeport, Connecticut schools, all students and subgroups of students saw increases in SBAC scores in both ELA and Math (e26). The application presents data that demonstrates achievement increases for Bridgeport students on multiple assessments, including Fountas and Pinnell and NWEA (e26). Most students at GO Wilmington earned a higher raw score on the ELA and Math SBAC from the previous year (100% and 89% respectively) (e27). Great Oaks Bridgeport students made nearly two years of progress in math during the 2015/16 school year (e31). The applicant demonstrates that student retention and attendance rates exceed 90% for its programs (e121).

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

Weaknesses:

Data provided by the applicant indicate that proficiency for all students and for each subgroup is below 50% in most cases (e120). The application includes data that indicate a 25% suspension rate across programs, with steady increases in the rate since 2013 (e121).

Reader's Score: 13

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 has demonstrated that their students were able to outperform students in the state. On the 2015/16 PARCC, performance at Great Oaks Legacy exceed that of New Jersey schools in grades 7 and 8 as well as Algebra I and II (e25). Proficiency rates on Smarter Balanced (GO Bridgeport) rose at rates higher than the state's

Sub Question

rate (e26). Student at GO Bridgeport outperformed the state on the State Education Department's Next Generation Accountability Report (e26). In addition, low income students outperformed their peers in NY in both Math and ELA in every grade (e28).

AT GO NYC, student growth exceeded the state rate for all students and for all subgroups (e26) GO NYC ELA Growth for All students and for subgroups Low Income, Students with IEPs, exceed state rate (e27) GO Wilmington: 100% of students earned a higher raw score on ELA SBAC, 89% in math. Low income students at GOLCS outperformed similar NJ student in every grade (e28). 6th grade proficiency rates on the SBAC increased 7.5% compared to 3.3% for the state (e25). Low income students at GO NYC were 24% more proficient in Math and 16% more proficient in ELA than low income students in NY State. Their proficiency growth rate was nearly triple the growth rate of the state (e29).

Proficiency rates for GO – NYC students with disabilities were more than double those of students with IEP or 504 plans in New York State. 60% of ELL 7th graders were proficient in Math compared to 8% in the State. (e29). GO Legacy students with disabilities outperformed their peers in New Jersey on PARCC assessments as well (e29).

Weaknesses:

NJ students at GO Legacy did not outperform New Jersey schools in grade 6 and in geometry (e25). The application did not provide score comparisons in Bridgeport, only gains compared (e25) Absolute proficiency rates remained stagnant (e27). When compared to surrounding districts and states, the schools had a mixed record of performance, especially in the area of students with disabilities (e122).

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 states that minimal compliance issues have arisen for Great Oaks Charter Schools (e29). In addition, each school is on track to receive or has received a charter renewal from the authorizer (e29). The proposal describes financial planning procedures, appropriate accounting practices, and fundraising strategies. Finally, there have been no revocations, dissolutions or closures of their charters (e30).

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that they have encountered "minimal" fiscal, regulatory, or compliance related challenges" without providing detail (e29).

Reader's Score: 14

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 proposal includes a table that shows that students with IEPs at three sites, ELL students in Bridgeport, and low income students in Newark and Wilmington are served at higher or comparable rates to their local systems. The applicant states that between 69% and 91% of students qualify as economically disadvantaged (e20), including 86% of students qualifying for Free and Reduced Meals. The enrollment at GO Legacy is comprised of 90% African American and 10% Latino students. At Bridgeport, 47.8% are African American and 46.6% are Latino. In addition, the Bridgeport lottery provides a weighting for ELL (e21). In Wilmington, 72.9% are African American; 17.5% are Latino; and 7.9% white (e21). The applicant describes a tutor corps: 270 members, 45% AA, 33% White, 5% Asian. Strive to reduce racial, ethnic, economic isolation (e21).

Weaknesses:

Special Education, ELL, and Low Income student enrollment does not exceed that of the neighboring school district. For example, GO Legacy serves a smaller percentage of students with IEPs or ELLs; Christina school District serves a greater percentage of ELLs and the same percentage of students with IEPs; GO NYC serves less ELLs and Low Income students as a percentage of the student body than NYC Schools; and Bridgeport public school enrollment is comprised of nearly 100% Low Income Students compared to only 81% at GO Bridgeport. (e30)

Reader's Score: 7

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:

Significant programming designed to ensure that academic needs of the target populations are met and then using those programs to recruit parents of students who benefit, especially ELLs and low-income students (e.g., ongoing assessments, tutoring, immersion programming, co-teaching, etc.) (e31). The proposal describes additional supports for student with disabilities and ELLs (e31). The applicant will engage in actively recruiting educationally disadvantaged students by creating materials in multiple languages, informing families of supports, providing information to families and community and faith-based events, and canvassing and disseminating school information in low-income neighborhoods (e33). Lotteries at GO Bridgeport and GO NYC give ELLs preference (e34). GO NYC offers lottery preference to ELL (e20). The applicant describes recruitment strategies in NYC and Bridgeport including recruiting students in multiple languages spoken in the community and canvassing non-English speaking neighborhoods. The proposal includes a Tutor Corps: multi lingual, high dosage daily tutoring. The applicant describes core components that offer research-based strategies designed to support educationally disadvantaged student, including individualized instruction, increased time on task, character development, and meaningful relationships with at least one adult (e61).

Weaknesses:

The project goals presented in the abstract do not suggest that recruitment and retention of educationally disadvantaged students is a goal or an expected outcome (e17).

Reader's Score: 14

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 logic model presented in the application is directly linked to the goals and outcomes of the project (e56).

The goals and outcomes include specific performance measures including:

- o plan is for 80% of Great Oaks student demonstrate 1.5 years of growth in Math and ELA per year (e17)
- o Average daily attendance will be 95%
- o 95% of families will indicate satisfaction
- o 75% of students in Grade 8 will be proficient in state mandated ELA/Math exams
- o 80% will graduate HS in 4 years
- o 95% will take the ACT/SAT
- o 90% of graduates will have taken at least one AP exam
- o 70% will pass at least one AP exam
- o 70% will earn SAT 480/530 math
- o 50 Tutor corps members will earn MAT

The applicant provides metrics that are aligned with the proposed outcomes (e35-36) and metrics have data sources that are easily accessible and already developed (e36). There is an additional outcome of teacher satisfaction ratings (e35). The applicant proposes to reduce "achievement gap" as represented by college graduation rates (e37). The applicant includes an annual strategic review process with the school's Executive Director and Board (e38). The applicant uses an outside evaluator to assess the tutoring component of the plan (e38). The inputs are linked to the budget with specific references to the CSP grant (e56).

Weaknesses:

The logic model does not identify enrollment of educationally disadvantaged students (e56) as a short term or long-term goal. There are no specific outcomes related to the recruitment or retention of the targeted subgroups (e36).

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: 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 applicant proposes a realistic timeline that includes activities and milestones and is sufficiently detailed. In addition, the timeline assigns responsibility to specific positions in the organization (e39). The applicant includes systems design, evaluation, hiring and purchasing, and budgeting milestones (e40). The organization chart demonstrates that all areas of the grant are assigned to specific staff members (e51).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses observed in this section.

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 CEO has extensive experience with the organization and past experience that directly applies to the proposal (e42) Key project personnel, including the CFO, CAO, COO, and other central office staff, are experienced in opening and operating charter schools (e43). The tutor corps, an important component of the program, is led by experienced staff that has previously served in the position (e43). The proposal also identifies key site staff. Since the project's focus is expansion, the current site leadership will continue in their role. In addition, the site leadership and staff seem capable of managing the expansions of their sites (e45). The applicant offers higher than average salaries to instructional staff to better attract high quality, experienced teachers (e66).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses observed in this section.

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 program will be able to continue after the grant solely on the public funds it receives, without the need to supplement with grant revenues (e46). The organization has central staff that will provide support in the major areas of the project (e.g., Academics.) (e47) The proposal identifies experienced leaders and staff that will continue to manage important elements (e.g., finance, operations, tutor corps, etc.) after the grant period ends (e49). Foundation staff will support the program marketing and fundraising efforts (49). The applicant's model includes site-based management through a board of trustees at each site (e50). The applicant has a program that develops school leaders from within and cites examples of leaders that followed this pathway in the past (e50) The applicant proposes to expand its Great Oaks Teacher Residency at the sites and describes a partnership with NYU to allow staff to gain an MAT in a job embedded program. (e50). Summer Preparation programs and ongoing professional development for teachers are proposed to increase competency and promote from within (e53). The application identifies important community partnerships with renowned organizations (e53).

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes a steady increase in central office staffing that is not addressed in the sustainability section (e64).

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 describes a program that intends to expand their enrollment at the four charter schools they operate. The enrollment at these schools is 86% low income (e17). The lottery process at two schools purposefully offers preferences for ELLs (e21). The schools have recruited and hired minority candidates who "represent the diversity of local and global communities (e21). Recruitment activities are conducted and materials are produced in English and the predominant languages of the community (e22). The applicant provides extensive and thoughtful programming designed to benefit educationally disadvantaged students, including ELL and special education students (e75). Programming such as tutoring and extended day benefit educationally disadvantaged students (e113)

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses observed in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

In 2016/17 school year, the applicant merged with a failing charter school (Newark Legacy) incorporating their 700 students into the Great Oaks network (p23). These students exhibited increased growth in achievement. Using the

Achievement Network (A-Net) assessments to gauge progress, students who previously attended Legacy Charter saw increases in both ELA from (39.2% to 59% predicted to achieve proficiency) and Math 32.5% to 43% predicted to achieve proficiency (e24).

Weaknesses:

This element required that the applicant have experience in turnaround programming and proposes to create a turnaround program during this grant period (e24). None of the programs included in the grant are turnaround schools taken over by Great Oaks (e17).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2017 10:46 AM