

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 01:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Hebrew Language Charter School Excellenc (U282M160011)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	45
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	7
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	89
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	0
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	8	3
Total	108	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Charter Management Organization - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Center for Hebrew Language Charter School Excellenc (U282M160011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

Tables 1 and 2 (p. 7 and 8, respectively) demonstrate applicant has increased student achievement at the school-level and across most demographic categories.

Results for 2016 - see page 13 for Hebrew Language Academy (HLA) - suggest a continued upward trend for all students.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not report English Language Learner (ELL) data for HLA, even though it's a larger school than Harlem Hebrew Language Academy, for which it did report ELL data. According to applicant-reported data, ELL population at HLA should be about 45 students (8% of 564 students), which seems large enough to report.

ELA performance for African-American students at HLA seems to have flat-lined between 2014 and 2015 (p. 7).

Reader's Score: 18

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

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

Applicant is clearly making more rapid progress in increasing student achievement when compared to statewide peer groups (tables 4 and 5 on page 11). Performance in math is particularly impressive.

Weaknesses:

A direct comparison between applicant's educationally disadvantaged students and their non-educationally disadvantaged peers (i.e., if tables 4 and 5 had another cohort of students representing non-educationally disadvantaged students at the state level, or white students) would have been helpful in determining the precise extent to which applicant has closed achievement gaps.

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

Applicant's growth rates for African-American students, low-income students, and students with disabilities far outpaces growth rates for those student populations at the state level (p. 10-11). Particularly impressive is the applicant's performance with low-income students in Math (applicant moved from 28 to 53 percent, whereas the state moved from 21 to 27 percent) (bottom of page 10, top of page 11). Not only are the applicant's students outperforming their peers at the state level, but they're growing at a faster rate.

Weaknesses:

ELL data is not reported in tables 4 and 5 (page 11). Though applicant notes the group is too small to report, it would be helpful to see at least some anecdotal evidence of their performance.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

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

Strengths:

Applicant has a proven track record of student achievement for select educationally disadvantaged groups - namely low-income students, students with disabilities, and African-American students (p. 7-9, 11).

Weaknesses:

No reference to ELL population in this section. Applicant refers to target enrollment percentages for low-income students, SWDs, and racial/ethnic diversity, but does not directly address ELL population (p. 17). Additionally, applicant did not produce ELL performance data in prior section, so it's difficult to determine the extent to which applicant has succeeded in serving that student population.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design

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

Strengths:

Language immersion program is evidence-based. Applicant details benefits of language immersion, citing RAND study that showed benefits for ELA performance (p. 20).

Co-teaching model (p. 21) seems to be deliberately planned to ensure that instruction is differentiated in core subjects.

Goals and objectives (p. 43-45) appear to be rigorous, particularly those associated with closing achievement gaps and ensuring HL students outperform their state-level peers.

Weaknesses:

Student diversity goals (top of p. 45) leave room for the applicant to not serve ELL and SWD populations similar to neighboring schools. While 15% for SWDs seems reasonable, that figure may be higher for neighboring schools. Likewise, aiming to be "within two percentile points" of neighboring schools for ELL enrollment means that HL schools could serve ELL students at a lower rate than neighboring schools. Measures that require HL schools to serve ELL students and SWDs at rates at least as high as neighboring schools would be more appropriate.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

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

Reader's Score: 19

Sub Question

Sub Question

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).**

Strengths:

Applicant has clear, robust management structures in place for both instructional and operational elements of its model. Positions and personnel structure detailed on pages 23-24 is relevant for the purposes of this project and indicates that applicant has management/personnel structure that will support effective implementation of replication and expansion efforts. Timeline outlined on pages 24-26 is reasonable and effectively detailed.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

According to applicant, "After approximately three years of operation, the schools become sustainable on public non-grant funding" (p. 26). Given the nature of CSP funding, this timeline appears to be more than adequate.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Applicant demonstrates strong philanthropic support (p. 30-31), as well as support from key stakeholders in its current areas of operation (p. 28). Additionally, applicant is a member of key regional and national organizations related to its school model, especially the national organizations focused on diverse charter schools (p. 3) and charter schools serving SWDs (p. 3). These relationships and the applicant's efforts to serve as a leader in these national organizations demonstrate a strong commitment for the school.

Weaknesses:

Applicant doesn't directly address support from communities into which it plans to expand.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

Applicant notes strong authorizer requirements for school quality (p. 33), and more importantly notes the logistical elements it has in place to ensure effective school closure that limits adverse consequences for students, families, and staff (p. 32-33). Particularly important is the emphasis on page 33 on ensuring a smooth transition for students.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

Applicant demonstrates talent in the areas of school management, communications, development, learning and instruction, and key elements of the school model, particularly in the areas of school integration and Hebrew language instruction (p. 33-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.**

Strengths:

Applicant emphasizes diversity in its evaluation plan (p. 44-45), which is important given the extent to which that characteristic is central to the school's model. Furthermore, applicant's measures are relevant and aligned with the project's intent and specifically measurable. In particular, student performance measures (p. 43-44) are pointedly focused on achievement and growth and demonstrate a robust understanding of evaluation methods and are consistent with the type of growth and achievement outlined earlier in the application.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

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

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

described below:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Applicant utilizes deliberate marketing to diverse group of families, yielding diversity along lines of race, ethnicity, income levels, etc., particularly when compared to neighboring schools that are largely segregated along lines of race/ethnicity and income (p. 3-5). Additionally, applicant heavily emphasizes diversity in its school model as evidenced by its engagement in national organizations related to diversity and serving SWDs (p. 3). Applicant is serving EL students at rates that are largely similar to surrounding schools, and proposes to do so moving forward based on the goal on page 45.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2016 01:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 10:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Hebrew Language Charter School Excellenc (U282M160011)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	43
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	8
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	8
Sub Total	100	83
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	0
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	8	3
Total	108	86

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Charter Management Organization - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Center for Hebrew Language Charter School Excellenc (U282M160011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

Reader's Score: 43

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

Hebrew Language operates two schools and both schools demonstrated that their students increased their academic achievement over the last three years (p. e26, e27). For example, over the last three years African American students increased their math proficiency rates by 19%, and Special Education students nearly tripled their proficiency rates in both Math and Reading. This demonstrates that all students at Hebrew Language are growing academically over time.

Weaknesses:

The application would have benefitted from a more detailed discussion that described what the school was doing to address African American students' needs in reading. From the data, it appears that the percentage of African American students scoring proficiently at HLA has plateaued (p. e26). The application lacked an explanation and a plan to address the issue.

Reader's Score: 18

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

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

Strengths:

According to data presented in the application, African American students at Hebrew Language are improving their academic proficiency rates in ELA at more than double the rates of African American students across the state and

Sub Question

more than triple their rates in Math (p. e29). The application presents a strong case that they are closing achievement gaps more effectively than other public schools across the state.

Weaknesses:

The application would have benefitted from an internal comparison in addition to the external comparison provided. In other words, the application makes a strong case for its efforts to close achievement gaps when the data is compared to the state but there is limited discussion of internal data comparing subgroups within the school.

Reader's Score: 12

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

Strengths:

Hebrew Language attendance rates are improving from year to year (p. e33) and retention rates remain high (p. e34). As previously mentioned, Hebrew Language performs well academically when compared to the state (p. e29).

Weaknesses:

The application would have benefitted from including data of surrounding schools or districts in addition to comparisons with the state.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

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

Strengths:

The application makes a strong distinction between its vision for inclusion and integration, and the reality that New York City public schools remain some of the most segregated schools in the country (p. e35). The application discusses the locations for the proposed replications and expansions and they relate directly to the existing diverse student body (p. e36). Given the CMO's academic success, the desire to promote diversity within the school and the location of the new schools the proposed project could positively contribute to assisting educationally disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

The application would have benefitted from connecting a broader discussion of its recruitment and marketing practices (p. e161) to efforts that might serve to diversify the student populace even further (p. e36).

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design

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

Strengths:

The application outlines milestones and timeframes for the implementation of the grant (p. e44). The goals and objectives of the grant are clearly specified in the abstract narrative (p. e16).

Weaknesses:

The application would have benefitted from an even greater degree of specificity as related to timelines, assigned roles and responsibilities and the stated measures. Without this level of detail in the application, it is difficult to judge the degree to which the proposed project is attainable.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

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

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).

Strengths:

The application outlines milestones and timeframes for the implementation of the grant (p. e44). The goals and objectives of the grant are clearly specified in the abstract narrative (p. e16). The budgets for the schools are outlined (p. e140) and the budget narrative provides detailed rationale for the cost of the project (p. e219).

Weaknesses:

While the application clearly defines milestones, timelines and the projected budgets, the grant application would have benefitted from a more detailed discussion of how the management plan would mitigate risk and ensure that the project was implemented on time and within the stated budget.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The grant application outlines a business plan that accounts for the sustainability of the project beyond the life of the grant (p. e45) and the financial health of the organization is clearly evident in the application (p. e49, e140, e219).

Weaknesses:

There were no noted weaknesses for this section.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The application clearly indicates the financial health of the organization (p. e49, e140, e219) and demonstrates extensive, broad support for the existing schools and the proposed expansion (p. e117, e144). Support and sustainability of the CMO is evident by their massive fundraising efforts.

Weaknesses:

The application would have benefitted from greater detail (p. e143) that could have included an organizational chart or a discussion concerning the student-teacher ratio. Given that the largest expenditure for the CMO is personnel, the application might have benefitted from disaggregating the cost of personnel. This would have provided more clarity.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The application states that Hebrew Language sets aside funds in the event that a school closure is required (p. e51). The application does outline a plan for school closure and demonstrates a concern for the potentially affected students (p. e52).

Weaknesses:

The plan relies heavily on the authorizer (p. e52). The grant would have benefitted from clarifying further the roles and responsibilities of the CMO in the school closure process.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

The application clearly identifies the relevant personnel who would be responsible for the successful implementation of the grant if it were awarded (p. e52)

Weaknesses:

The grant would have benefitted from a visual representation of the organizational structure in order to more clearly understand who is responsible for specific elements of grant implementation.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.**

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation measures the objective and outcomes related to the project (p. e60). The plan outlines the measures and differentiates between measures for students and measures for the schools.

Weaknesses:

While the CMO management team may have valuable experience in data analysis and evaluation (p. e61), the grant would have benefitted from planning to contract with an independent third-party evaluation unit. This degree of separation would have provided another level of quality and validity to the project evaluation.

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not address criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The application indicates that Hebrew Language maintain an economically and racially diverse student body (p. e22 and e23). The CMO and its leadership desire to promote diversity in charter schools by their association with the National Coalition of Diverse Charter Schools and by institutionalizing this principle in school measures (p. e63). The percentage of students receiving special services (special education and ELL) are comparable to the surrounding areas (p. e24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 10:46 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/05/2016 01:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Hebrew Language Charter School Excellenc (U282M160011)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	45
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	9
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	6
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	8
Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	0
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Sub Total	8	3
Total	108	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Charter Management Organization - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Center for Hebrew Language Charter School Excellenc (U282M160011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The proposal indicates the applicant has a significant record of increasing student achievement among the targeted student population. Table 1 is provided to demonstrate increased proficiency levels for mathematics and English Language Arts among the targeted student populations at the school's Brooklyn campuses. The subgroups include African American students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. (pages 6 and 7) Research is also provided on page 7 to describing the assessment system.

The proposal includes a data chart indicating a solid history of increased academic achievement for all students at the Harlem school campus. This chart supports the proposal narrative that describes positive 3rd grade cohort test outcomes, as well as a chart showing strong academic performance for all students including educationally disadvantaged students. (page 9)

Page 11 charts indicate consistent increase in student performance over previous three years and supports the narrative summary found on pages 10-12.

Charts showing student attendance and retention rates are provided on (pages 14 and 15)

Weaknesses:

The table 1 on page 7 indicates no growth for Africa American students at HLA. The response would benefit from a discussion of these outcomes that includes details on how the applicant addresses stagnant student performance.

Reader's Score: 18

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students

Sub Question

described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

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

Strengths:

The narrative and data clearly demonstrate the schools have been continuously successful at closing historic achievement gaps for educationally disadvantaged students.

A chart is provided on page 14 chart that describes student attendance. A chart is provided on page 15 chart for student retention indicate high rates for previous 3 years for students in the schools.

Data is cited in the narrative indicating academic growth for English Language Arts and Mathematics.

The proposal narrative and data provided on pages 10 and 11 indicates the applicant has closed traditional achievement gaps for the targeted student groups at the existing schools.

Weaknesses:

The response for this sub criterion would be improved with a brief explanation of fluctuating proficiency rates for Special Education students found in tables 1 and 4, and for Africa American students in Table 3.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Strengths:

The narrative provides data to draw comparisons the applicant schools and statewide proficiency scores over past three years. The description indicates continuous success that exceeds student performance statewide. (page 10) Data is used to describe the comparisons for African American, economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities.

Data provided in the narrative to describe The diverse by design model found on page 10 is used to close achievement gaps.

Section IV.A.2 and Tables indicate reduced achievement gaps for educationally disadvantaged subgroups at a rate that exceeds the state, and the data illustrates the targeted population of African American students, students with disabilities, and economically exceeding the performance of their peers statewide in core subject areas at the HLA campus.

Weaknesses:

There are confusing statements on page 10, "HLA's proficiency growth rates for students with disabilities were sixteen times that of the state in ELA, and more than five times that of the state in math" See actual numbers describing the significant disparity and "6 times that of the state between achievement scores for students with

Sub Question

disabilities in the state compared to the applicant school" These statement are not clearly supported by data. A strong response would provide data that reveals the validity of these statements.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes prior success providing high quality education options for 1000 economically disadvantaged students at existing school sites. (page 16)

The proposal states the project will serve populations similar to currently operating schools and describes demographic compositions supported by data. The information indicates a significant targeted population of educationally disadvantaged students, including those defined as economically disadvantaged (60%), students with disabilities, (20%) and minority students (50%).(page 17)

Applicant discusses the proposed locations on page 17 and describes a focus on creating integrated schools.

The narrative describes academic benefits for the targeted student population and discusses initiatives for character development and travel opportunities. (Page 17 and 18)

The proposal discusses a focus on closing the "language gap" as a strategy to ensure success in college and the work force and cites research to support this effort. Page 17)

Weaknesses:

A brief restatement of prior success in key areas for economically disadvantaged students and how this success will be aligned to the replication project would improve the response in this area.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable.**

Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.

Strengths:

The applicant describes project initiatives that include diverse-by-design schools model, foreign language immersion, instruction, increased instructional and a rigorous, wide-ranging academic program. (pages 18-21)

Nine research citations are provided to support the effectiveness of the initiatives. (pages 19-21)

Weaknesses:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes for the project are not clearly articulated. The response in this area would be improved with the addition of a detail explanation of specific project goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved along with details on how the project outcomes will be measured.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

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

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).**

Strengths:

The narrative describes the applicant's history of success implementing and managing high quality charter schools. Details include a summary of the school network and the responsibilities of the various persons/positions/individuals who support the school goals of the schools including governing board, administrative and financial staff, and school leaders. (Page 23). Resumes for key personnel provided in appendix.

On pages 24 and 25 the applicant describes the expansion phases and a project timeline with milestones is provided to explain grade expansions during the cycle of the grant. This information indicates a clear plan is in place to guide the replication of a high quality charter school.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses evident in this element of the selection criteria.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The proposal states that member schools are expected to become sustainable after three years of operation relying and are expected to rely on public non-grant funding.(page 26) that will translation to a decreased reliance on donated funding and grant awards.

The narrative cites the applicant's experience in securing facilities to address increased student enrollment and describes strategies that include facility renovation, relocation to larger sites, assistance from existing community relationships, and facilities financing (page 26)

The applicant provides a description of the financial funding process that indicates sound fiscal management plan is in place. The process is guided by a financial management team whose roles , duties and responsibilities imply robust financial oversight of, budgets, policies, financial analyses, and risk management. (page 27)

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not clearly articulate how student achievement impacts business decision making. A strong response would include a brief description of an existing or proposed process to align student performance in ways that inform financial decision making, such as plans to redirect funding to increase staffing dollars at a struggling school should the need arise.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The proposal includes a comprehensive chart on page 30 detailing the multi-year budget for current and future projects. Funding distribution appears appropriate and in alignment with stated project goals.

Site specific budgets are provided in Appendix G that reveal a record of continuous, sound fiduciary oversight.

The proposal indicates a history of extensive funding support from numerous stakeholders. (page 31)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

A comprehensive plan for the closure of ineffective schools is described on page 33. The narrative explains steps that will be taken including student placement,, staff transitions, information processing. (page 32) These strategies are likely to ensure an organized closure process.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses evident in this area.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

A comprehensive description of eleven key project personnel is provided. The skills and experience of these individuals are in keeping with abilities expected to implement and guide high performing charter school model of the scope and size in the project. The applicant also provides detail on the specific roles and responsibilities of these key personnel.

(pages 33-40)

Weaknesses:

A strong response for this criteria would include a brief description of a professional development process or other expected training for the school leaders as they expand to sites nation-wide. Leadership training should support efforts the expansion process and keep those responsible informed of issues pertinent regional and national best practices for school governance and day-to-day management of the schools they serve.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.**

Strengths:

A comprehensive evaluation plan is described that, if implemented with fidelity, is likely to support the school's goal of increasing academic achievement among the targeted student population.

Ten forms of data to be collected and reviewed is listed to inform the evaluation model which is implemented by both school based and network level data teams.

The evaluation model contains a set of objective performance measures are described to evaluate academic performance in math, English Language Arts, and Science. Indicators of success are described including student achievement in specific assessments such as the state tests and school specific assessments such as the Fountas and Pennel

Benchmark assessment. Additionally, the proposal states attention is given to using data to close the achievement gap. (pages 43 and 43)

According to the narrative the applicant includes attendance, language proficiency, retention, character development and discipline as indicators of success in the evaluation plan. (page 45)

School operations and overall effectiveness is assessed including stakeholder satisfaction surveys, teacher retention, financial performance, enrollment, outcomes for school standing by the authorizer. The applicant will also monitor the effectiveness of the school network based on outcomes from a combination of assessments and surveys. (Page 45)

Weaknesses:

The application would benefit from a discussion and supporting documents describing project level performance measures

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is not applying under this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Efforts to create racially and economically diverse schools that serve all students are evident. The applicant uses various strategies to ensure diversity locate schools in areas that are close to neighborhoods of different racial and economic composition market to families in multiple media outlets, Appendix H provides significant detail on strategies to recruit a diverse student population, extensive samples of marketing materials in a variety of languages.

Data provided indicates significant student diversity including 39% of students at existing schools are African American, 4% are Latino, 1% are Asian, 2% are multiracial 54% are white. Additionally; 8% are English language learners; and 68% are economically disadvantaged (compared with 66% in the district in which the school is located) includes variety of home languages. (page 4)

At second school to be replicated, 35% are African American, 28% are Latino, 2% are multiracial, and 35% are white; 10% are English language learners; and 51% are economically disadvantaged (compared with 50% in the district (page 4)

Data for students with disabilities currently served is cited on page 5 indicating 17 percent of HLA's students have IEPs, compared with 16 percent in District 22 (in which the school is located). 22 percent of HH's students have IEPs, compared with 18 percent in District 3 (in which the school is located).

Data for ELLs cited efforts to engage family with non-English home language that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in neighboring public schools. Across both schools, 30% of students speak a language other than English at home. 8% of HLA's students are English language learners, compared with 11% in the district in which it is located. 10% of HH's students are English language learners, as compared with 6% in the district in which it is located. (page 5)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are evident in this area.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/05/2016 01:28 AM