

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2017 03:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Paradigm for Education, Inc (U282M170008)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	38
<b>Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	18
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	82
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	82

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Paradigm for Education, Inc (U282M170008)

## 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:

Comparative proficiency data for black and economically disadvantaged subgroups on Math and ELA State tests indicate that both subgroups, economically disadvantaged and black, outperform District and State students (App. G pp. 2-8). According to reported data NPFE schools outpaced district schools in all years reported (p.7). African American students at DEPSA outperformed students at both the district and state levels in each of the last five years. NPFE reports that the achievement gap has been closed in both reading and math between black and white students for the 2 years reported (pp. 12-13). Dis-aggregated results show growth in Math and ELA for black and ED students in the turn-around schools when compared to District results for the most recent 2 year period. Relative growth compared to State-wide performance for African American and ED subgroups was demonstrated during the Common Core transition period for both Math and ELA (p.9). In addition, NPFE has outperformed district schools in all 3 years reported and has outperformed the State-wide average on Grade 11 Math and ELA for the most recent year of data (p.10). NPFE has demonstrated a commitment to serving low-performing schools through replication and expansion models that have demonstrated success in their turn-around schools. They use the Success for All reading and writing programs, Eureka Math, Project lead the Way and International Baccalaureate models as their core curriculum. (p. e 45). NPFE has a track record of improving schools in its turn-around model. A significantly higher percentage of NPFE students met achievement targets than the district on the NWEA-MAP assessment (p. 7).

#### Weaknesses:

Data is not reported for the two most recently acquired turn-around schools (Global Prep Academy-GPA and University Yes Academy-UYA) and NPFE only states that they "plan to implement the same model and expects the same pattern of consistent growth..." (p. 10). In three of the 5 years reported, Black and White subgroup scores on the State tests for grades 3-8 in Math and ELA were below the District and State averages (p.30). Additionally, disaggregation of DEPSA and ECE data would strengthen this application (Appendix G).

Reader's Score: 12

2. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, and where applicable and available,

### Sub Question

**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:**

Annual performance data on statewide assessments in Math and ELA grades indicate that DEPSA schools' black students outperformed the same group when compared to both district and state results over the past 5 years and surpassed district performance when compared to White students. The two turn-around schools demonstrated growth when compared to State and District schools for both black and white students after the third year of operation. On ACT readiness subject exams ECE performed above the district but not the State average in each of the years reported (p. 11). Results from the turn-around schools and at the NPFE high school (ECE) demonstrate that the achievement gap between educationally disadvantaged and non-educationally disadvantaged students is closing under the NPFE model (p. e33). NPFE has outperformed district schools in all 3 years reported and has outperformed the State wide average on Grade 11 Math and ELA for the most recent year of data (p.10). Average for grades 3-8 in Math and ELA surpass the district and State in 4 of the 5 years reported for each of the proficiency rates for three schools for which data is included (p. e.27). Sub-group data also indicates higher performance by Black and White subgroups for two of the five years reported (p. 30). Four and five year graduation rates for ECE have exceeded the graduation rates of both the district and state data and NPFE is committed to following students after graduation to determine persistence rates. Only one year of persistence data is available and it is higher than expected when compared to national norms, the only reference point included.

#### **Weaknesses:**

ACT scores are lower than State averages for all years reported (p. e29). There is no data for White subgroups at ECE after the 2012-13 school year. The NPFE schools serve a small percentage of students with Special Needs as compared to both district and state. Average proficiency rates on 3-8 Math and ELA State tests for economically disadvantaged students were lower than State District averages for 2 of the 4 schools over 4 years of reporting (p. e32).

**Reader's Score: 12**

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

#### **Strengths:**

NPFE provides clean audits and has not experienced any significant issues in the areas of student safety, financial management, statutory or regulatory compliance (Appendix I, p e150).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The UYA high school program closed 2 weeks prior to school opening forcing families to find other high schools. There is no indication in the proposal as to the process and or thinking behind the timing of this closure.

**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: 18

### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

NPFE has been serving educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and ELL students since opening its first school in 1998. 80% of their student body fall in the educationally disadvantaged category compared to the state average of 46% and the district average of 73% (p.e22). Average proficiency rates for grades 3-8 in Math and ELA surpass the District and State in 4 of the 5 years reported for each of the three schools for which there is reported data (p. e27). Sub-group data also indicates higher performance by Black and White subgroups for two of the five years reported (p. e30).

#### Weaknesses:

Two years of approximated data is provided for Special Education and ELL students that is significantly lower than District, County and State enrollment of these two subgroups (p. e48).

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:

NPFE participates in a 100% blind lottery complying with all federal and state laws. Schools are open to Michigan residents only and recruitment plans target the educationally disadvantaged neighborhoods in which each school is located. Recruitment plans include working with community organizations in low income neighborhoods where NPFE schools are located, targeted recruitment at elementary schools serving educationally disadvantaged students, partnering with organizations that serve high-need students and using local media as a recruitment tool (p. e.50). The applicant reports that all four of NPFE's expansion neighborhoods have high concentrations of low-income and special education students (Appendix I, Map of CommunityClusters).

#### Weaknesses:

NPFE reports that it actively attempts to recruit special education students but there is not stated plan as to how that recruitment will occur. Recruitment efforts include collaborating with community organizations in neighborhoods where educationally disadvantaged students live, recruiting at elementary schools that serve educationally disadvantaged students, partnering with organizations that support educationally disadvantaged students and using media to recruit students in neighborhoods where educationally disadvantaged students reside. In the Southwest Detroit neighborhood where replication and expansion is proposed there is a "relatively higher population of English Language Learners" however NPFE does not provide an intentional plan for recruiting ELL students from that neighborhood. The applicant does not provide a plan for recruiting and enrolling the ELL and Special Education subgroups.

**Sub Question**

**Reader's Score: 11**

**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:**

NPFE provides a detailed Logic Model and objectives related to the goals set forth in the proposal). The Logic Model outlines resources, objectives, activities and associated measurable quantitative and qualitative outcomes for each of the 8 resources: leadership, intervention, high performing staff, alumni network, community demand, policy, local and national relations and sustainability (p. e52). They report using both state assessments and internally created assessment tools. Qualitative data will be obtained by an independent evaluator who will survey each of the NPFE schools to identify "similarities and differences" between the schools (p.e56).

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear that an independent evaluator has been solicited for this project rather a list of potential evaluators is provided (p.e56). It would have strengthened the application had information that had been obtained from previous NPFE independent evaluations was used to inform this proposal. (p. e55). Finally, more specificity in Performance Targets should be added in statements such as "for students who have been at NPFE schools for 4 years, test scores in math or reading meet or exceed state averages. There is no indication as to by how much they will exceed the state average and therefore it is difficult to determine their standard for success. (Objective 2, p.e54).

**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: 18**

**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:**

NPFE has identified the amount of time needed to successfully implement the proposed project at the CMO level. School level growth planning has clear timelines, milestones and roles associated with implementation. Performance measures include enrollment, school opening dates, geographic clusters where schools are to be situated, total number of teachers and total number of CMO staff to be recruited. For each of these activities there is an associated performance target by the numbers expected in each area and the time frame in which each is to be accomplished. For example, by the need of the grant period (2021-22) there will be a total of 290 teachers hired

## Sub Question

and receiving professional development. Data will be tracked by NPFE academic team and reported by the Michigan Dept. of Education. Enrollment table outlines specific targets that increase from 2900 in the initial year of the grant to 5000 by the end of the grant cycle in 2021-22 (p.e53).

### Weaknesses:

Performance targets are vague and specific reporting measures are not included in the plan. The applicant notes that there are "factors beyond the horizon" that could change the details of this management plan over the five year period but there is no explanation as to what they are or how that change would impact the objectives and milestones for accomplishing project tasks within the management plan. The replication and expansion project as proposed has a start date of "fall of 2016" a target date that has already past.

**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:

Those listed as managing the proposed expansion and replication plan have experience and knowledge commensurate with stated replication and expansion goals. The management plan and personnel dedicated to this project have extensive experience at NPFE headed by the Co-Founder and CEO of NPFE who will take on the role of Superintendent for the purposes of this grant. Other key management personnel have experience working with NPFE and Edison Schools and in particular the designated CEO for this project has been employed by DEPSA across the country since 2003. (Appendix B, pp 2-26)

experience at NPFE headed by the Co-Founder and CEO of NPFE who will take on the role of Superintendent for the purposes of this grant. Other key management personnel have experience working with NPFE and Edison Schools and in particular the designated CEO for this project has been employed by DEPSA across the country since 2003. (Appendix B, pp 2-26)

### Weaknesses:

There are no noted weaknesses in this area.

**Reader's Score:** 10

- 3. The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model included in the applicant's response to application requirement (g).**

### Strengths:

NPFE is committed to raising funds and/or seek other sources of revenue to support the expansion and growth model presented. There are supporting letters in this application from investors, board members and other significant resources committing financial support to this application ( p. e118, e 124)

## Sub Question

### Weaknesses:

The applicant notes the need for supplemental funding “in small part by private philanthropy” (p.e58). Since staffing uses an FTE model across schools it is difficult to determine the number of staff and related budget at each individual school. It is not clear what percentage of the CMO costs and what percentage of the individual school costs are sustained through the per-pupil funding. Special education support is included in the CMO budget and not identified per school.

Reader's Score: 4

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

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

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

### Strengths:

In all 6 of New Paradigm for Education schools there is a significantly high percentage of educationally disadvantaged students specifically those of “low-income demographics” (Appendix F p e 131).

### Weaknesses:

There is little evidence that NPFE has intentionally developed steps to avoid racial isolation or that it has considered a range of student attributes including non-racial characteristics such as parental educational background nor did they reject race-neutral approaches based on the racial composition of the location of their school sites. There is no indication that the applicant has considered options for increasing diversity such as identifying the educational level attained by parents (Guidance on Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools (Section III, p. 8).

Reader's Score: 0

### Competitive Preference Priority - School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts

1. This priority is for applicants that both:

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

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

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 flexibility<sup>1</sup> 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](http://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:**

New Paradigm for Education (NPFE) has demonstrated academic success in its flagship schools Detroit Edison Public School Academy/Early College of Excellence DEPSA/ECE for All Students in comparison to district and state data in math and ELA (Appendix G, p e133). NPFE cites as evidence an article in the Detroit Free Press dated 1/25/17 stating that it was the highest ranked school in Detroit (p. e 21).

**Weaknesses:**

While the proposed project suggests that New Paradigm Glazer Academy (NPGA) stands as a model for the potential of school turn around the data provided does not provide strong evidence of consistent academic achievement levels for all students in Math, ELA or Science as compared to statewide data. Other NPFE turn around and expansion models (NPLA, GPA, NPCP) also do not have representative data or do not show consistently strong results in the data presented for all students (Appendix G, p.e141). Combining DEPSA and ECE data does not allow for in-depth analysis of each school by grade.

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

**Reader’s Score:**      **0**

---

**Status:**                Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      07/10/2017 03:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2017 10:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Paradigm for Education, Inc (U282M170008)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	36
<b>Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	18
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	8
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	79
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	79

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Paradigm for Education, Inc (U282M170008)

## 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: 36

#### 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 performance of black students at NP schools has improved since school year 11-12 with students at DEPSA outperforming white students significantly (P e30-31). Performance relative to DPS show black students outperforming white students in school year 2014-2015 (P e31). In addition, looking at student achievement across the New Paradigm For Education (NPFE) network, performance on NWEA MAP assessments for math and reading in the years 2013-16 revealed that NPFE students outperformed DPS students for all grade levels 2nd-8th, and those students who had spent three or more years at NPFE schools outperformed all DPS students as well as the total of NPFE students tested. State achievement test performance for all students in reading and math exceeded DPS proficiency rates in 2014-15 and 2015-16.

#### Weaknesses:

With the exception of DEPSA, there are still significant differences for all students between state academic performance and academic performance at New Paradigm 3-8 schools. Differences in average proficiency rates on 3-8th grade math and ELA state standardized achievement tests from school years 11-12 through 15-16 shows that for two NPFE schools, NP Glazier Academy (NPGA) and NP Loving Academy (NPLA) academic achievement trailed the state significantly for the five years measured, and trailed DPS achievement rates for 2011-12 through 2013-14.

Reader's Score: 11

2. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.

#### Strengths:

The performance of economically disadvantaged (ED) students at DEPSA outperformed ED students at DPS and the state in 2014-15 and at DPS for the previous three years and the state for the previous two years (P e32). Attendance percentages have improved for ED students and black students at NP campuses as well as all

### Sub Question

students. Mobility rates for DEPSA have risen but are below the state average (P e37-39). Detroit Edison Public School Academy (DEPSA) is performing above the average for Detroit Public Schools (DPS) and for the state generally (P e27). While the other New Paradigm (NP) schools are performing above DPS but below the state average, academic performance margins between statewide performance and NP schools are decreasing from 30% or more to 20% or less, with New Paradigm College Prep (NPCP) performing at the state average, indicating student growth despite a change in assessments (P e26-27).

#### Weaknesses:

Overall, the performance of ED students mirrors that of all students where there are still significant differences for all ED students between state academic performance and academic performance at New Paradigm 3-8 schools (P e32). Black students under-perform academically relative to white students at the state level at all campuses (P e29-31). Student attendance rates for all students have improved each year but are below DPS and state averages except for DEPSA (P e37). Attendance rates for black students are still below state averages although above the DPS average (P e36). Mobility rates have risen significantly at New Paradigm Glazier Academy (NPGA) and New Paradigm Loving Academy (NPLA) but dropped at NPCP, although above the state average (P e39-40).

**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:

There have been no reported issues of noncompliance, closure, and statutory and regulatory compliance with New Paradigm schools (P e42).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 15

### Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary**

**Reader's Score:** 18

### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

The percentage of economically disadvantaged students served in the New Paradigm network is higher than the state and DPS ( P e153, e32; 39-40). Specifically, NP's average economically disadvantaged student population served for all schools is 79 percent ED, above the state average of 46.3 percent and DPS' average of 73 percent.

## Sub Question

### Weaknesses:

DEPSA's percent of economically disadvantaged students served is lower than the state and DPS (P e153, e32; 39-40). NP Early College of Excellence (ECE) serves a lower percentage of ED students compared to DPS and the state (P e48, 153). The percent of special education students served is significantly lower than DPS and the state at all schools except University Yes Academy, where it is comparable to the state (P e153). NP schools indicate that they do not serve any English Language Learner (ELL) students at any of their campuses, while DPS serves almost 12 percent ELLs and the state nearly 6 percent. (P e48-49, 153). The ELL percentage is not consistent with comparable percentages in the surrounding district, although NP (e134) indicates that the 0 percent listed is stated that way because less than 10 students were served. There are indications that NP is attempting to reach out to the community to serve more ELLs and special education students (P e51).

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 plan quality to replicate and expand the percentage of economically disadvantaged students is plausible and consistent with the fact that NP already serves a higher percentage of ED students than the surrounding district and the state (P e49-50). Elements of the plan include work with community leaders, advertising, local media, and work with local DPS schools. In addition the school has identified a number of community partnerships (Appendix I, P e161). This advertising is cited as a way to enroll more students with disabilities as well (P e51).

### Weaknesses:

The partnerships referenced by the applicant as being related to the plan to recruit and enroll ED students on P e161 are noteworthy in that the list is lengthy, but there is no evidence presented by the applicant that these partnerships have a direct impact on the plan to recruit and enroll economically disadvantaged students, only a list of which schools are impacted by the partnership, the number of students impacted, and the duration of the partnership. ELL recruitment efforts are not evident, although there is reference to an ELL population of Spanish and Bengali ELL students in an area (southwest Detroit) where the network is considering expansion (P e51).

Reader's Score: 12

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan

### 1. In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the alignment of the evaluation plan to the logic model for the proposed grant project and the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed grant project articulated in the applicant's response to application requirement (c) and will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the performance period.

#### Strengths:

The logic model is aligned to the goals of the project and contains with two exceptions (noted in Weaknesses) and lists objective performance outcomes that are measurable with quantitative outcomes, including numbers of additional students enrolled in each year of the grant as well as additional staff employed, college acceptance and matriculation rates, attendance rates, and student retention rates. Qualitative outcomes are listed as well (P e154).

#### Weaknesses:

Some of the plan elements related to student performance measures that would suggest quantifiable measures were not quantifiable, including the term "no significant achievement gap" in comparing the percent of student group academic achievement to the state as well as "no significant achievement gap" between the performance of ELL students and special education students compared to the general population (P e54).

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: 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

#### Strengths:

The five year plan in Appendix H lists a detailed financial plan that describes in detail the use of grant funds to accomplish grant objectives. The enrollment table (P e151) details the new seats created at the fresh start and turnaround campuses. The logic plan as well as the performance measures and targets (P e53-55) are well-defined and measurable and linked to accomplishing grant tasks. Team member roles and responsibilities as accurately detailed beginning on P e61.

#### Weaknesses:

In the leadership narrative, specific grant fund dollars are not clearly linked to leadership team responsibilities (P e64-65).

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 key staff involved in managing the grant have already successfully initiated expansion efforts at NP with the addition of three additional campuses from the original campus, providing verifiable evidence that the leadership team has the training and experience to manage this replication. (P e65-71)

#### Weaknesses:

Because this is the largest grant the New Paradigm schools has applied for, there is no existing evidence from verifiable past experience, other than the previous expansion efforts noted, that grant reporting and evaluation activities will be accomplished successfully.

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 sustainability of the grant is reflected in the anticipated increase in student revenue from the enrollment growth that results from the successful completion of grant activities. Most of the expenses are in years one through three, with a significant decrease in grant expenses in year five as the grant funding ends (P e148-149).

## Sub Question

### Weaknesses:

Because a large portion of grant funds will be spent by year four, there is less likelihood that changes can be made in the grant implementation if evaluation measures indicate grant activities are not accomplishing grant goals (P e148-149).

Reader's Score: 4

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

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

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

### Strengths:

The applicant notes that while diversity has not been attained through the predominance (98 percent) of African American students, economic diversity has been accomplished through a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students enrolled than DPS and the state (P e20).

### Weaknesses:

Although the applicant notes that there is a planned outreach to ELL student populations to increase the likelihood that they will enroll in a New Paradigm school, the actual percentages of ELL students (0 percent, or less than 10 students) is indicative that these efforts have not been effective (P e22).

Reader's Score: 0

### Competitive Preference Priority - School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts

1. This priority is for applicants that both:

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

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

For purposes of this priority, academically poor-performing public schools may include, but are not limited to, persistently lowest-achieving schools, as defined in this notice and the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program under Title I of the ESEA (<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>); and priority schools in States that exercised flexibility<sup>1</sup> 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](http://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

public school.

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has extensive experience in turnaround efforts, operating two turnaround campuses slated for closure where academic performance improved from single digit percentages to the 33rd percentile (P e23). The applicant proposes two to three schools in four neighborhood clusters in Detroit (P e51-54).

**Weaknesses:**

Because of the high mobility rates at the turnaround campuses (P e40), it is difficult to distinguish the past success of the applicant in turnaround efforts; specifically, whether the turnaround efforts have been effective in actually achieving improvement in student performance for the students that were enrolled in the schools prior to turnaround or if these are simply students new to the school who enrolled after NP took over the failing campuses.

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/30/2017 10:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/05/2017 02:52 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Paradigm for Education, Inc (U282M170008)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Quality of Applicant	45	39
<b>Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	25	20
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 1	3	0
<b>School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>86</b>

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Paradigm for Education, Inc (U282M170008)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

Reader's Score: 39

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

NPFE has demonstrated growth that is better than DPS averages across all grade levels in NWEA Math and Reading and results are strongest for students who have been at NPFE for more than 3 years (p. e25)

The applicant provides strong comparative data and rationale for flagship school and turnaround schools. (p. E32)

The data demonstrates that the efforts that NPFE are making to close the racial achievement gap are working. (p. e33) Economically disadvantaged students at ECE outperformed those at DPS in each of the last three years and outperformed those at the state in two of the last three years. Economically disadvantaged students outperformed not economically disadvantaged students at ECE's host district, DPS, and significantly closed the over 20-point gap between economically disadvantaged students and those that are not at the state level in 2014-15 (p. e33).

#### Weaknesses:

First, improvement over time is inconsistent in several cases (ACT scores) (p. e34). Additionally, the limited data provided for special education achievement is difficult to draw conclusions about the performance of special education students (p. e35). Lastly, the percentage of special education students is less than DPS and the state (p. e48).

Reader's Score: 12

2. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

Comprehensive data are provided for attendance, retention, mobility, and graduation rates. DEPSA and ECE have improved attendance in the last four years, outperformed DPS in the past three years, and outperformed the state the past two years. NPGA, NPLA, and NPCP have shown improvement over the past three years. NPGA and NPLA outperformed DPS in at least two of the last four years, and otherwise have tracked similar to DPS. NPCP outperformed DPS in 2015-16. In 2012-13, NPLA outperformed the state. (p. e36) DEPSA/ECE, NPGA, and NPLA all either approach or exceed the district when it comes to the attendance of low income students. (p. e37). At DEPSA and ECE, student mobility is lower than the district and the state. When one looks at the same metric for only African American students, NPFE mobility rates more closely resemble the state (p. e39). In the most recent year for which data was available, NPFE showed near perfect four year graduation rates (the state does not report percentages above 95%). ECE's rates are much higher than both DPS and the state for all students, and for black students, educationally disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities. (p. e41)

### Weaknesses:

The academic assessment data for ACT and State tests, while generally strong when compared to DPS, is still below state average and is inconsistent across campus and over time (p. e36). Additionally, data for economically disadvantaged subgroups is not available prior to 2015-16 (p. e40)

Reader's Score: 12

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

### Strengths:

The applicant does not indicate that there have been any past compliance issues (p. e42).

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses to note.

Reader's Score: 15

## Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary**

Reader's Score: 20

## Sub Question

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

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

A large proportion come from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds (79% have economically disadvantaged status) (p. e29). NPFE's population of disadvantaged students is far above the state average of 46.3%, and significantly above the host district, Detroit Public Schools (DPS) (73%) (p. e31).

### Weaknesses:

The school does not serve any students designated as English Learners while the host district has an 11.9% population of ELL students (p. e49). Additionally, the number of students classified as special education is relatively low compared to the city and state and the application notes that 7% of NPFE's total student population receive special education (SPED) services, which is below the DPS average of 17.6% and the state average of 12.7%. This varies across NPFE's schools: 3.2% at DEPSA, 3.7% at ECE, 5.6% at NPGA, 7.5% at NPLA, 13.3% at NPCP, 10% at GPA, and 13% at UYA (p. e34).

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:

The curriculum, student support program and academic program is rigorous and designed to compete with private prep schools (e 43, 153). Additionally, the school is open enrollment with a blind lottery. The school has long term plans for tracking college persistence rates for educationally disadvantaged students (p. e42). Information presented regarding the recruitment program shows how the applicant will work with community organizations and use a marketing campaign to recruit and enroll new students (p. e49). The school participates in an open lottery system and has a resulting student population that is representative of the community around the school (p. e50).

### Weaknesses:

Special Education programming for special education and ELL is vague with few details beyond "meets them where they are" and should be more evident in the application.

The applicant lacks a detailed recruitment and enrollment plan and there aren't any target enrollment numbers or long term goals for targeting and recruiting ELL and Special Education students (p. e51).

Reader's Score: 13

## 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 and evaluation plan include clear objective performance measures that are well-aligned to the project's goals (p e 51). Milestones and measurable quantitative and qualitative outcomes are clear and metrics are well defined. The evaluation plan draws from a variety of data sources including surveys, external and internal assessments and artifacts from board meetings (p. e 65). Finally, the applicant includes a plan for rigorous external evaluation (p. e38).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant has not yet identified an external evaluator which will impact the timeline if they haven't secured one yet.

**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: 18**

**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:**

Within the applicant's management plan, the timeline and milestones are well defined. Additionally, the corresponding enrollment table is clear and well planned, detailing the necessary resources, objectives, activities, and goals (e153-55). The budget narrative includes clear projections for expenses at each proposed expansion site for the project period and breaks down site-based costs and CMO expenses separately (p. e213-15).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant cites previous experience with successful school turnarounds and based on past experience shared in the application's biographical information, key staff are well-qualified to implement the grant program (p. e39-50).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant lacks sufficient experience with management of large-scale grants (p. e39-50).

**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 submits a financial model that supports sustainability by front-loading major spending and expenses and planning for schools to be sustainable on public funds after 5 years (p. e 73).

## Sub Question

### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not have a contingency plan for shifting political climate around charter schools in Detroit. The applicant assumes continued stakeholder support (p. e158).

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](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf)).

### Strengths:

NPFE creates diversity within schools to the extent possible given the demographics of the surrounding community (p. e22) and has an economically disadvantaged population far above state and district average (p. e22).

The location that has more English Language Learners, will make extensive outreach efforts (p. e23).

### Weaknesses:

The racial diversity is limited to African Americans (p. e22). Recruitment efforts targeted at English Language Learners are inconsistent. Only one location plans to make outreach efforts to English Language Learners but the others will not and this is explained by noting demographic data (p. e23).

There is no evidence that the schools will make an intentional focus on recruiting and retaining a racially and socioeconomically diverse student body beyond the demographics they already serve.

Reader's Score: 0

### Competitive Preference Priority - School Improvement through Turnaround Efforts

1. This priority is for applicants that both:

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

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

For purposes of this priority, academically poor-performing public schools may include, but are not limited to, persistently lowest-achieving schools, as defined in this notice and the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program under Title I of the ESEA ([https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-](https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and)

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](http://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 specifically focused on turnaround as part of replication and expansion and has prior experience with this work, currently operating two turnaround schools(p. e23).

**Weaknesses:**

The high mobility rate of students at turnaround schools make data less reliable (e23); thus, this reviewer was not able to assess the success of prior turnaround efforts .

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**             Submitted  
**Last Updated:**    07/05/2017 02:52 PM