

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Resurgence Hall Inc (S282M200007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	37
Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	13
Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	23
Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan		
1. Personnel/Management	10	10
Sub Total	100	83
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP 3: High School Students		
1. High School Students	2	0
CPP4: Serve Native American Students		
1. Native American Students	4	0
CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
Sub Total	8	0
Total	108	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Resurgence Hall Inc (S282M200007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources

1. 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant and Adequacy of Resources

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 37

Sub

1. a. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments, 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 served by other public schools in the State.

Strengths:

This applicant's academic achievements have been documented by the College, Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI) to prove they have the highest score of all 85 charter schools with a demographic of high economically disadvantaged student population (page 8, 9).

Resurgence Hall Charter school received a score of 93.4, the "only state-authorized charter school in the state to receive this top mark, (page 6).

Since this is a relatively new school, established in 2016, CCRPI was available for 2017-18 and 2018-19 years only. Additional test scores show in the areas of Math and ELA; Resurgence Hall has outscored the surrounding Atlanta schools (page 11, 12). These scores are focused on the middle school academy because the elementary does not yet have a tested Milestone grade. Growth is measured through the Northwest Education Assessment (NWEA) test.

Attendance rates given for these two schools are high, which is, therefore, a contributing strength for high academic performance.

The applicant's response to the criteria in this question proves this model has been effective since 2016.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's weakness is the applicant being a relatively new charter school on the landscape with only two years of measurable test scores (pages 9-12). There is no guarantee that the school will sustain these high scores or that the high scores are a result of teaching methods, content and other school-related factors.

Additionally, there was no comparison data for attendance and retention rates with regards to other schools or state average.

Reader's Score: 7

2. **b. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

Strengths:

Documented clean financial audits are a strength of this applicant. The narrative documents Resurgence Hall has met all performance expectations as mandated by the Georgia Comprehensive Performance Framework and has never had revocation questions regarding its performance (page 21).

Further documentation of the school's fiscal oversight measures may be found in Attachment F, which shows the school's perfect score in operational performance.

By operating at such an exemplary level, this level of high expectation transcends to other areas within the school environment. It also allows for leadership to focus on the education side rather than the business side (page 21).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

3. **c. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

Strengths:

The narrative reflects nothing but a reliable financial and operational management systems are in place. Both financial audits and authorizer-imposed checks have all received high scores, including 75 points (page 22) from the State Charter School Commission's evaluation framework (page 21-22).

This school has not had either revocation issues or non-compliance issues.

This is a strength when the leadership takes care of the business side of the school, thus allowing more emphasis to be placed on student growth and success (pages 21-25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **d. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a multi-year budget (Appendix G), which shows the spending plan to support the expansion of the network, giving validity to the school being able to sustain after expansion (page 26).

This is accomplished because each year of the multi-year projected budgets, there is a projected net income, and a fund balance of 25 percent of expense is held in reserve.

The sustainability is also due in part because fixed costs for future campuses have been spread over a larger student enrollment base (page 26).

A local foundation that has a history of providing support the first two years of this charter's existence is another

Sub

contributing factor for the balanced financial expansion budget (page 26). A letter of support from this nonprofit group is in Appendix C.

Financial "well-being" is a critical factor in the success of both a replication and expansion school, given the strategic financial planning and budgeting, this project would likely continue after the federal funding ends.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students

1. 2. Significance of Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

The Secretary considers the significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students for the proposed project. In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant's enrollment demographics have deemed it a Title I school with 77 percent of students enrolled qualifying for FRPL (page 27) which is similar to the Atlanta Public School system, where this school is located. According to the chart on page 28, Resurgence Hall serves more economically disadvantaged students than one other neighboring district and the state average but has the same percentage of economically disadvantaged students as the Atlanta Public Schools, where it pulls many of their students.

This is a strength since the mission of the applicant is to provide more high-quality educational opportunities to those in disadvantaged areas (page 28 and e15).

Weaknesses:

The chart on page 28, shows the Resurgence Hall percentages of those served in the subgroups of students with disabilities and ELL students is far below both nearby districts and the state average.

Although the narrative states 5 percent of the current student population is designated as Special Education, the comparison provided is well below the percentage of Special Education students in the Atlanta Public Schools at 12.7 percent (page 27).

This evidence proves the applicant falls short of meeting the criteria of this question in the areas of ELL students and students with disabilities.

Sub

Reader's Score: 6

2. **2. The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

Strengths:

The applicant's plan to recruit, enroll, and serve educationally disadvantaged students includes creating a Design Team that has engaged over 300 families and community partners to gauge the level of commitment of the community. This team, which is a strength for expansion purposes, utilizes multi-social media platforms to recruit in areas of economically disadvantaged families.

Addressing the focus of developing effective services for students with disabilities, the narrative describes in-depth the Special Education strategies they have in place (page 30). These strategies include "push-in" with differentiated classroom instruction (page 30-32). Through data-driven decision-making, any student may be referred to as a Response to Intervention (RTI). An RTI protocol has been put in place in the existing schools and will be replicated in the expansion schools. The applicant exhibits a strength stating the RTI process will be evaluated and refined as the network of schools grows. This shows flexibility to meet the needs of their changing population (pages 33-36).

Weaknesses:

For the sake of diversity and for all students to be integrated with all persons, the 5 percent Special Education population numbers seemed low. Although, there is evidence the educationally disadvantaged student does gain academic growth according to test scores (page 29).

Besides the Design Team, there is no other evidence or strategies offered which would validate this school will effectively recruit and enroll a higher number of educationally disadvantaged students, specifically those with a disability.

The school's expansion and replication plans clearly state they seek more educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged. Still, at the elementary level, there were no ELL students present in the school and no data given on ELL students in the middle school.

To be more effective, the Design Team needs to be more diverse in composition to enhance recruitment efforts for the subgroups of educationally disadvantaged, ELL, and those students with disabilities. To encourage more applications from these subgroups, the applicant might encourage more creative ways to reach families with disabilities (page 45).

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan

1. **3. Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan for the Proposed Project**

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 following factors:

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

1. **1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

Sub

Strengths:

Using a logic model (page 38), the applicant identifies four areas of inputs with accompanying activities, short-term outcomes, and long-term goals. These goals include locating in a predominantly economically disadvantaged area day, increasing rigor, and engaging families.

Using a research-based approach for experimental-based learning, the expansion and replication schools will be utilizing Design Thinking with a five-phase process (page 38).

The school leaders have demonstrated a strength by allowing for reading intervention time in their model as this should allow students to reach grade proficiency in reading, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (page 40).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how 200 minutes a day on literacy will improve literacy skills (page 38).

The literacy program does not appear to implore age-appropriate rich literature.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2. 2. 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 project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a chart (pages 43-46) outlining the measures which will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project's four points, which were articulated in the logic model (page 38). Many of the tools used to assess the Performance Measures will rely on CCRPI scores, STEP scores, and Georgia Milestone assessments. In the area of building a robust core of a trained talent pool of teachers in the Atlanta area, the measurement tools will include retention rates. For the third logic model focus, the applicant will track the student's high school course load. By tracking students' high school courses students, this entity builds-in a reliable measure to evaluate their curriculum, which will prepare them for this course load.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation measurement tools for the intended fourth objective listed in the logic model (page 38) dealing with parental engagement was not found. Therefore, it is unclear how the effectiveness of this goal will be measured.

It is unclear how the two-teacher push-in literacy model (page 38) will be an effective tool to achieve either short-term or long-term goals for the "robust talent pool" objective.

Additionally, there is a disconnect between the goals which were described in the narrative (page 37) and the goals which were articulated in the logic model (page 38).

Information on quantitative and qualitative data lacks because there is little information for specified methods of evaluation in place.

Reader's Score: 6

- 3. 3. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

Project objectives and outcomes are focused and strong, making the rationale behind this expansion and replication project clear. It is the applicants' objective to expand through the creation of two new K-5 schools; two new 6-8 schools with a total of 900 new high-quality educational seats in Southwest Atlanta. (page 37)

Sub

Weaknesses:

The goals lack being clearly stated (page 38), and in the logic model, the goals are weak in specificity. They are not specific, measurable and some may not be attainable, such as 200 minutes a day of reading/literacy instruction (page 37)

Clarity is needed to ensure the goals in the narrative are the same ones in the logic model.

All goals, objectives, and outcomes must be clearly articulated so the model may be implemented with fidelity.

Reader's Score: 3

- 4. 4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**

Strengths:

Resurgence Hall exhibits an understanding of the sharing of "Best Practices" of the expansion and replication models and the benefit involved to the larger Atlanta-area educators. The school leaders already host an Educator's Day designed to bring area-wide educators to experience professional development and to share lessons-learned (page 48). The narrative went on to explain other such informational opportunities available to showcase the project's effectiveness, such as Resurgence Hall leaders presenting at conferences. The plan also has Resurgence Hall educators do on-site visits at neighboring schools and inviting area-wide educators to their classrooms (page 48).

The network will use an annual retreat to review and evaluate data points to make adjustments and share lessons learned as the expansion continues (page 48).

Through the sharing of these data points (Timeline page 47), the applicant's replication and expansion process will have more impact on a future project like this.

It is evident the applicant understands the importance of sharing the experience of the implementation and evaluation process used to measure the project's effectiveness. It will only be through this sharing of lessons learned will high-quality charter schools become more prevalent.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan

1. 4. Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. 1. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The narrative lists five positions and those who currently serve in those positions as the leaders who will manage the expansion and replication for which this grant seeks funding (pages 49-52). The positions listed in the application and the listed individuals are experienced and have adequate training. All resumes are made available in Appendix B. All leaders are associated with the current school, which is a strength as they will know and understand the culture they want to replicate.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. 2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The only evidence of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement is a data timeline (page 47) and a statement saying expansion progress reports will be on the Board of Directors monthly meeting agenda (page 48) leaves the reader with an inconclusive idea as to the exact procedures which will be used for feedback to encourage continual improvement

It is a strength for an educational entity to be nimble enough to make real-time adjustments to ensure the success of the process (page 46).

Feedback procedures and protocols are in planned to be collected on a timeline with different deadlines. this allows the staff to access data to be nimble when making data-driven decisions with regards to student achievement (page 46).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP 3: High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: High School Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must propose to --

a. Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;

b. Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting

students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

c. Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and

d. Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

Note: For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

Strengths:

No strength noted.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not address this,

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4: Serve Native American Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—

1. Utilizes targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

2. Has a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

3. Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;

b. Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Native American organization located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school; and

c. Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American organization(s) from

which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools

1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Reopening Academically Poor-Performing Schools as Charter Schools.

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and

b. Propose to use grant funds under this program to restart one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by—

1. Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

2. Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools

Strengths:

No strengths noted

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not address this..

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Resurgence Hall Inc (S282M200007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	38
Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	13
Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	23
Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan		
1. Personnel/Management	10	10
Sub Total	100	84
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP 3: High School Students		
1. High School Students	2	0
CPP4: Serve Native American Students		
1. Native American Students	4	0
CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
Sub Total	8	0
Total	108	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Resurgence Hall Inc (S282M200007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources

1. 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant and Adequacy of Resources

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 38

Sub

1. a. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments, 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 served by other public schools in the State.

Strengths:

On page e26, the applicant included Content Mastery Overall Scores for Resurgence, Atlanta Public Schools, and the State. The chart shows that the applicant outperformed both the local school district and the state by a sizable margin. Additionally, the applicant provided data to show that the schools met all improvement targets in each subgroup (pg. e29). Both attendance and retention rates from 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 are strong which is likely a contributing factor to the overall academic achievement (pg. e37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not include any comparison attendance data. This information would be helpful in determining if the school attendance rates are similar in the surrounding school districts.

Reader's Score: 8

2. b. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

Strengths:

On page e42, the applicant reported not having any charter schools closed or having their charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. In Appendix F, the applicant included data that further recognizes the school's compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements (pg. e140-e153). This data demonstrates that the applicant has satisfied this criterion.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

3. **c. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

Strengths:

The applicant noted on page e42 that they have not operated or managed any charter schools having significant issues in the area of financial or operational management. On pages e38 and e39, the applicant met all performance expectations, which included three areas; financial oversight, academics, and operations, which demonstrates overall compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

4. **d. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

Strengths:

Page e43 includes information that describes typical revenue and expense patterns by the applicant. From what is described, the applicant has a pattern of conservative spending and ending each year with a surplus. The applicant has also received funding from other sources in order to support the overall vision of the school (pg. e43). The applicant is working with a consultant to build a donor base of major national and local funders to help raise funds on an annual basis. All of these efforts will help to ensure that project outcomes can be sustained after Federal funding ends.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students

1. 2. Significance of Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

The Secretary considers the significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students for the proposed project. In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

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

Strengths:

Pages e44 and e45, give great insight into the demographics of students served by the applicant. Based on the data presented on page e45, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students served by the applicant exceeds those that are currently served in local school districts. This information strengthened the application in satisfying this criterion.

Weaknesses:

According to the data presented on pages e44 and e45, the applicant's population of students with disabilities is significantly lower than the local school district and the state. Additionally, the population of EL students is also lower than the average for both the state and local school districts. The data reported in the application does not satisfy the requirement for this criterion.

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, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

Strengths:

The marketing plan identified on page e45 includes a variety of mediums that will be utilized to recruit families for the schools. The applicant has described how a Scholar Recruitment Team will be used throughout various community events to share information with families of prospective students. The applicant also indicates that there will be mass emailing efforts and postcard mailings that will be specifically targeted to high poverty communities based on reported income (pg. e46). If these efforts are consistently implemented, there is a high probability that the applicant will increase the population of disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the applicant will meet enrollment targets for disadvantaged students, without exploring creative ways to engage families with children who may have special needs or who may speak other languages. The Scholar Recruitment Team may have barriers with reaching other families if the team composition is not reflective of individuals that are able to address the concerns of populations of disadvantaged learners.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan

- 3. Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan for the Proposed Project**

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 following factors:

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

1. 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

Pages e47 – e52 describes a full academic program that lends itself to the success of all students. The applicant included a strong plan for serving students with IEPs that ensures that all students' needs are met. The applicant also described the innovative approach to instruction through the design thinking and computer science curriculum (pg. e53).

Weaknesses:

There is no information included that describes how the applicant will successfully implement a 200-minute reading block. e55. Without a clear understanding of how this strategy is implemented, the conceptual framework is not fully defined. The Reading Mastery literacy program described by the applicant is not a rigorous program. It is unclear if the use of this program will result in successful project outcomes.

Reader's Score: 4

2. 2. 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 project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

On page e37, the applicant clearly detailed the project objectives with applicable performance measures that are closely related to the proposed project. The logic model, on page e55, further explains how the project inputs and activities will directly influence the short-term outcomes and long-term goals. Given the aligned objectives and performance measures, the response to this criterion satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not adequately describe what activities would directly relate to the robust talent pool objective. In the logic model on pg. e55, the aligned activity is expressed as a two-teacher push-in literacy model providing 200 minutes of daily literacy instruction. It is unclear how this activity will increase a robust talent pool using this strategy.

Reader's Score: 6

3. 3. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Strengths:

The project objectives are detailed and included appropriate performance measures (pg. e60-e63). The applicant included baseline data and a rationale for each of the stated objectives which fully support each of the performance measures.

Weaknesses:

The project goals are not consistent throughout the application. Objective 2, on page e63, is referencing teachers and instructional leaders; however, the same objective on page e55 appears to be referencing students. The applicant would be more clear if there were greater detail included that described this section.

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

4. 4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

Strengths:

On page e63, the applicant indicated that the leadership team would review data at various intervals with the Network Leadership Team throughout the project. Page e64 includes a detailed chart of the types of data that will be collected and the timeline for collecting data. The applicant included additional information that describes how the project results will be shared with other educators outside of their school network to include Annual Educator Day, school visits, and through the Georgia Charter Schools Association Incubator Program. The applicant is also committed to sharing best practices at the Georgia Charter Schools Conference (pg. e65). By sharing the findings of the project, the applicant has the potential to have a more significant impact on charter schools around the state and possibly the country.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan

1. 4. Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. 1. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The resumes included in the Appendix provided great insights into the qualifications of the key personnel. Each of the personnel listed has experience in managing projects of this magnitude. The roles for each of the key personnel directly align with the project objectives, which adds a greater assurance of successful project outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

On page e63, the applicant indicated that the results of the data collection at various intervals would result in making real-time adjustments to student supports, staff coaching, and professional development. The data will also inform the school leadership of any areas that are not meeting project milestones so they are able to make adjustments as necessary. By collecting and analyzing data at regular intervals, the applicant decreases the likelihood that the project will not meet the project objectives and ensures that the project is progressing at all stages.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP 3: High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: High School Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must propose to --

- a. Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;
- b. Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;
- c. Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and
- d. Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

Note: For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4: Serve Native American Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—

- 1. Utilizes targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;**
- 2. Has a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and**
- 3. Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;**

b. Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Native American organization located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school; and

c. Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools

1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Reopening Academically Poor-Performing Schools as Charter Schools.

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and

b. Propose to use grant funds under this program to restart one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by—

1. Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

2. Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Resurgence Hall Inc (S282M200007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	38
Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	14
Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	25
Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan		
1. Personnel/Management	10	10
Sub Total	100	87
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
CPP 3: High School Students		
1. High School Students	2	0
CPP4: Serve Native American Students		
1. Native American Students	4	0
CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
Sub Total	8	0
Total	108	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 CMO - 1: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Resurgence Hall Inc (S282M200007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources

1. 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant and Adequacy of Resources

In determining the quality of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 38

Sub

1. a. The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments, 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 served by other public schools in the State.

Strengths:

Resurgence Hall, a k-8 middle school, ranks as one of the highest achieving schools in Georgia (p. e26). It ranks in the top 5% for Schoolwide and Targeted Assisted Title I schools in Georgia. It earned an A rating for its 93.4 single College Career Read score in 2019. For Fall 2018 to Fall 2019 in mathematics, 83% of the students met or exceeded their NWEA Map (p. e35). For reading, 69% of scholars met or exceeded their targets (p. e35). According to Resurgence Hall, these scores are the same for black students. Resurgence Hall reports the school had a higher percentage of students scoring proficient and above ELA and Mathematics than any other state-authorized charter school (p. e35). The school attendance scores are strong: 97% ELL, 95% Special Education, and 95% of free and reduced-price lunch (p. e37). These rates are representative of the school's commitment to academic excellence.

Weaknesses:

The academic/achievement results reported in the proposal show some levels of comparison, but mostly to other Resurgence Hall schools. The application does not provide comparison data with sending districts and state on student growth, attendance, retention, percentage of disadvantaged students taught in the school, and closing gaps (p. e35).

Reader's Score: 8

2. b. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

Sub

Strengths:

The charter school was founded in 2016 and received a five-year certification which is effective until June 30, 2022 (p. e91). The applicant reports that no charter school operated by Resurgence Halls has ever been closed, had their charters revoked for any reason, nor had their affiliation with Resurgence Hall revoked or terminated (p. e71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

- 3. c. The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

Strengths:

The applicant reports receiving a clean-unmodified opinion in all prior year financial audit. The 2019 certified accountant's report shows no material weaknesses identified, no non-compliance material to financial statements noted, and no reported significant deficiencies (p. e112). The Comprehensive Performance Framework for State Charter School Evaluation shows Resurgence was not in default of loan and did not have any debt (p. e143). The audit shows sound financial management within the school.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

- 4. d. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

Strengths:

After Federal funding ends, Resurgence Hall has the necessary resources in place to sustain it. It is a leading education philanthropic organization with a significant capital campaign and several donors. A development consultant is helping the program create an annual development plan. They have included a letter of commitment (p. e43).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students

1. 2. Significance of Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

The Secretary considers the significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students for the proposed project. In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

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

Strengths:

Resurgence Hall believes that "every child, regardless of home language or disability, should be educated for success in high school, college, and beyond" (p. e47). At the school, students are addressed as scholars and provided with multiple instructional strategies to engage and to participate in diverse learning. This includes disadvantaged learners who are taught side by side with their peers (p. e 47). Resurgence Hall provides numerous services that address their needs, but still holds them to excellence. The program provides a comprehensive Response to Intervention (RTI) process. It is used by the Student Support Team to identify academic and behavioral needs. The goal is to provides data-driven, rigorous, standards-based instruction (p. e47). The program offers modified instructional strategies to ELLs and special education students. It uses scaffolding to help children access the same instructional content. It provides differentiated instruction within the strategic instructions of ELLs and special education requirements. The applicant states that Resurgence Hall serves and will continue to serve "a predominantly educationally disadvantaged student population" (p. e44).

Weaknesses:

Although Resurgence Hall describes its program for serving ELL and special education students, the data show this population of students served at Resurgence Hall Charter Schools is much lower than Atlanta Public Schools, Fulton County Schools, and the state (p. e45).

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, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to use a comprehensive recruitment and enrollment plan that incorporates multiple strategies (p. e45). With the help of a scholar recruitment team, the school can extend outreach as the school expands. The plan consists of conducting small groups, attending parent information session, conducting weekly labeling sessions. The school has a social media account and is listed on Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. School website provides information about upcoming events (p. e 45). School recruiters provide information at local pre-kindergarten and Head Start centers. Mass mailings and postcards are used to target families in high poverty areas. Modality based instruction, small group/one-on-one tutoring, extended time, modified instructional strategies are offered to educationally disadvantaged students who are recruited to the school (p. 30-31). The program plans to broaden their recruitment to attract more disadvantage students.

Weaknesses:

Although the program proposes to increase its recruitment, little emphasis is given to parent involvement in the school, other than making contact and providing information. Parent involvement is important because it is associated with positive student outcomes: better grades, attendance, and retention.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan

1. 3. Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan for the Proposed Project

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 following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

The applicant suggests the logic model describes the program and instructional practices to be implemented in each school receiving funding under the program (p. 54). For example, the logic model identifies economically disadvantaged students residing primarily in qualified opportunity zones (input). They enter the program and receive services from the two-teacher push-in literacy model and computer science program (activities). In the program, they developed social/emotional skills and develop their critical thinking skills (short-term outcomes). The results: students enroll in and graduate from competitive colleges, they choose a career that contributes to long-term happiness (p. 38), or they enroll in college preparatory course work in high school (goal attainment). This model describes the process for how the organization will function.

Weaknesses:

The model illustrates how the program will function; however, it does not include performance measures.

Reader's Score: 4

2. 2. 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 project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes three objectives. They are to expand the number of high-quality elementary and middle school seats in Southwest Atlanta, build robust talent pool in metro Atlanta of teachers and instructional leaders, and through continuous improvement, ensure all scholars fulfill the vision of enrolling in college preparatory high school courses and entering competitive universities (p. e 60). Performance measures, baseline, and rationale were assigned to each objective (pp. e60, e61). The baseline and rationale suggest most of the objectives will be attain within one year. Data will provide useful information to evaluate program progression.

Weaknesses:

The model illustrates how the program will function; however, it does not include performance measures and timeline (p. e55)

Reader's Score: 8

3. 3. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant proposes three objectives. They plan to dramatically expand the number of high-quality elementary and middle school seats in Southwest Atlanta, build robust talent pool in metro Atlanta of teachers and instructional leaders, and through continuous improvement, ensure all scholars fulfill the vision of enrolling in college preparatory high school courses and entering competitive universities (p.43). Performance measures, baseline, and rationale were assigned to each objective (pp. 43-45). The baseline and rationale suggest most of the objectives will be attained within one year. Data will provide useful information to evaluate program progression.

Weaknesses:

The model illustrates how the program will function; however, it does not include performance measures and timeline.

Reader's Score: 3

- 4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.**

Strengths:

Section J on p. e72 tells about the lottery when there is an expansion by adding another charter school. The data chart on p. e64 shows the process of several tasks within the school that can easily be replicated. Auditing the financial books through the same practices can be extended to other schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan

- 1. 4. Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan**

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The application provides a detailed summary of the personnel who have the collective knowledge and experiences that are essential to the success of the project. They fill positions of executive director, principal, director of scholar support, head of strategy and growth, and director of operation. They have backgrounds in elementary education,

Sub

education and curriculum, professional development, personal effective trainer, teachers, administrator, and finances. They bring a wide range of teaching experiences and working in charter schools. Resurgence Hall reports these positions are critical to the successful expansion of the Resurgence Hall Charter Network. Tori Jackson Hine, Founder and Executive Director Hall Charter Network will serve as executive director (p. e. 205).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. 2. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Resurgence Hall has numerous data points that require analysis at different times on a daily or weekly basis (e10). The process is to give the data to the leadership team. The leadership team reviews and makes real time adjustments. The leadership team gives the reviewed data to the school-based leadership team and network leadership team in weekly meetings. A copy of the data points is posted in the proposal. Examples of the data points are student data, academic data, organizational data, talent data, stakeholder data and engagement data. This process is continuous, data collection is ongoing. The organization uses the data for corrective actions. Information is shared across data points. The school and network base maintain and analyze the data from the data points. The program plans to continue this process in the proposed project. The information is placed in the school director's reports and shared with staff, e54. Evaluating and constant monitoring and reflection will help to project success and refine strategies for success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP 3: High School Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: High School Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must propose to --

- a. Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;
- b. Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;
- c. Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same

institution; and

d. Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

Note: For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

This applicant did not address this in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP4: Serve Native American Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—

1. Utilizes targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

2. Has a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

3. Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;

b. Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Native American organization located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school; and

c. Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

This applicant did not address this in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools

1. Competitive Preference Priority 5: Reopening Academically Poor-Performing Schools as Charter Schools.

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must --

a. Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and

b. Propose to use grant funds under this program to restart one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by—

1. Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

2. Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

This applicant did not address this in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:35 PM