

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:40 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fortune School of Education (S282M200010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources</b>		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	29
<b>Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	14
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	23
<b>Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan</b>		
1. Personnel/Management	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>CPP 3: High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	2	0
<b>CPP4: Serve Native American Students</b>		
1. Native American Students	4	0
<b>CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - FY20 CMO - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Fortune School of Education (S282M200010)

## 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: 29

#### 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:

The applicant has demonstrated academic growth over the past five years. The achievement levels for educationally disadvantaged students outperformed the state for all subgroups in both achievement and growth. (page e22) The data indicated 17% more students meeting standards in ELA and 27% more students meeting standards in math. African American and Latino students make up approximately 90% of the school's enrollment with the data confirming the closing of the achievement gaps. (page e159-188)

100% of the schools operated are in the top 30% of similar schools statewide demonstrating the value of continuous improvements and indicators used in serving students. (page e26) The schools have lower absence rates for English Learners and Latino students in the state. Although the percentage of African Americans have higher than the state average in absence rates, the school is designing incentives to reduce this figure.

The application notes that California does not report attendance or retention data by school or group, however the data presented by the school is impressive. Fortune school's attendance rate for 2018-19 was 96% for English learners, 95% for Latino students and 94% for students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students and African American students. Retention rates for this period were 100% for students with disabilities, 93% for English Learners, 91% for Latino students, 88% for economically disadvantaged students and 87% for African American students. (page e27)

The applicant does not have measures for high school success, graduation rates, college attendance rates, and persistence rates. Fortune's early college high school opened in 2017-18 with them becoming seniors in 2019-20. However, there is a program in place for all high school students to take college courses thus earning simultaneously earnings their Associate's Degree. (page e27)

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Students with disabilities did not outperform the state in areas of achievement and growth. Absence rates for African American students are slightly higher than the state's; 23% vs. 21% and these represent a larger percent of the school's population with disabilities and economically disadvantaged. (page e26) Although incentives are in-place they haven't been successful.

There is no disaggregated data to confirm growth of students with disabilities in language arts or English learners. (page e159-188)

The high school opened in 2017-18 therefore, there's no data available to evaluate high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates.

**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:**

The charter schools have been renewed by their local authorizer and no school operated by Fortune School of Education has ever closed. No charter has had their charter revoked due to noncompliance in statutory or regulatory requirements as evidenced in their financials. (page e315-316) The applicant has not had their affiliation revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation. (page e28)

**Weaknesses:**

The document is not consistent as it pertains to the number of schools. Early sections of the project narrative references state that, Fortune School of education operates two schools in California. (page e18, e20) However, their Charter Renewal document lists five schools with the expectation to open four additional schools to reach its goal of nine schools. (page e98-99)

Furthermore, the audited financials note in the summary that Rex and Margaret Fortune School of Education sponsors two charter schools. Fortune School operates six separate charter school campuses. (page e321)

**Reader's Score: 8**

- 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's audited financials show that there are no significant issues in financial or operational management areas. (page e193-349) The school has not had any significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to the revocation of a school's charter.

The application details that each quarter the school's facilities department performs California Facilities (FIT) tool inspection.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The application is missing the Form 990 which is a program requirement. This documents their tax-exempt status and that their activities have been reported to the IRS. Additionally, information could not be verified against the financials.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 is conservative with the financials indicating reserves and been sustainable once schools have been fully built out. The majority of the operating expenses are covered by state and federal funding. (page e230-343) They plan to have self-sustaining budgets once sites are operating near capacity and maintains a healthy fiscal reserve for times of uncertainty.

Fortune is now a part of the National Portfolio of the Charter School Growth Fund (CSGF) which they will use for advice and financial support to ensure continuous improvement. The application includes a letter of support from CSGF. (page e86)

The applicant is conservative with the financials indicating reserves and been sustainable once schools have been fully built out. The majority of the operating expenses are covered by state and federal funding. Given the size of the organization they have demonstrated strong financial stewardship. The project scope is two new charter schools which is manageable given this information along with their strategy.

Fortune is now a part of the National Portfolio of the Charter School Growth Fund (CSGF) which they will use for advice and financial support to ensure continuous improvement. The application includes a letter of support from CSGF. (page e86)

**Weaknesses:**

There is insufficient information presented in the application to understand how the schools will continue after Federal funding ends. Fortune has five schools with the expectation to open four additional schools. (page e98-99) This doubles the number under management. The applicant notes that they plan to have self-sustaining budgets once sites are operating near capacity. However, there are no timelines or milestones in their application to demonstrate that target dates have been established.

**Reader's Score: 6**

**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:**

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 application provides detailed data indicating that effective 2018-19 84% of their students were educationally disadvantaged falling into one of the subgroups that include economically disadvantaged, English Learners, and/or students with disabilities. (page e182-184) Information provided also included statewide achievement data for each racial subgroup divided into its economic disadvantaged components. (page e31)

The school serves approximately 20% higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students in the counties where they reside. As an integrated charter school information about their philosophy and the Five Pillars demonstrate how they follow their mission with fidelity. (page 32)

The applicant researches community demographics, poverty rates, population growth patterns, and evidence of low performing neighborhood schools so that schools are placed in the neediest areas. This research and strategic planning helped them decide that the new project with two new school additions would be in Sacramento. (page e44-45)

The applicant researches community demographics so that schools are placed in the neediest areas. This research and strategic planning helped them decide that the new project with two new school additions would be in Sacramento.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant serves a lower percentage of students with disabilities and English Learners which has not been previously addressed. The application notes that some of this is attributed to current demographics and with the launch of project specialized staff being hired to recruit in these deficient areas. (page e33) No specific information is included as to the recruitment activities. They serve a lower percentage of students with disabilities and English Learners. Some of this is attributed to current demographics and with the launch of this project specialized staff will be hired to recruit in these deficient areas. (page e33)

- 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 will move one of their more established school leaders to insure success with replicating the project. (page e53) This same experienced school leader will move to open the next school providing training to the new principal. They have successfully provided regional solutions to specific problems in the geographic locations. The school model has been successful and they propose to implement activities to recruit, enroll and serve educationally disadvantaged students.

The applicant's marketing and communications strategy uses radio, television and newspaper advertising focused on the target market. Additionally, they've noted that billboards at bus stops and social media had been effective in recruiting large numbers of educationally disadvantaged students from minority communities. (page e47)

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant currently services a lower percentage of students with disabilities and English learners and no clear plan for targeting these subgroups is detailed in the application.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's theory of action centers on their team leaders and site principals in the execution of the Fortune model. Their research using best practices from other successful schools and use open-source curricula from Achievement First because it was successful for organizations. (page e51-52)

Second strategy is to have weekly "Principal Meetings" with principals, team leaders, and the CEO. Dashboards are reviewed and discussions about reaching goals takes place. Additionally, the CEO regularly meets with principals and team leaders for further discussions about resources needed.

**Weaknesses:**

Proficiency is lower with students with disabilities than indicated. (page e23, e23, and e52) Their main challenge is implementing the existing model with fidelity. For the project they will move one of their more experienced school leaders to lead the expansion for two years. However, this strategy doesn't address how research is conducted and needs more structure.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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:**

Fortune has learned from their past growth by opening eight schools over the last ten year. The expansion into more schools incorporates a logic model aligning objective performance measures to resources, activities, outputs, and both short-term and long-term outcomes. The goals are in keeping with their current strategy and are achievable.

Activities include ongoing data collection with baselines established. For an example, teachers and principals will

**Sub**

use dashboards and data about assessments and chronic absence to target interventions. In these instances, both long-term and short-term activities are established. (page e55-56)

By the end of the grant period they expect to have quantitative data to demonstrate that goals were met. Also, their model uses qualitative data to help them achieve the goals. Fortune has learned from their past growth by opening eight schools over the last ten year. The expansion into more schools incorporates a logic model aligning objective performance measures to resources, activities, outputs, and both short-term and long-term outcomes. The goals are in keeping with their current strategy and are achievable.

By the end of the grant period they expect to have quantitative data to demonstrate that goals were met. Also, their model uses qualitative data will be used to help them achieve the goals.

**Weaknesses:**

Significant timelines activities details as it pertains to opening the schools is absent. This includes the marketing outreach activities and hiring of staff. (page e355-359)

Performance of English learners is lower than other schools in the district. There is no disaggregated data at the school level. Because this information is unavailable determining if schools met student academic performance at the local and state level was not possible. (page e55-57)

**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.**

**Strengths:**

The goals, objectives, outcomes to be achieved for serving and retaining academically disadvantaged students are detailed and measurable. (page e54-58)

The applicant relies on data collection and reporting. This includes enrollment data, student, and staff surveys. Within each of the areas in the logic model activities, short-term and long-term goals are established. This is to ensure that Fortune enrolls an educationally disadvantaged population of students that are attending school regularly and succeeding academically. (page e58) This include retention of the population as well.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not include timelines and milestones which would include established indicators or benchmarks to determine the status of the project. Without this information it isn't clear how performance is going to be measured.

**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.**



**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant will implement the project that produces information about its effectiveness. They will use multiples phases to measure outcomes. Short-term data will be used and annual data collection will support annual evaluations. This includes reports from student information system to calculate outcome measurements. (page e59-60)

The Project Director is the Director of Data, Analytics and Strategy and the role is critical in guiding the activities and strategies. The Director and other key personnel have invaluable experience. This includes the recruitment team reviewing lessons learned prior to making changes. The design and execution are data driven. (page e38-39)

**Weaknesses:**

There is no activity in the data collection as it pertains to lessons learned and how the model has and will continue to change.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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: 9**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The executive leadership team as evidenced by their resumes bring expertise and experience across all of the sectors including educational programs, data assessment, instruction, curriculum, community engagement, finance, and fund raising. Collectively they have over 20 years credentialing programs and operating charter schools for 11. (page e64)

The Project Director also services as the Director of Data, Analytics and Strategy at the school. The role is critical in guiding strategic decisions.

The application details how data collection and analysis are critical for the continuous process improvement and involves improving the fidelity of implementation. This mechanism involves improving the Fortune Model. Challenges or lack thereof can vary by student and these tools will be utilized to analyze data in context caused by differences. (page e66-68)

Feedback and discussions at "Weekly Principal Meetings" focus on reaching goals and ensuring that the

**Sub**

appropriate resources are available for the team leaders to reach their goals. (page 52) Fortune will implement a variety of assessments across different aspects of the project that will enable to make them to make sound decisions prior to deciding on adjustments that will improve work.

**Weaknesses:**

There is no narrative or organizational chart referencing how each of the key staff contribute to the project.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The application details how data collection and analysis are critical for the continuous process improvement and involves improving the fidelity of implementation. This mechanism involves improving the Fortune Model. Challenges or lack thereof can vary by student and these tools will be utilized to analyze data in context caused by differences. (page e66-68)

Feedback and discussions at “Weekly Principal Meetings” focus on reaching goals and ensuring that the appropriate resources are available for the team leaders to reach their goals. (page 52) Fortune will implement variety assessments across different aspects of the project that will enable to make them to make sound decisions prior to deciding on adjustments that will improve work.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses.

**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:**

The application did not specifically address this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The application did not specifically address this competitive preference 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:**

The application did not specifically address this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The application did not specifically address this competitive preference 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:**

The application did not specifically address this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The application did not specifically address this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 02/12/2020 04:40 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:40 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fortune School of Education (S282M200010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources</b>		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	29
<b>Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	14
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	24
<b>Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan</b>		
1. Personnel/Management	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>CPP 3: High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	2	0
<b>CPP4: Serve Native American Students</b>		
1. Native American Students	4	0
<b>CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - FY20 CMO - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Fortune School of Education (S282M200010)

## 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: 29

#### 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:

The applicant provides impressive academic results in English language (ELA) and mathematics for all students in all subgroups, with the exception of students with disabilities in one category, that clearly show strong academic achievement based on annual student performance on statewide assessments (pp. 6-7). The growth rate significantly outperforms the state results in both ELA and Math, including students with disabilities (p. 7). These results are even more impressive given the fact that African-American and Latino students make up approximately 90% of Fortune's enrollment (p. 7). The data provided also shows a higher rating for Fortune students when compared with similar demographic schools (p. 10).

The applicant gives evidence that student attendance rate is better (lower) chronic for English Learners and Latino students than the state (p. 10). However, rates for African American students are slightly higher than the state: 23% vs. 21% (p. 10). Retention rates were reported but no comparison could be made because the state does not maintain statewide retention rates (p. 11). The data reported, however, shows retention rates for 2018-19 were 100% for students with disabilities, 93% for English Learners, 91% for Latino students, 88% for economically disadvantaged students, and 87% for African American students (p. 11).

#### Weaknesses:

Disaggregated data indicates a lower growth rate for students with disabilities in English Language Arts. No data was offered to compare students with disabilities with neighboring school districts. Also, absence rates for African-American students were higher than State averages. All data reported was for a one-year period rather showing trends over multiple years.

**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:**

The applicant states that no charter school operated or managed by FSE has ever closed. No charter has been revoked due to academic, fiscal mismanagement or noncompliance reasons according to the applicant (p. e28).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not give clear, consistent information on the number of schools it operates.

**Reader's Score:** 8

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 states, with evidence, that they have had no significant financial issues. The applicant supplies their external financial audit to document a strong financial position and a three-year Local Control and Accountability Plan required by the State to assure financial stability. Lastly, applicant indicates that they have not had significant issues with respect to student safety base on a quarterly inspection (p. 12).

**Weaknesses:**

Form 990 is missing. This Internal Revenue form would verify the financial stability of the non-profit organization.

**Reader's Score:** 9

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 describes their financial stewardship and ongoing effort to maintain strong financial controls along with the fact that FSE is now a part of the National Portfolio of the Charter School Growth Fund (CSGF), which will provide advice and financial support to ensure that the CMO can continuously improve how we serve their students (p. 15).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provides insufficient information as to how the expanded schools will be supported after the funding ends. The minimum information concerning definitive levels of support raises a concern that the project could not be maintained beyond the funding period.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

## 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. 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 provides an adequate plan to serve educationally disadvantaged students, especially economically disadvantaged African-American students who comprise over half of the total student populations (p. 15). Basic achievement data for this subgroup in particular show strong outcomes compared to statewide data (p. 15). The applicant shows similar data on a regional county basis even though the applicant schools serve a 20% higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students (p. 16). The applicant also adequately describes the curriculum and school environment designed to meet the needs of these students (pp. 17-22).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant notes that its schools serve a lower percentage of students with disabilities and English Learners, notwithstanding those two-thirds of their students are African-Americans (pp. 16-17). The breakdown of these subgroups was not reported by school; thus, it is difficult to fully evaluate the enrollment disparities among the subgroups.

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 provides a comprehensive and clear plan to purposely recruit, enroll and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students through their community outreach efforts and site-based planning in the neediest areas (p. 27). Consistent with their mission to reduce the achievement gap for historically disadvantaged and underperforming subgroups the applicant intentionally locates its schools in low-income communities (p. 27). The applicant explains how they will engage parents through community recruiting events and ensures that information about the program's services for student with special needs and disabilities is provided (p. 29). An English Advisory Committees has also been developed to give information, feedback and advice for parents of English Language students. (p. 30).



**Sub**

The applicant details a clear and targeted marketing plan with multiple strategies in its effort to recruit large numbers of educationally disadvantaged students from minority communities (p. 31).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provided no plan to reach out and target market students with disabilities and English learners. There was no acknowledgement that these areas were deficient and need focused attention.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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: 24**

**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 conceptual framework details a comprehensive plan that addresses the role of team leaders and site principals that will utilize a theory of action to solve problems and ensure improvements occur based on their model of effectiveness (p. 35). The model is constructed from other known successful models and researched-proven practices (p. 36). The applicant includes, therefore, definitive high-quality evidence of effectiveness and demonstrated activities for the targeted student population based on the framework.

**Weaknesses:**

The narrative shows that proficiencies are lower for students with disabilities compared with surrounding school districts (p. e23). The applicant, nonetheless, does not provide a plan to address these discrepancies.

**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 logic model is well described, listing three goals with resources (inputs) activities, outputs, short, medium and long term outcomes that generate specific and measurable performance measures (pp. 38-42). The evaluation method proposed is clear, comprehensive and feasible. For example, Performance Measures, in particular, are part of the logic model and are directly related to the outcomes of the project. They also address the need to increase percentage enrollment for students with disabilities and English Learners (p. 39).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

Data is not sufficiently disaggregated for all subgroups. Chronic absence rates are particularly high compared to states results in California. Budget information is also lacking in the timeline (pp. e54-58).

**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.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly identified goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved in detail in chart form (pp. 38-42). Each goal is specific and measurable. Further, each goal is relevant and focused on enrolling and retaining educationally disadvantaged students and retaining highly effective teachers (p. 42). The timeline to evaluate the performance measures is also appropriate for throughout the grant period.

**Weaknesses:**

Timelines and milestones are missing activities pertaining to the opening of new schools. For example, the timeline tables provided (pp. 54-58) are focused on ensuring that the applicant enrolls educationally disadvantaged students, that these students are attending regularly and succeeding academically, and finally that students and teacher's retention rates are high. Absent are the critical activities and timelines for opening new schools.

**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:**

The design for project implementation and evaluation details clear and thorough plans to document and analyze outcomes and to establish clear evidence of lessons learned (pp. 43-45). The applicant is explicit in describing how data and lessons learned will be utilized into the replication and program correction process. The plan also references how dissemination of results and lessons learned, including reflecting on the evaluation design, are shared with a broader audience (p. 45).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide information relative to how lessons learned would be incorporated into the Fortune model for the proposed project expansion. For example, the applicant only describes an impact of lessons learned on the budget cycle (p. e60) and not how data from lessons learned can supply added information to the effectiveness of the Fortune model.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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: 8**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant lists key project personnel and provides a summary of their qualifications, including training and experience in management and, with identified personnel, operating and leading schools. For example, the Chief Financial Officer is a Certified Public Accountant with over 28 years of experience (p. e63). Resumes of key personnel are also provided (appendix B).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide sufficient details concerning the importance of the key personnel to the successful implementation of the project. While their experience is broad and, in several cases, substantial, information is limited on how each of the key staff will contribute the project.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation design provides a detailed plan of feedback from the critical goals and outcomes in order to guide in the project's continuous improvement efforts (p. 50). Feedback and the continuous improvement process involve improving the fidelity of implementation and improving the CMO's model (pp. 50-51). A significant number of data points will be collected, according to the plan, to use to make improvements (pp. 52-55). The variety of the data sources, particularly the formative assessments, would be helpful to gain real-time feedback and course corrections for the project's success.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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:**

The applicant did not address the question.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the question.

**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:**

The applicant did not address the question.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the question.

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:**

The applicant did not address the question.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the question.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   02/12/2020 04:40 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:40 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fortune School of Education (S282M200010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources</b>		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	26
<b>Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	14
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	20
<b>Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan</b>		
1. Personnel/Management	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	68
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>CPP 3: High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	2	0
<b>CPP4: Serve Native American Students</b>		
1. Native American Students	4	0
<b>CPP5: Reopening Poor-Performing Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Schools	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	8	0
<b>Total</b>	108	68

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - FY20 CMO - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Fortune School of Education (S282M200010)

## 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: 26

#### 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:

Student academic proficiency data on state assessments provided by the applicant shows consistent growth of all students attending Fortune School of Education schools from SY2015 through SY2019 in both ELA and Math (pgs. e22, e153, e169). Disaggregated state assessment data also shows higher growth for most students attending Fortune School of Education schools than in the state of California in both ELA and Math, including English Learners, Economically Disadvantaged, African American, Economically Disadvantaged African American, Latinx, and Economically Disadvantaged Latinx (pg. e23, e157, e173).

Attendance data for Fortune School of Education was 96% for English Learners, 95% for Latinx, and 94% each for students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and African American students (pg. e27). No comparative data is provided because it is not included in the state accountability system. Chronic absence rates for English Learners and Latinx are lower than the state (pg. e27).

Retention rates for SY2019 were 100% for students with disabilities, 93% for English Learners, 91% for Latinx, 88% for economically disadvantaged, and 87% for African American students (pg. e27). No comparative data is provided because it is not included in the state accountability system.

#### Weaknesses:

Student proficiency rates on state assessments for ELA is lower than Sacramento county and state of California (pg. e153). Disaggregated state assessment data shows a lower growth rate for students with disabilities attending Fortune School of Education schools than students in the state of California in ELA (pg. e23). Applicant indicates students attending Fortune School of Education perform far better on state assessments than students at the districts they would have attended but only assessment data from SY2018 and SY2019 for African American and



**Sub**

Latinx students is provided (i.e., not English Learners, Students with Disabilities, or Economically Disadvantaged) (pgs. e23, e24). Detailed statewide subgroup performance on state assessments in SY2019 for ELA and Math is provided, but no comparative CMO data is provided to show how it performs compared to the state (pg. e32).

Chronic absence rates for students attending Fortune School of Education in SY2019 is higher than the state average for students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and African American students (pg. e27). Fortune School of Education provided an explanation for this information (i.e., most of its students with disabilities are also African American, which explains why [Fortune School of Education] rate is for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged is also higher than the state) (pg. e27).

Enrollment rates for students with disabilities compared to resident districts is lower in both counties (e.g., FSE = 8%, Sac County = 12%, HB = 3%, SB County = 12%) (pg. e33). The applicant plans to make a concerted effort to recruit and retain students with disabilities but does not provide any actions or steps it will take to accomplish this (pg. e32).

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 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:**

Fortune School of Education operates two charter schools, Fortune in Sacramento, which opened in 2017 and serves grades K - 12, and Hardy Brown College Prep in San Bernardino, which opened in 2010 and serves grades K - 8 (pg. e28). Neither charter school operated by Fortune School of Education has separated from the central office or been closed, and each has been renewed by their local authorizer (pg. e28).

**Weaknesses:**

There are multiple mentions throughout the application of differing numbers of schools operated by the applicant (pgs. e14, e18, e28, e42, e53, e76, e158). As such, it is not possible to verify if any charter school operated or managed by the applicant has closed.

**Reader's Score: 8**

- 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:**

Neither charter school operated by Fortune School of Education has had any significant issues in finance, operational management, or student safety (pg. e28). Fortune School of Education's facility department performs a facility inspection using the California Facilities FIT tool every quarter (pg. e28). Fortune School of Education participates in annual fiscal audits (pg. e28). Fortune School of Education participates in annual fiscal audits (pgs. e28, e191-e350).

**Weaknesses:**

No Form 990, Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax, was provided. As such, it was not possible to verify if Fortune School of Education's current financial position aligns with its Form 990.

**Reader's Score: 8**

Sub

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 majority of operating expenses are covered by state and federal funding (pg. e30). The Chief Financial Officer takes action to scale back expenses mid-year if projected expenses significantly exceed expectations (pg. e30). Ongoing expenses are added only if they can be covered with normal funding sources (pg. e30). The applicant is part of the Charter School Growth Fund and received advice and financial support as needed (pg. e31). In 2019, the Charter School Growth Fund committed to supporting Fortune School of Education's expansion of their next two elementary schools based on its track record of outstanding academic performance (pg. e86).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide a detailed summary of how they will support new charter schools after the grant ends, only a basic statement that they operate within their budget (pg. e30). There was no multi-year financial and operating model for the schools after the grant ends and, as such, it is not clear if the level of support by Fortune Schools of Education is reasonable and sufficient.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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. 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:**

In SY2019 the applicant served 84% educationally disadvantaged students (pg. e31). The enrollment of the African American (FES = 65%, HB = 66%) and Economically Disadvantaged (FES = 82%, HB = 91%) subgroups is higher than the county in which the school is located (Sacramento County = 11%, 61% and San Bernardino County = 8%, 72%, respectively) (pg. e33).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant serves a lower percentage of students with disabilities and English Learners than the county in which the school is located (pg. e33). There is no data specific to the enrollment of Latinx at Fortune School of Education schools (pg. e33).

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 acknowledged it serves a lower percentage of English Learners and provided its plan to recruit more, which includes hiring Spanish-speaking staff for recruitment and enrollment efforts (pg. e33). In addition, one of Fortune School of Education's goals is to serve and retain academically disadvantaged students and they provided percentage enrollment goals by year for each year through SY2025 (pgs. e54-e55). Fortune School of Education follows the five pillars originally developed by Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP) and all students, including educationally disadvantaged students, are held to the same standards and expectations (pgs. e34-e35).

**Weaknesses:**

Although acknowledging serving fewer students with disabilities, the applicant did not provide a plan on how it will reach out to and enroll additional students with disabilities (pg. e32).

Reader's Score: 8

**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: 20

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:**

Fortune School of Education adheres to the Five Pillars originally developed by KIPP (pg. e34) and provides an extended school day, week, and year (pg. e35). The applicant provides all education services through site-based programs using standards-aligned instructional materials and provided its plan to ensure continued alignment after California adopts its new standards for core disciplines (pgs. e35-e36). Fortune School of Education provides 54 days of in-house professional development to its teachers including weekly meetings, daily planning time, weekly early release day, and a Summer Symposium focused on school culture and organization-wide initiatives (pg. e38). It also participates in the Charter School Growth Fund Emerging CMOs program and the Charter network Accelerator hosted by Achievement First (pg. e38).

The provided theory of action centers on team leaders and site principals using the Fortune Model to open two new charter schools in Sacramento (pg. e51). Evidence was provided that this model works for most disadvantaged students (pgs. e23-e24). The applicant intends to focus on different aspects of their model sequentially to ensure fidelity of implementation (pg. e52). First strategy is to focus on helping staff, students, and families understand the Fortune School of Education culture (pg. e52). Second strategy is to help team leaders and principals track progress through weekly principal meetings and using a dashboard for data (pg. e53). Third strategy is to have high-level accountability for principals and team leaders (pg. e53).

**Sub**

Fortune School of Education will move a highly successful school leader from an established site to lead the expansion for 2 years, training a principal during that time (pg. e53). The same leader will move to the second new site to lead the second expansion for 2 years (pg. e53). Fortune School of Education indicates they believe having two administrators on site at the new schools will mitigate many growing pains (pg. e53).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant indicated that one of its major focuses when adopting and implementing new curriculum is to ensure it serves educationally disadvantaged students well (pg. e37). Its assessment of the curriculum “found that both the EL Curriculum and the Accelerate curriculum were exceptional in providing access to all students, including students with disabilities and English Learners. In our first several years with these curricula, we have seen that we have been closing achievement gaps with educationally disadvantaged groups” (pg. e38). Despite the alignment of instructional materials and the statements provided by the applicant above, the proficiency and growth of students with disabilities is lower than the state and district in which the school is located (pg. e23). No plan was provided to address this issue.

The theory of action includes using the Fortune Model. The applicant indicated it adheres to the model “unless we make a conscious choice to do otherwise” (pg. e52). There was no information provided regarding when such choices might be made and why, and no assurance the two new schools would adhere to the current model (pg. e52).

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 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 methods of evaluation proposed by Fortune School of Education include ongoing evaluation for short-term outcomes and annual evaluation during its planning phase of the year for medium- and long-term outcomes (pg. e59).

Fortune School of Education's ongoing evaluation process is focused on feedback and continuous improvement processes. One focus is on improving the fidelity of implementation of the educational model (pg. e66). This is accomplished through close monitoring of program implementation via regular observations by principals or central office workers to track the extent to which staff implements the Fortune Model (pgs. e66-e67). The second focus is on improving the Fortune Model. This is accomplished through review of assessment data, such as Smarter Balanced summary assessments, NWEA MAP interim assessments, formative assessments, application records, enrollment and attendance records, staff records, and teacher and student surveys (pgs. e68-e71).

**Weaknesses:**

Fortune School of Education did not identify an external evaluator for this project or who will serve as the evaluation team for the project (ongoing or annual). As such, there were no clear objectives for the evaluation working group and no description of how the analyses of data for the project would be distributed to other school staff.

**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.**

## Sub

### Strengths:

The applicant provided three goals for this project: Goal 1 – Serve and retain academically disadvantaged students; Goal 2 – Help students attain high levels of achievement; and Goal 3 – Sustainable grow the Fortune model (pgs. e54-e58). Each goal has three performance measures and specific targets for each year of the 5-year grant period (pgs. e54-e58).

The performance measures for Goal 1, for example, focus on the percentage of students enrolled in the subgroups of economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English Learners (pgs. e54-e55). The short-term outcome is to have more applications from students with disabilities and English Learners (pg. e54). The long-term outcome is to meet specific enrollment targets by SY2025 of 80% economically disadvantaged, 13% students with disabilities, and 13% English Learners (pg. e55).

### Weaknesses:

The performance measure for percentage of English Learners (Goal 1) intends to increase the percentage of EL students served from 7% to 13% over the five years of the grant. However, the 5-year goal of 13% is still several percent lower than the percentage of EL students served by the district in which the schools will be located (i.e., 17%) and the applicant provides no explanation regarding the reason for the lower target (pgs. e33, e55).

Fortune School of Education acknowledges that students with disabilities don't always meet their peers in the district and state (pgs. e23, e158, e172). Yet, the long-term outcomes for Goal 2: Help Students Attain High Levels of Achievement, are aggregated for all students and don't ensure that each subgroup of students will attain high levels of achievement (pg. e56).

The target set for year 5 of the performance measure specific to chronic absenteeism (i.e., 12.5%) is higher than the statewide rate for economically disadvantaged students (i.e., 11.0%) (pgs. e27, e56) with no explanation regarding the reason for the higher target.

Throughout the application, Fortune School of Education provided disaggregated retention rates for students, yet the target set for year 5 of this performance measure (i.e., 93%) is for the organization population. In addition, this rate is lower than the current rates for two subgroups with no explanation regarding the reason for the target.

**Reader's Score:** 4

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:

The application provides procedures for feedback and continuous improvement, including individual or group discussions and regular observations by principals or central office workers as a means to determine which efforts are most likely to be successful (pgs. e66-e67). A second means of identifying effective approaches or strategies is the collection of data, including: Smarter Balanced summary assessments, NWEA MAP interim assessments, formative assessments, application records, enrollment records, attendance records, student surveys, teacher surveys, and staff records.

Each data collection area discusses how the data is collected, analyzed, and used for improvement in the immediate future at a specific school site.

### Weaknesses:

There is no discussion how the lessons learned through this grant specific to the project goals, measures, and targets will be incorporated into the Fortune Model for future expansion (pgs. e51, e58-e61, e67-e71).

Sub

Reader's Score: 7

## 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: 8

Sub

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

##### Strengths:

Based on the project goals of (1) serving and retaining academically disadvantaged students, (2) helping students attain high levels of achievement, and (3) sustainably growing the Fortune model, the assumed qualifications for key personnel include knowledge of the community and how to focus enrollment on students with disabilities and English Learners; teacher and principal knowledge of target academic interventions; central office knowledge of academic results to target support, adjust professional development, and identify best practices; and student and teacher retention strategies (pgs. e54-e57). Resumes for key personnel indicate the provide evidence of qualifications, training, and experience for this project (pgs. e62-e66, e76-e85). The Project Director, specifically, has experience on student assessment, data systems, student information systems, training principals and teachers on effective use of data to drive improvements in teaching and learning (pgs. e64-e65).

##### Weaknesses:

There is no job description or indication of particular skills needed for the 'New K-5 school principal' (pg. e66). The budget indicates a salary for the highly successful school leader in year 5, but there is no description of that individual's responsibilities during that time (pgs. e360, e53).

Reader's Score: 4

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

##### Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed list of data collected, including Smarter Balanced summary assessments, NEWA MAP interim assessments, formative assessments, application records, enrollment records, attendance records, student surveys, teacher surveys, and staff records (pgs. e68-e71). There is also a specified time of the year that these data pieces will be collected (pgs. e68-e71).

The knowledge and experience of the project director inspires confidence he will use an appropriate analysis method (pg. e64-e65, e80). Fortune School of Education indicates it will continuously collect and analyze a large amount of information and describes how it will be used to make improvements and course corrections during the school year (pgs. e67-e71). For example, the applicant administers the NWEA MAP interim assessments each trimester. The day after testing is complete, its data team exports the results from the NWEA website and imports it

**Sub**

into its student information system. The data team analyzes the results and produces a one-page summary for principals and central office staff. Areas of weakness receive additional support, such as extra time with Master teachers. Evaluations of particular interventions show the extent to which adjustments should be made to interventions (pgs. e68-e69).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no indication of the frequency or duration of 'regular observations' to collect feedback regarding the fidelity of implementation of the Fortune Model (pgs. e66-e67).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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:**

Not addressed in the application.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed in the application.

**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:**

Not addressed in the application.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed in the application.

**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:**

Not addressed in the application.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed in the application.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 02/12/2020 04:40 PM