

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles (S282M200012)

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	17
Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	27
Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan		
1. Personnel/Management	10	9
Sub Total	100	90
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	90

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles (S282M200012)

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:

The applicant presents detailed state-wide assessment data showing that CWC schools achieved levels 3 and 4 (met and exceeded standards) for ELA and math which are significantly higher than both the LAUSD and the state of California for students in grades 3-8 for the past three school years. This is the case for the overall student population, as well as for student sub-groups such as African-American and Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, English language learners, and students with disabilities (page 26, Appendix F page 4-6, 9-21).

The applicant provides detailed enrollment numbers and attendance, chronic absenteeism, retention, suspension, and expulsion rates by grade level for the most recent school year for the current three charter schools that it operates (page 12, 21, Appendix F).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide student attendance and retention rate comparisons with the local district and the state for educationally disadvantaged students (Appendix F).

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.

Sub

Strengths:

Since its inception in 2010, no applicant schools have closed, had a charter revoked, or had a charter affiliation revoked or terminated (page 20).

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 has had no significant financial issues in the areas of financial management, academic performance, operational management or student safety. The applicant has not experienced any significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter (page 20).

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 provides detailed financial statements and audits for each of its current charter schools, as well as financial budgets and projections for three new replication schools through 2033 (page 22, Appendix G).

The applicant clearly demonstrates the potential for continued support of the project after federal funding ends, given that they have raised almost 60% of the funding needed through the end of the grant period from both public and private funders, as well as a fundraising gala and parent-based fundraising (page 23-24, Appendix G).

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: 17

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:

Based on the data provided, the applicant clearly meets and exceeds the threshold for educationally disadvantaged students by serving at least 43% economically disadvantaged students in the current three schools, with similar projections for the three replication schools in the future (page 30, 35).

The applicant provides detailed tables for each charter school of their demographics compared to the surrounding community as well as rates of families who qualify for free and reduced lunch and the changes over time, clearly indicating that they are increasingly serving educationally disadvantaged students for the past three years (page 31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

- 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 thoroughly discusses several strategies for enhancing the recruitment and enrollment of educationally disadvantaged students, such as enrollment preferences for students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch, developing strong partnerships with community-based organizations, and standardized marketing materials in multiple languages (page 31-33).

The applicant clearly describes high-quality enrollment and recruitment plans and initiatives specifically targeted to students with disabilities and English learners such as bilingual Community Coordinators at every school, in-person translators and translated recruitment materials, and offering a large array of student support services such as Adapted PE (APE), Recreational Therapy (RT), Behavior Intervention Developer (BID), Behavior Intervention Implementor (BII), Counseling, Language and Speech, Occupational Therapy, and Resource Specialist Support (page 33-35).

The applicant presents detailed enrollment targets for the current three schools that it manages, as well as for the three new schools that it plans to replicate, through the end of the grant period (page 4).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly describe how parents and the community are engaged in the recruitment and enrollment processes, specifically elaborating on the specific role that parent groups and community organizations will play (page 32).

Sub

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: 27

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 clearly describes the various research-based components of its conceptual framework of a student-centered Learning Model consisting of three strands (Core Academics, Social Emotional Development (SED), and Difference and Inclusion (DI), a Graduate Dispositions framework [three domains: 1) Self (self-understanding, self-efficacy, critical thinking and adaptability); 2) Together (communication, collaboration, cultural competency and empathy); and 3) World (systems thinking, global advocacy and lifelong learning)] (page 5, 13).

The applicant clearly explains the two building blocks of their conceptual framework and theory of learning, such as the evidence-based theories of constructivism and gradual release of responsibility. The applicant thoroughly documents the research-based success of these approaches with references of peer-reviewed literature (page 38-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 provides a clear logic model that is aligned to the goals and conceptual framework of the proposed project. Both the logic model and evaluation framework demonstrate clear and specific objectives and performance measures that are linked to project outputs and outcomes (page 43-44, Appendix G additional page 9).

Throughout the application, the applicant clearly discusses various types of quantitative and qualitative data that will be collected by the end of the grant period, such as parent satisfaction surveys, enrollment data and trends, state-wide assessment achievement results, focus groups, interviews, site visits, and review of student artifacts. This quantitative and qualitative data will be reported through trimester formative reports and annual summative reports (page 10, 21, 26, 43, Appendix G additional).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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, and outcomes of the project are clearly presented throughout the application. The objectives are specifically aligned to the goals, the outcomes are specifically aligned to the objectives, and more than 50% of the project outcomes are specific and measurable with achievable and realistic targets (page 43-44, Appendix G additional page 3).

Weaknesses:

At least two of the project outcomes are not specific or measurable, such as “Staff at replication schools embrace the mission + follow CWC Learning Model” and “Social network maps demonstrate increases in students’ SED”. In addition, there are no specific timelines for the achievement of the project outcomes, either by the end of the grant period or annual targets throughout the grant period (page 43-44).

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 applicant provides detailed plans for quarterly and annual formative and summative reporting, as well as periodic formative evaluation briefs, which will include implementation and performance information that can be used to guide the replication of project activities or strategies for new charter schools in the future (page 48-49).

The applicant provides a detailed evaluation framework that is aligned to the project objectives and outcomes and presents high-quality evaluation questions, data sources, and data analyses for each of the project objectives (page 48, Appendix G additional page 10-11).

The applicant clearly discusses working with the independent evaluator to determine optimal plans for external data dissemination, such as publications, website postings, community presentations, national conferences, and social media, that can be used to guide replication and share lessons learned to external audiences (page 48-49).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly discuss how outcomes data and lessons learned will be incorporated into the replication process to continually improve the project implementation on the school- and classroom-levels (page 44, 48, 49).

Reader's Score: 8

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 applicant clearly presents the training and experience descriptions, qualifications, and resumes for key project personnel. Almost all of the staff have 5-10 years of teaching, leadership, and management experience, including the Senior Director of Learning, Instructional Coach, and Executive Director who all have at least 5 years of experience specifically with CWC (page 51-55, Appendix B).

The applicant provides four resumes for the independent evaluator Bellwether team, and they have extensive experience conducting formative and summative evaluations specifically for charter schools and charter management organizations (page 49, Appendix B/C).

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:

The applicant clearly describes the procedures for ensuring project feedback and continuous improvement using continuous improvement cycles at several levels of the organization. Feedback solicited and priorities are developed by both the national organization and the local board of directors (page 55-56).

The applicant specifically discusses the multiple tiers of feedback cycles, including on the regional, school, and classroom levels, that incorporate school assessment data and other performance measure data. One example is the use of classroom-wide and individual performance data to tailor instruction to the specific learning needs of students as well as to monitor and refine the impact the curriculum has on each child throughout the school year (page 28, 55-56).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a comprehensive list of the types data they will collect throughout the project period, including a detailed explanation of how the data will be collected and used to provide continuous real-time feedback for the continuous improvement of project implementation (page 55-56).

Sub

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:

The applicant did not address CPP3.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address CPP3.

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 CPP4.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address CPP4.

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 CPP5.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address CPP5.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:41 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles (S282M200012)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Applicant and Adequacy Resources		
1. Applicant and Resources	40	36
Significance of Contribution in Assisting Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	20	17
Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	27
Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan		
1. Personnel/Management	10	8
Sub Total	100	88
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	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles (S282M200012)

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: 36

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 application presents achievement results for students and subgroups across schools managed (e868). Combined grades 3-8 data results do show the applicant schools outperforming district and state averages in ELA and Math (e869-886). The applicant acknowledges that subgroup gaps remain in current charter schools, and the application provides a focused narrative outlining three overall strategies to close subgroup gaps (e25).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides statewide assessment data and provides data points related to parent satisfaction and retention rates, but does not compare this data with district or state measures (e30-31). The applicant provides an unclear scatter graph to provide comparative statewide assessment academic data (e24). The applicant combines grades 3-8 data for both ELA and MA when comparing with both local and state public schools. Two school year results are compared for grades 3-8 with district and state data (SY16-17 and SY17-18) (e869). Most recent statewide assessments are not included. The applicant SY16-17 and SY17-18 comparative data shows a higher percentage of students achieving mastery in ELA and MA than local and state public schools. However, most schools indicate a downward trend in student achievement in both ELA and MA (e871-873). The application provides minimal narrative to explain academic achievement. The application does not provide sufficient narrative related to specific strategies for addressing the narrowing of achievement gaps.

Reader's Score: 6

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

Sub

terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.

Strengths:

The application states that applicant schools have had no significant issues for academic, financial mismanagement or noncompliance reasons (e39). The application provides a chart showing the number of schools approved and opened (e973). Clear data justifies that Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles are in a strong financial position to grow.

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 provides adequate evidence they have had no significant financial issues (e39-40). Copies of their most recent audit are included. A multi-year budget demonstrates sound financial planning and positive enrollment trends (e512-667).

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 provides a convincing summary of how they will support new charter schools after grant period ends (e41). The applicant provides an appropriate growth and sustainability plan, including a multi-year financial and operating model for each school. Funding support levels by the applicant are reasonable and sufficient. For example, the applicant provides funding for supporting additional capacity in order to ensure strong training, management, and oversight as the new schools are replicated (e42). In addition, the applicant provides a letter of support from Citizens of the World Charter Schools National which states that the applicant can reasonably expect to receive up to [REDACTED] to support project growth and replication activities (e668).

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: 17

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 sufficiently details how they are currently serving educationally disadvantaged students (e47-49). Percentage of educationally disadvantaged students across charter schools is provided, and demonstrates a +6% increase over a two year period (e50). The application presents academic and attendance data demonstrating that economically disadvantaged, special education, English learner and reclassified English learner subgroups all have outperformed the district and state (e44-45). A Chronic Absenteeism chart by subgroup is provided (e969-971). The applicant clearly provides data demonstrating comparisons of serving educationally disadvantaged students that are at or above the levels of surrounding public schools (e49-50). The applicant provides a specific and thorough narrative explaining how current curriculum and school environment address the needs of educationally disadvantaged students as well as how they will continue to provide this support (e47-49). For example, the applicant utilizes a three tiered response to intervention model for children with disabilities and a Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English approach for English learners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 convincingly documents a detailed recruitment plan, including marketing strategies, activities and outreach (e825-830). The applicant includes an extensive plan targeting educationally disadvantaged families, particularly English Language Learners. For example, prior to their lottery each spring, Charter School representatives hold multilingual events at local parks and playgrounds (e825). The application thoroughly documents how they will ensure all disadvantaged children will receive services needed to receive a free appropriate public education (e781-787). For example, ongoing formative performance-based and yearly summative assessments inform instruction for English learners (e789).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes outreach to the community for enrollment purposes, but does not explain how they will engage parents and the community in the implementation of the replicated charter schools (e51). Engaging parents and the community in this way would promote a higher probability of successful implementation of the replicated charter schools.

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: 27

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 application clearly presents a comprehensive conceptual framework that includes a theory of actions and results (e56-60). This is backed by appropriately documented and relevant research and literature. Two building blocks are presented- Constructivism, based on research of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Jerome Bruner and Howard Gardner; and Gradual Release of Responsibility based on Duke and Pearson (e57-60). The applicant provides strong evidence of promise backed by evidence of effective interventions with similar student populations (e57-59).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 logic model clearly provides a comprehensive listing of inputs, activities, and outputs; including short and long term results of the project (e683-684). Evaluation methods proposed are thorough, feasible, and appropriately aligned to performance measures. Performance measures are objective and measurable. They are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. The application narrative reasonably describes both quantitative and qualitative data to be collected as well as provides examples of the data. The applicant effectively divides the evaluation into two focus areas: 1) replicate with sustained fidelity to its model and improving overall performance, and 2) impact on student academic outcomes, development of Graduate Dispositions, Social Emotional Development (SED), and Difference and Inclusion (DI). These focus areas align to major goals,

Sub

objectives, and strategies represented within its logic model.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

All applicant goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly identified within the application (e683-684). The Evaluation Framework demonstrates that most goals are specific and measurable. Most goals are achievable and realistic for the grant period. There is evidence throughout the grant application to support this.

Weaknesses:

The applicant goals, objectives and outcomes are not all specific and measurable. For example, the Outcome, "Staff at replication schools embrace the mission and follow CWC Learning Model" is not measurable nor specifically aligned with the goal of "Replicating 3 high quality, diverse by design charter schools using the CWC LA Learning Model" (e62-63).

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 applicant adequately describes a design for project implementation and evaluation (e63-68). The design includes clear and thorough plans for documenting both outcome evidence and lessons learned. Data will be appropriately analyzed and reported formatively both quarterly and annually, with summative data provided at project end in response to the evaluation questions posed in the evaluation framework. This allows for ongoing decision-making related to program implementation and enhancement. The applicant includes some actions for disseminating results and lessons learned from project implementation and evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has some plans for incorporating evidence into decision-making but specific activities and structure for data-driving decision-making in the replication process is unclear (e48, e63-68).

Reader's Score: 8

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, providing general qualifications of the group that are relevant to the opening, operation, and management of charter schools (e68-74). Resumes of key personnel are provided (e83-127).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not list why each key personnel are essential to the success of the project based on their qualifications (e68-74). For example, the applicant describes the Director of Student Enrollment and Outreach's experience and training, but does not describe how these unique skills will be essential to the project success.

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 provides a detailed timeline for charter replication activities (e77-79). The applicant provides an adequate plan on how they will receive and document feedback and collect outcome data to make improvements to the project. The type of data and feedback collected is provided. The applicant provides a brief explanation about how the data will be used to make course corrections to the project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly provide significant details about the steps to collect data feedback. The plan has provided limited information on how it will be analyzed and used to make adjustments to the proposed project (e74-75).

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:

The applicant does not address CPP3.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address CPP3.

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 does not address CPP4.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address CPP4.

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 does not address CPP5.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address CPP5.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:41 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles (S282M200012)

Reader #3: *****

	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	17
Quality of the Project Design and Evaluation Plan		
1. Project Design/Evaluation	30	29
Quality of Project Personnel and Management Plan		
1. Personnel/Management	10	9
Sub Total	100	92
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	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 CMO - 4: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Citizens of the World Charter Schools - Los Angeles (S282M200012)

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:

The applicant provides data to that illustrates the achievement results of students. The data provided demonstrate the narrowing of the achievement gap of CWC students when compared to comparable schools in the district and State.

The annual performance data provided by the applicant clearly shows that all CWC schools outperform the district and State in all tested areas. As such the data shows that a higher percentage of CWC students achieved Levels 3 and or 4 on annual California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CASPP) results leading to CWC LA students being ranked in the top 13% in Math and the top 14% in ELA (e24).

When broken down by subgroups, the data provided by the applicant show that CWC's economically disadvantaged students have outperformed the district in the State in ELA (grades 3-8) and Mathematics (e878).

Overall, the applicant provides a comprehensive comparative summary of the performance of CWC LA students compared to the LAUSD and California based on 2014-2018 CAASPP data in Appendix F, which contains a clear explanation of the data presented in the table. Included in graphs are data the show the performance of African-American, ELL, ED and students with disabilities compared to the LAUSD and the State. The data represents the narrowing of the achievement gap among CWC LA students. (e866-e936).

The applicant acknowledges some dips in performance in some subgroups and subjects but overall CWC students still outperformed the state and district. The applicant noted that African American students increased by 13% in ELA and 5% in math based on the 2018-2019 data (e45).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provides data that show that CWC LA students ranked in the top thirteen percent in Math and the top fourteen percent in ELA, the applicant does not provide disaggregated data to show the performance of the students by grade level (e24).

The applicant does not provide data to show how CWC LA attendance and retention rank when compared to the district and the state. These areas were not addressed.

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 clearly states that no charter schools operated or managed by the CMO have closed due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. The authorizer has unanimously renewed all three CWC LA schools with each receiving a five-year renewal (e39).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 has provided solid evidence to support their claim of being in good financial standing and that CWC has not had any significant financial issues since inception (e39-40).

The applicant includes a multi-year budget, 2018-19 audit, and the 990s as evidence of the CMO's sound financial planning, enrollment trends, and facilities and operational costs in Appendix G (e141-e182).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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 provides a detailed summary and results of the methodology employed by the applicant to develop a regional financial model that demonstrates and incorporates all C (WC LA financial transactions through 2033 with 2018-19 as the baseline year (e41).

Sub

Utilizing the regional financial model, the applicant has determined the total funding needed to complete the project and the financial position the CMO will be in when the CSP funding ends. To this end, the applicant projects that an additional [REDACTED] will be needed to complete the growth phase. The applicant provides events that will be planned to secure the funding needed (e24).

The applicant indicated that CWC LA has already raised [REDACTED] toward the [REDACTED] through commitments from the Charter School Growth Fund, Great Public Schools, and funding from the California Public Charter Schools Grant Program.

The applicant has provided substantial documentation to illustrate that there is a plan for continued support with the demonstrated commitment for major entities to ensure the continuation of the project after the Federal grant funding ends.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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: 17

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 data to support that CWC LA schools are contributing to assisting educationally disadvantaged students. Based on data provided (e44), the results show that some CWC LA students are outperforming the State and District in Math and ELA based on the percentage of children scoring Level 3 and 4 on the statewide assessment (e872).

Although the applicant noted some dips in performance at several CWC schools, students still outperformed the State and District. The applicant provided a detailed summary of factors contributing to the dips in performance (e46) and have established strategies aimed at addressing the achievement gaps in core academic strands (e25-27).

The applicant provided data showing the District and Statewide comparison, Grades 3-8 of the performance of student subgroups in ELA and Math. The data shows that the majority of the CWC LA schools serve a higher percentage of subgroups than the District or State.

The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the programs and learning theories utilized by CWC LA to

Sub

address the educational needs such as differentiated instruction, Howard Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory, and Tier 2 intervention programs (e48).

The applicant also addresses the utilization of the response to the intervention tiered approach for learners who need additional support (e47).

The data the applicant provides demonstrates that the applicant has successfully served educationally disadvantaged students. The curriculum, interventions, and researched-based learning models that have proven to yield positive academic outcomes for all subgroups add validity to the applicant's intentional focus on serving educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 has provided a detailed plan that provides to recruit, enroll, and effectively serve students in the communities where the schools are located. The applicant’s recruitment plan reflects the intentionality of CWC LA in ensuring that their efforts are inclusive especially in reaching non-English proficient and limited English proficient families (e53).

The applicant notes that special needs students are actively recruited and attributes their success with attracting this population to word-of-mouth recruitment from current families to potential new families (e54).

The applicant provides CWC LA’s admission preferences in the event CWC LA receives more application than available seats. The applicant notes that students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch are given preference in the event there are more applicants than seats after the open enrollment period and lottery end (e55).

The applicant has an extensive recruitment plan that engages parents, community partners and other stakeholders. An example of such is the diverse community advocates, which is a network of community advocates who serve as validators for the school and ensure that established stakeholders and organizations are up the school’s message to parents and the community (e53).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides insufficient evidence to determine the degree to which parents and the community are engaged in the implementation of the project (e51). Including strategies for engaging the parents and the community-at-large would provide increased success in the implementation and replication of the model.

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: 29

Sub

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

Strengths:

To support this theory of action, the applicant provides substantial evidence of consultation of current research to underpin their actions. The applicant presents a clear and comprehensive conceptual framework based on evidence-based models and theories, specifically the Constructivist approach that allows space for children to construct their understanding of the world (e58).

The applicant states school performance results, logic model and evaluation approach all align to their theory of action. The applicant provides a detailed summary of the theory of action that guides the project (e57).

The applicant cited numerous references throughout that demonstrate that the conceptual framework designed to equip learners academically and with the skills needed for the next generation of learners is researched and evidenced-based. For example, the applicant references Duke & Pearson, 2002, p. 211 as research that supports the gradual release of responsibility model the school plans to use as an instructional tool (e59).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 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 proposed by the applicant is clear and comprehensive that shows inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and indicators and impact. The project evaluation methods are thorough and align with the outcomes (e683).

Outcomes and indicators are written in measurable terms designed to yield high-quality quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the project. For example, for student achievement outcomes, the applicant has identified a target of 75% or more proficiency in ELA and Math, reduce the achievement gap for economically disadvantaged students as a key outcome with key indicators for measuring progress towards reaching the projected outcomes (e683).

The applicant has identified the intended impact of high-quality charter school replicated and graduating from 8th

Sub

grade prepared for high school and global citizenship. The design of the logic model is structured to produce high-quality data desired at the end of the project (e683).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 included a table of clear measurable goals and objectives with outcomes stated in measurable terms designed to yield the quantitative and qualitative data desired by the end of the project. There is evidence throughout the grant that supports the relevance of the goal to the grant. The applicant has developed the project goals throughout the grant in its data tables, narrative, and program design (e17).

The applicant has developed learning models that will be used to support the achievement of academic measurable outcomes. For example, the applicant notes that the schools will use the CWC LA Learning Model that is the framework that describes the organization's holistic approach to teaching to the full needs of every child (e31).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provides some measurable outcomes for the project, not all are measurable. For example, the applicant states social network analysis or similar measure that demonstrates increases in students' SED. As written it is unclear the data they can expect to collect from any actions associated with this outcome (e63).

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 applicant has created an evaluation framework and associated performance measures to represent proposed evaluation questions and their alignment to replication and performance goals (e684). The applicant notes that the questions in the evaluation framework will serve as evaluative tools to measure the degree to which they are making progress towards meeting the goal

The applicant indicates that CWC LA's evaluation plan includes a set of metrics to assess the performance of the organization that includes measuring the progress of the school in major academic and operational areas (e63). The design of project implementation and evaluation as noted by the applicant provides for ongoing reflection and continuous school improvement. The design of the evaluation framework, which includes evaluation questions, will serve as the guide for ongoing reflection and decision-making and improvement. For example, the applicant will use the summative data analyzed and reported formatively in response to the evaluation questions in the evaluation framework (367).

Sub

The applicant has selected Bellwether Education Partners to serve as the lead project evaluator. The applicant notes that the team's experience in serving as an external evaluator for four CSP-awarded CMOS as evidence of the relevant experience and expertise desired to conduct the project evaluation (e68).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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: 9

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided a list of key project personnel and brief bios summarizing why each is critical to the project (e70).

Resumes are provided that include the relevant training and experience of key personnel relevant to the opening, operation, and management of the charter school (e81-e128).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

According to the applicant, CWC LA has multiple continuous improvement cycles that include developing a plan, receiving feedback on the plan, implementing the plan, measuring performance along the way, making adjustments to the plan based on the progress made or not made (e74). The feedback cycle developed by CWC LA suggests that feedback will be collected at various levels of the organization (e75).

The plan developed by CWC LA for feedback and continuous improvement is designed as single and multi-year plans for conducting feedback and continuous improvement cycles (e74).

The plan and procedures the applicant has described are sufficient to provide some data to support the organization make the necessary course corrections based on data results and feedback.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provided a plan for feedback and continuous improvement, the plan lacks sufficient details regarding how feedback will be provided. The plan also does not provide adequate details regarding feedback. The applicant states various structures to look at progress/feedback in a cross-cutting way that spans across the structures, however, it is not clear how this strategy will result in the dissemination of information and continuous improvement as the applicant did not provide specific details needed for clarity (e75).

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:

The applicant did not address CCP 3.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address CCP 3.

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 CCP 4.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address CCP 4.

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 CCP 5.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address CCP 5.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2020 04:41 PM