

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 05:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico (S282E230006)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	19
Sub Total	20	19
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	33
Sub Total	35	33
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	35
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers Replication Panel - 1: 84.282E

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico (S282E230006)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (1) Quality of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 points).

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

Reader's Score: 19

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) 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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

Applicant provides clear and extensive evidence of their “evidence-based one-stop model designed to break the cycle of generational poverty in PR’s disadvantaged communities”. Applicant notes that their school-site is the only public school in PR to employ a dual-language educational model (English and Spanish), and serves a predominantly low-income, Spanish-speaking, Latinx (Puerto Rican) population where the students come primarily from four neighborhood public housing complexes. They seek to use this grant to expand from K-5 to also offer grades 6-12. (See page e-13)

Applicant provides evidence through specific data that students are demonstrating higher academic achievements than students in comparable schools in community. (See page e-14)

Applicant provides evidence through specific data that students perform significantly better than similar students at area schools, especially in Math and Spanish, and make significant progress in closing the achievement gap for disadvantaged populations. (See page e-15)

Applicant provided a chart outlining timelines, roles, and responsibilities is extensive, thorough, and reasonable. (See pages e-21-24)

Weaknesses:

Applicant notes that students still struggle with ELA. (See page e-16)

Sub

Applicant notes high chronic absenteeism rates. (See page e-17)

Reader's Score: 4

2. (ii) **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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

Applicant notes that the school is in good standing with the authorizer and is a thriving school. Additional details of school's governance structure (Page 22-23), financial operations (Page e18-19), and mechanisms for ensuring parental and staff voice are heard and are all included in the application. (See page e-18)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) **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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

Applicant provides appropriate evidence that monitoring reports conducted by the authorizer (PRDE) have never found issues or deficiencies in the school's academic, financial, operational, or safety aspects. School has achieved high compliance ratings, maintaining a score of 95% or above in all reviews, mostly securing a 100% perfect score. Additionally, the applicant notes that the school's finances are audited annually by an independent third-party. (See page e-19)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (iv) **The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

Applicant provides clear data from surveys which demonstrates: the school is considered "well performing" if scores are above 3.5 and Vimenti's survey scores are above 4 for all populations. Parents, staff, and students recognize Vimenti for enforcing safety rules, offering strong adult support, and promoting learning and engagement. (See page e-21)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (2) Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 35 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors.

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

1. (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

Applicant notes that the school is in good standing with the PRDE (our authorizer) and is a thriving school. Additional details of school's governance structure, financial operations, and mechanisms for ensuring parental and staff voice are heard are all included in the application. (See page e-18)

Applicant provides appropriate evidence that monitoring reports conducted by the authorizer (PRDE) have never found issues or deficiencies in the school's academic, financial, operational, or safety aspects. School has achieved high compliance ratings, maintaining a score of 95% or above in all reviews, mostly securing a 100% perfect score. Additionally, the applicant notes that the school's finances are audited annually by an independent third-party. (See page e-19)

Applicant provides a chart outlining timelines, roles, and responsibilities that is extensive, thorough, and reasonable. (See pages e21-24)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(f)(2)(iv))

Strengths:

Applicant provides sound justification that costs are reasonable, as demonstrated in the Budget and Budget narrative documents. Applicant notes that the costs are reasonable estimates considering the added expense of supplies, equipment, and curriculum in PR and vendor shortages in PR. "Expansion into upper-grade levels 6-10 allows us to increase enrollment by 194 students at a cost per pupil of \$ [REDACTED] (See page e24)

Sub

Weaknesses:

Applicant cites a flat fee cost for professional development but it is unclear who will be delivering this professional development, how many people will participate in the professional development, and what professional development materials will be offered. This is a \$ [REDACTED] allocation of funds that provides only a vague explanation as to how this expenditure will be utilized. (See pages e46-47)

Reader's Score: 4

3. (iii) **The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))**

Strengths:

Applicant provides a sound and specific plan for staffing, particularly of the project director and key project personnel, to meet the objectives of the grant. (See page e25-26).

Applicant provides a detailed breakdown, including time commitments for all personnel based on experience in effectively implementing previous federal grants. (See page e25-26)

Weaknesses:

Applicant notes that 10 percent of staff time will be devoted to professional development but it is unclear that staff will have time to allocate towards this purpose based on the grant narrative. (See page e25-26)

Reader's Score: 4

4. (iv) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))**

Strengths:

Applicant provides extensive and strong details outlining the relevant experience and training of all key project personnel. (See pages e25-26)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

5. (v) **The adequacy of the applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)**

Strengths:

Applicant provides clear and extensive overview of how the Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico will play an advisory and oversight role on Vimenti grant activities and expenditures. The Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico has a strong track record of overseeing funding for 55 years. Prior to heading the Boys and Girls Club, Olga Ramos, oversaw sales and purchasing for Sam's Club where she was in-charge of [REDACTED] in sales, purchasing, and logistics. (See page e-29)

Applicant describes how the board will have clear financial oversight and has a track record of success in managing a variety of grants effectively. (See page e-30)

Applicant describes strong and extensive protocols that are in place, including a three-quote requirement for

Sub

expenditures over \$ [REDACTED] bid or pre-approved sole source justification for contracts over \$ [REDACTED] maintenance of a capital asset schedule with depreciation accounting; payment for supplies/equipment only upon delivery; maintenance of federal purchase lists and inventory tracking by grant identification. (See page e-30)

An extensive and exhaustive set of measures are in place to cover the processes for spending approvals, quote and invoice documentation, monthly reconciliations, standard staff and time and effort tracking, and reimbursement-based drawdowns when possible. (See page e-31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

6. (vi) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Applicant provides adequate and appropriate description of how all programmatic decisions will be made at the school level through a committee structure. (See page e-32)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

7. (vii) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to administer or supervise the administration of the grant, including maintaining management and oversight responsibilities over the grant (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Applicant describes an extensive and exhaustive plan to administer and supervise the grant including how they will maintain management and oversight responsibilities. (See pages e-32-35)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (3) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 10 points).

In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

Applicant demonstrates an effective and existing track record that is strong philanthropically. For example, they have raised more than \$ [REDACTED] in private funding to ensure a public and private funding balance for operations. (See page e37)

Applicant documents a 95% retention rate of major gift donor renewal showing a deep commitment to the model and high-quality education. Recent notable fundraising includes \$ [REDACTED] through the US ED Full-Service Community Schools grant, of which [REDACTED] + supports new activities at Vimenti charter school (5 years, awarded in Dec 2022); \$ [REDACTED] from the Charter School Growth Fund to support capacity-building grade-level expansion (3 years, 2022); and the previously mentioned funds from NSVF (2 years, 2022 and 2023, up to \$ [REDACTED] (See page e37)

Applicant specifies funding for constructing a permanent facility has been secured ([REDACTED]), and development is in the final permitting process for construction. They anticipate occupying the permanent facility in 2026. (See page e38)

Applicant notes that most grant expenditures are one-time costs that support having a quality continuation plan. (See page e35)

Applicant plans to fundraise and already has raised [REDACTED] dollars that will be targeted to support their facility. (See page e38)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**1. (4) Quality of the Project Design (up to 10 points).**

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: 10

Sub**1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))****Strengths:**

Applicant provides a clear and thorough rationale. In terms of non-academic outcomes: "The school seeks to ensure families report higher incomes, less unemployment, more education, improved health, and more stability." Families are reporting this to be the case thanks to the school. (See page e-38)

Applicant has a clear rationale for academic offerings: academic curriculum is rooted in an English-Spanish dual-language instructional model that draws on Project-Based Learning (PBL), STEAM, and Entrepreneurship as core curriculum building blocks and cites a research base for each element. (See page e-38)

Applicant provides a clear, thorough and exhaustive logic model to explain their rationale via two major objectives and four activity strands that cover: (1) annually creating and sustaining an evidence-based learning environment in

Sub

each year of operation that fosters increased student achievement as measured by grade-appropriate, standards-aligned assessments and (2) developing, adopting, and implementing comprehensive systems to enhance the capabilities of staff and board leadership, improve pedagogical methods of teachers, and deepen content knowledge, integrating additional best practices into the school ecosystem. (See pages e41-56)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))

Strengths:

Applicant defines very clear, specific, and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes. (See pages e41-56)

Applicant specifies the following major outcomes will be achieved thanks to the grant, all of which are specific and measurable: Performance Measure (PM)1a: By September of each project year, 100% of curricula for grade expansion that year will be available to staff. PM1b: Annually, the # of students identified as proficient in Math will increase by 2%, until at least 64% of students are proficient in Math. PM1c: Annually, # of students identified as proficient in Spanish will increase by 2%, until at least 54% of all students are proficient in Spanish. PM1d: Annually, the # of students identified as proficient in English will increase by 3%, until at least 36% of all students are proficient in English. PM1e: Annually a 5% decrease in the number of students with chronic absenteeism until no more than 15% of students are considered chronically absent. PM2a: Annually, 90% of teachers are proficient in core instruction competencies, classroom environment, planning and preparation, and professional responsibilities, per annual evaluations. PM2b: Through annual evaluations, 90% of school-level leadership will apply pedagogical and content knowledge learned through PD. PM2c: By end Y3, Vimenti has developed an articulated Teacher-Leader pipeline Initiative with clear opportunities for high-quality teaching and operations staff. PM2d: By end of grant, five Vimenti teachers will participate in the Teacher-Leader Pipeline initiative. (See pages e-10, e41-56)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (5) Need for Project (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

Sub

1. (i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(i))

Strengths:

Applicant provides a clear rationale of the magnitude of the problems they seek to address, and their approach designed to break the cycle of intergenerational poverty among the families in nearby public housing. (See pages e50-52)

Applicant thoroughly describes the disproportionate impacts of poverty, exposure to violence, lack of affordable and accessible services, and lack of supervision for their existing students and likely students. Further, the schools' students face Adverse Childhood Experiences increased by disasters. (See pages e50-52)

Applicant describes an effective and research backed model to address the core community problems of lack of high-quality schools; lost learning time; persistent poverty; and poor physical and mental health. (See pages e50-52)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

Applicant effectively describes demand for their school: "Significant demand and support exist for Vimenti's expansion into middle and high school grades within the Ernest Ramos Antonini community." There are twice as many students wanting to attend the school as there are seats currently available. (See page e54)

Applicant shares focus group data from parents and the community that demonstrates a strong impact on academic success, including radically increased proficiency rates, added learning time, a positive impact on eradicating generational poverty, and signs of a healthier community. (See page e55)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Competitive Preference Priority—Promoting High-Quality Educator- and Community-Centered Charter Schools to Support Underserved Students (up to 5 points).

(a) Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—

(1) With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators; and

(2) Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development of the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties.

(b) In its application, an applicant must provide a high-quality plan that demonstrates how its proposed project would meet the requirements in paragraph (a) of this priority, accompanied by a timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school.

Strengths:

In terms of meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators, the applicant provides an overview of key ways this competitive preference priority will be achieved – via educator feedback on the school design, educator feedback on performance and culture, and to support designing key professional development opportunities. (See pages e56-57)

In terms of using a community-centered approach, the applicant conducted extensive surveys and community engagement to determine key assets and programming to embed in the school model. Applicant determined that the following elements would be critical based on their community-centered engagement: creating a space in which deep family and community ties would be fostered, creating a culture of entrepreneurship, placing a strong emphasis on both academic results and student safety, integrating surrounding business sectors that engage in educating the workforce, and engagement with various social service organizations working within a 2-Gen framework.

Applicant met face-to-face with key stakeholders between December 2022 and March 2023, holding six Town Halls and Public Meetings to discuss ideas for school expansion and solicit feedback on key design elements. (See pages e58)

Applicant provides a clear overview of how their approach aligns with best practices in community engagement in education, demonstrating their commitment to collaborative and inclusive school governance and describes the ways in which their Parent Council engages with school leadership.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2023 05:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 05:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico (S282E230006)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	19
Sub Total	20	19
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	33
Sub Total	35	33
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	35
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers Replication Panel - 1: 84.282E

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico (S282E230006)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (1) Quality of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 points).

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

Reader's Score: 19

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) 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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

- Applicant presents data demonstrating that current students in the elementary school grades of the school have significantly higher academic achievement than other schools in the community and in PR: Proficiency in Spanish and Math for students with disabilities and socioeconomically disadvantaged students at the school is higher than both the PR average and other local schools for those student groups (e15). This is particularly notable since the school serves a higher percentage of students with disabilities than the area schools (e15).

Weaknesses:

- The school's English proficiency rates are significantly lower, particularly for students with disabilities and socioeconomically disadvantaged students, than the PR average and local schools' averages for these subgroups (e15-16).

Reader's Score: 4

2. (ii) 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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

- The existing school has not had a charter revoked or closed a charter school and is in good standing with their authorizer (e18).

Sub

Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) **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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

- The applicant demonstrates that the school has never had a monitoring report that has found issues or deficiencies in the school's academic, financial, or safety (e19). The applicant has had very high compliance scores of at least 95% from their authorizer (e19) and is annually audited by an independent third party (e19).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (iv) **The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

- The school provides health services to students, families and community members, and 100% of students are screened for free annually by doctors and referred for any needed free services (e19-20). The school also provides free meals to students, families, and community members (e20).
- The school provides case management to families and referrals to services, which has resulted in meaningful decline in unemployment rates for families and access to higher paying jobs and opportunities through training (e20).
- The school's culture and climate survey demonstrates very good school climate, with survey scores will above the benchmark for a school to be considered "well performing" (e20) and have assisting the school with identifying and targeting areas for growth (e20).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (2) **Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 35 points).**

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors.

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

1. (i) **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

Strengths:

- Applicant provides extensive and thorough management plan for the project, and includes specific milestones and responsibilities for highly experienced staff members (e21-22). The plan is divided into key phases with comprehensive and detailed actions/tasks for each phase and identifies a reasonable time frame for each task (e21-24).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(f)(2)(iv))**

Strengths:

- The costs, particularly when broken down on a per student level, are reasonable in relation to the objectives and significance of the project (e24-25). The budget narrative provides sufficient detail about personnel costs, equipment, supplies, and most contractual services to justify the projected expenses (e629-645).

Weaknesses:

- The budget narrative provides minimal detail about the exact services to be provided each year by the professional development contractor, and does not include necessary context such as how many people the professional development will reach, the number of sessions, and materials provided (e629-645).

Reader's Score: 4

3. (iii) **The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))**

Strengths:

- Applicant provides a detailed breakdown and justification of the time commitments for all of the key project personnel, which are based on prior CSP grant management experience (e25). Multiple individuals have experience with either CSP grants and/or grant oversight (e25-26). The time commitments detailed by the applicant all specifically and directly support the objectives of the proposed project (e25-26).

Weaknesses:

- Some of the principal's time commitments as part of the project, for example teacher evaluation, should already be included in the principal's job responsibilities outside of the context of the grant (e25-26).

Reader's Score: 4

Sub

4. (iv) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))

Strengths:

- Key project personnel have extensive related experience, including managing prior CSP and federal grants (e26-7), funding compliance and reporting (e26), financial management and reporting (e27), community organizing (e27-28), educational and academic leadership (e28), and curriculum design (e28-29).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

5. (v) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

- Applicant has a strong plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds and a strong history of fiscal management, including management of previous federal grants, including the CSP grant (e30).
- Applicant has extensive financial management policies in place to support the organization's control over all CSP grant funds, including spending approvals, quote and invoice documentation procedures, monthly reconciliations, and staff time tracking (e30).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 5

6. (vi) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

- Applicant demonstrates strong plan and history of making programmatic decisions, particularly for federal grants, including previous CSP grants (e31-32). Applicant has established and extensive decision-making process and cross-team coordination to ensure decision-making is aligned with each of the project objective strands (e32).

Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

7. (vii) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to administer or supervise the administration of the grant, including maintaining management and oversight responsibilities over the grant (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

- Applicant provides extensive structure for plan to administer and supervise the grant, which includes a system of specific checks and balances defined by specific responsibilities for each of the key project personnel, including the school board and community (e33).

Sub

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 5

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (3) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 10 points).

In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

- The applicant provides information about how the "vast majority" of the project costs are one-time expenditures intended to support the start-up of the stated grades, at which point the school will be self-sustaining (e35). The applicant has considered future needs such as maintenance and replacement of items and equipment, maintaining grant-acquired skills, and continuing to implement the grant-supported curriculum with fidelity through ongoing training and development (e35).
- The school names several strategies to enhance long-term school sustainability such as a teacher-leader pipeline to increase staff retention and advancement (e36), the success of which can be shown by their 100% teacher retention rate (e36).
- The applicant has planned extensively for realistic long-term financial sustainability that includes a wide variety of anticipated costs after the grant funding ends, including hiring and training for new positions related to curriculum implementation and school operations (e36).
- The applicant has acquired alternative private funding sources for the gap between per-pupil funding and projected costs for the first several years until the school becomes sustainable on per-pupil funding alone (e36-37).
- The school has a lengthy history of fiscal responsibility, making them qualified and prepared to continue to be financially sustainable upon the ending of the grant (e37).

Weaknesses:

- None identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (4) Quality of the Project Design (up to 10 points).

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: 10

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))

Strengths:

- The applicant demonstrates a strong rationale, including evidence for the school's current "Vimenti" approach to wraparound services, for how the proposed project will support the school's objective to provide strong academic and economic support to support PR's workforce and recovery (e38).
- The applicant details their wraparound service strategy, dual-language model, and project-based learning, and their effectiveness for current students and families (e38).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))

Strengths:

- Applicant details extremely specific and extensive objectives in support of the overall project mission, and specific action items and timelines, which are specific and measurable, for each of the objectives, and strands within the objectives (e40-49). For example, the applicant extensively details the necessary activities each year to roll out five new grade levels, including aligning with PR standards, creating vertical integration and cross-curricular coverage, and ongoing re-evaluation of the curriculum (e40-42).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (5) Need for Project (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(i))

Sub

Strengths:

- Applicant identifies intergenerational poverty in a specific public housing complex in PR and the severity of poverty, exposure to violence, and lack of services for children, which the school's community model aims to address (e50).
- Applicant provides extensive information about the extreme lack of quality school options in both PR in general, and in the specific neighborhood that the school targets (e50-51), particularly highlighting the extremely inadequate services for students with disabilities (e51)
- Applicant provides data about lost learning time during the past several years due to natural disasters and the pandemic and increased disengagement with school and severe chronic absenteeism post-pandemic (e51).
- Puerto Ricans experience much more severe poverty, health disparities, and lost learning time than much of the rest of the United States, indicating the need for wraparound community school services (e51-52).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

- The applicant provides data for the demand for the school's expansion and the potential impact on serving older students (e53), including the most current demand data, in which there were twice the number of applicants as there were spots (e53-54).
- There is a significant need for quality academic options for grades 6-10 in the area, as demonstrated by very low student achievement at area public schools, and the school has been shown to greatly outperform area schools with similar demographics of students (e54).
- PR students have experienced a severe loss of learning time, beyond much of the rest of the country, and the school will provide extended learning hours to help students add learning time and recover from lost instructional time (e55).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Competitive Preference Priority—Promoting High-Quality Educator- and Community-Centered Charter Schools to Support Underserved Students (up to 5 points).

(a) Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—

- (1) With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators; and**
- (2) Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development of**

the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties.

(b) In its application, an applicant must provide a high-quality plan that demonstrates how its proposed project would meet the requirements in paragraph (a) of this priority, accompanied by a timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school.

Strengths:

- Applicant has structured teacher engagement procedures that have informed decision making at the school (e56). These include town hall meetings with current educators, which were attended by a large number of staff and staff surveys that allow teachers to provide feedback (e56).
- Applicant notes that they conducted community needs assessments in 2022-23 to receive input from the community in preparation for planning for the grade level expansion (e 57-58). This included evaluating current programming in the community, assessing the community needs and assets, and then holding six town halls and public meetings to solicit feedback on key design elements (e58).
- Applicant has plan for ongoing community engagement including a monthly parent counsel, which also provides reports and feedback to the board; school climate report surveys of parents annually which are used by school leadership to shape school policies; partnerships with community organizations (e59-60).

Weaknesses:

- None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2023 05:32 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 05:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico (S282E230006)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	20	19
Sub Total	20	19
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	35	31
Sub Total	35	31
Continuation		
Quality of the Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	35	35
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers Replication Panel - 1: 84.282E

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Boys and Girls Club of Puerto Rico (S282E230006)

Questions

Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (1) Quality of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 points).

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

Reader's Score: 19

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates, including in college or career training programs, employment rates, earnings and other academic outcomes) 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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The application provides ample evidence of annual VCS student academic achievement performance in Table 3 (p e15), significant demographic data in Table 1 (p e13) and comparison data for 2 San Juan schools and PR. For example, math, Spanish (language of instruction in PR), and English data is provided that indicates VCS students outperform peers. VCS students identified as economically disadvantaged and with special needs also outperform peers significantly (p e15) in math and Spanish, but not English. VCS performs similarly to the 2 San Juan schools in English. Table 4 highlights VCS attendance, retention, and chronic absenteeism (p e17), which is compared to PR and 2 area schools. This is mostly appropriate.

Weaknesses:

No comparison data for attendance or retention is provided (p e17). Comparison data for attendance and retention is needed to acquire a complete picture of these factors and to assess how VCS students compare to peers. This degree of specificity is warranted.

Reader's Score: 4

2. (ii) 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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)

Sub

Strengths:

The VCS is single charter school and not part of a charter management organization (CMO) or an educational management organization (EMO) (p e18). The application clearly states that no revocations or terminations have occurred since the school inception in 2020 and that VCS is in good standing with its authorizer, the PR Department of Education (DE) (p e19). This is sufficient.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) **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 (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

The application provides that the VCS is a single charter school seeking to expand. It is not part of a CMO or an EMO. No audit issues or student safety issues situations have occurred (p e19). The application further states that VCS has received a high compliance rating (95% to near 100%) from the PR DE (p e19).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (iv) **The extent to which the schools operated or managed by the applicant demonstrate strong results on measurable outcomes in non-academic areas such as, but not limited to, parent satisfaction, school climate, student mental health, civic engagement, and crime prevention and reduction (up to 5 points). (2019 NFP)**

Strengths:

Non-academic instructional practices were addressed as part of the proposed plan for expansion, which include, for example, a 2-Gen support model and a Healthy and Ready to Learn (HRL) initiative (p e19). The VCS implements a full-service community schools' approach and addresses health, racial disparity, and economic difference (p e19). Of note is that VCS has administered 4400 services, such as health screenings, school nurse services, and pediatrician services, to 453 individuals, which is significant (p e19). In addition, family case management is part of the full-service approach (p e20). Also, school climate is assessed annually using the Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI) and scores are above 4 with 3.5 indicating well performing (p e20).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (2) **Quality of the Charter School's Management Plan (up to 35 points).**

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary

considers the following factors.

Reader's Score: 31

Sub

1. (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The application contains two objectives which focus on objective 1, which is creating and sustaining an evidence-based learning environment that fosters academic growth and objective 2, to develop, adopt, and implement comprehensive systems across VCS. A comprehensive timeline is presented with appropriate milestones, responsible personnel and a timeframe (pp e21-24); this timeline aligns milestones to objectives and subsequent activity strands. For instance, objective 2 is to develop, adopt, and implement comprehensive systems (pp e 23-24); strand 3 explicates annual professional development (PD) who is responsible and when this activity will take place throughout the academic year. For instance, by each May, the PD calendar for the following year will be completed; the Project Director (PD) and Education Director (ED) are responsible (p e23). In the timeline, activities, dates, and responsible personnel are delineated clearly. The budget adequately addresses personnel salaries, travel, equipment, supplies, and contractual services. (Budget narrative). Adequacy of the management plan is addressed sufficiently.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(f)(2)(iv))

Strengths:

Costs are reasonable. For example, expanding grades 6-10 incurs expenses but also generates additional enrollments. For instance, contractual items in year 1 are specific, such as the cost for the contracted PD, computer repairs, and advertising VCS and expansion grades (pp e24-25; budget narrative attachment). Overall, costs are reasonable regarding objectives and the significance of the proposed expansion project.

Weaknesses:

In the budget narrative, a flat fee cost for professional development (PD) is not justified adequately. It is unclear the number of individuals that will participate in reading comprehension, or the scope of PD or qualifications of who will deliver from TNTP. Likewise, the [REDACTED] allocation does not include the number of sessions of PD, duration, or any related PD materials (budget narrative attachment). Year 2 through 5 contain the same language as year 1 for reading comprehension. A potential list of PD contractors, qualifications, and areas/topics is not provided. The budget narrative does not match Table 6 which is the research base for planned PD (pp e46-47). This degree of specificity is warranted.

Reader's Score: 3

3. (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))

Sub

Strengths:

Personnel FTE and time commitments are provided as part of the proposed plan. For instance, in year 1, the PD position is [REDACTED]. Key position descriptions of time commitment are adequately described for the positions of PD, financial officer, human resources director, ED, and data manager (pp e25-26; e629-645), which is appropriate.

Weaknesses:

According to the application, the middle school principal is [REDACTED] but it seems an additional [REDACTED] of time will be on grant activities such as teacher evaluation. This is confusing as principals evaluate teachers as part of their duties. It is unclear how this will be implemented. In tandem, the middle and high school teachers are [REDACTED] but the application states that [REDACTED] will be devoted to PD and pipeline initiatives (pp e25-260; e629-645). Again, this is confusing and warrants additional explanation.

Reader's Score: 3

4. (iv) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))

Strengths:

Key project personnel are described in terms of their specific jobs as they pertain to the grant which are adequately detailed in the application (pp e26-28). In addition, CVs are provided for each team members that further delineates education, skill, and expertise (Appendix B). The PD has been the VCS operational director since 2019 and has skill and expertise in developing, implementing, and managing plans, operational procedures and services for 11 Boys and Girls Clubs throughout PR (pp e26-28). Key project personnel are eminently qualified.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

5. (v) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to maintain control over all CSP grant funds (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

This is a single-site independent charter school that is expanding grades 6-10 (pp e18-19; e30). It is not part of either a CMO or an EMO. As a proposed expansion, a chief financial officer with grant experience will administer funds with the Governing Board's approval. The application discusses the VCS's past record of receiving a [REDACTED] CSP grant as well as other federal grants. The application attests that [REDACTED] of the school's operating funds are derived from federal grants (p e30) and thus, the VCS has experience managing federal dollars, has established protocols, and adheres to federal cost principles (pp e30-31). As an example, monthly reconciliations, authorization for spending approvals over [REDACTED] and pre-approvals for sole-source justifications, are standard practice (pp e30-31). This is sufficient.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

6. (vi) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to make all programmatic decisions (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Sub

Strengths:

The application provides compelling evidence that VCS uses systematic decision-making processes that are embedded within the school's organization structure (p e31) in terms of programmatic decisions and authority. For instance, an instructional leadership team (members specified e22-24) and grade level meetings are structures that allow faculty to make their own recommendations and assist the ED with ultimate decisions. (p e32). In addition, an Operational Team (members specified; e 22-24) makes collaborative decisions regarding the expansion, teacher-leader pipeline, and creating policies that guide expansion (p e32). This is appropriate given the scope and purpose of the VCS proposed expansion.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

7. (vii) The adequacy of the applicant's plan to administer or supervise the administration of the grant, including maintaining management and oversight responsibilities over the grant (up to 5 points). (2022 NFP)

Strengths:

Management and oversight are addressed clearly. For instance, it is clear in the application that the PD will oversee grant management (p e33). The PD will be assisted by the Financial Officer (FO) in administering and supervising the grant (p e33). An Executive Leadership Team (ELT) will distribute and share leadership (members specified, p e33; the ELT will meet monthly; the PD will meet quarterly with the Board to share grant implementation (p e33). The VCS ELT will also meet monthly with the with the Boys & Girls Club PR president and finance director to update them (p e35). This is sufficient in terms of maintaining management and oversight.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Continuation - Quality of the Continuation Plan

1. (3) Quality of the Continuation Plan (up to 10 points).

In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (2019 NFP)

Strengths:

The VCS has a sufficient continuation plan that is reasonable. For instance, projected increased enrollments from expansion coupled with sound, industry-standard financial practices will likely allow the school to continue beyond the years of the grant (p e35). As an example, most grant expenditures are one-time related to expansion (p e35). VCS will replace consumables, PD related to curriculum, and maintain grant purchased equipment (p e35). In addition, VCS has received significant pre-launch funding from foundations (p e36) and intends to aggressively fund-raise (p e37). Funds to construct a permanent site have been secured () so that the need for lease dollars will evaporate (p e38). This is an appropriate continuation plan.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. (4) Quality of the Project Design (up to 10 points).

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: 10

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))

Strengths:

The project design is the 2 Gen Wrap around service strategy which mitigates the impact of poverty (p e38). Adequate empirical studies (p e38) are cited that illustrate the efficacy of this model. In addition, a dual language model is also implemented and is well-supported in the literature as it honors the heritage language (Spanish) while assisting students to master the dominant language (English) (p e38). Finally, instructional practices such as STEAM and project-based learning (PBL) are also part of the proposed plan; each enjoys a well-established research base. (p e38). A logic model is also provided (Attachment 2, document 5). This is an appropriate, well-justified rationale.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (up to 5 points). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))

Strengths:

The proposed project has appropriate goals, objectives, and activities designed to mitigate the effects of poverty, and through education, reduce childhood and intergenerational poverty by [REDACTED] within the next 10 years (p e39). Expansion addresses the objectives of adding 5 grade levels and creating and sustaining an evidence-based learning environment (p e40). Table 5 provided What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence and curricula rationale for disciplines such as science and ELA as well as positive behavior support (PBS), technology, and art (pp e41-44). Each area is addressed in terms of the evidence that exists. In addition, progress monitoring is delineated per objective and measure (p e44-49). This adequately addresses how outcomes will be achieved.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. (5) Need for Project (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project (up to 15 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(i))

Strengths:

Expanding the VCS is warranted. The application attests that school choice is warranted in the target area (p e50) and will address poverty and lack of access to services. The application provides that National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores rank PR as the lowest score behind mainland peer states. Natural disasters such as Hurricane Maria (2017) and the COVID-19 pandemic have exacerbated the impacts of poverty and lack of access to opportunity and have increased mental health issues among school-aged children and family members (pp e51-53). Need is sufficiently established.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project (up to 10 points). (34 CFR 75.210(a)(2)(ii))

Strengths:

Programming that offers alternatives to local district programming is established as a need. The proposed project will add 194 additional students to VCS (p e53). A waitlist of 66 students presently exists for current grade levels served by VCS (p e54). Added instructional time, 2 Gen wrap around services, creating a healthier community and implementation of a multi-tiered system of support is needed to break intergeneration poverty (pp e54-56).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Competitive Preference Priority—Promoting High-Quality Educator- and Community-Centered Charter Schools to Support Underserved Students (up to 5 points).

(a) Under this priority, an applicant must propose to open a new charter school, or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that is developed and implemented—

(1) With meaningful and ongoing engagement with current or former teachers and other educators; and

(2) Using a community-centered approach that includes an assessment of community assets, informs the development of the charter school, and includes the implementation of protocols and practices designed to ensure that the charter school will use and interact with community assets on an ongoing basis to create and maintain strong community ties.

(b) In its application, an applicant must provide a high-quality plan that demonstrates how its proposed project would meet the requirements in paragraph (a) of this priority, accompanied by a timeline for key milestones that span the course of planning, development, and implementation of the charter school.

Strengths:

a 1 The application provides a thorough discussion of how teachers are meaningfully engaged on an ongoing basis for the proposed expansion of Vimenti Charter School (VCS) (p e56). For example, fourcore initiatives are permanent polices that include educator feedback on school design through town hall meetings with current teachers, educator feedback on school performance and culture through an annual climate report, educator feedback and recommendations are solicited through the structure of professional learning communities (PLCs), and educator feedback is obtained through additional PD wherein teachers provide feedback through synthesis of students' outcome data (pp e56-57). This is extensive.

2 The application comprehensively discusses strategies for community engagement. For instance, in 2022 and 2023, VCS initiated a series of community needs assessments to better understand assets and to seek input from the community regarding grade-level expansion (pp e57-58). Assets include a composite analysis of case management records, Puerto Rico (PR) ESSER spending plans, health and community needs, PR disaster recovery plans, and the strong familial and community ties, as well as a strong community emphasis on education and entrepreneurial goals (p e58). In addition, 6 town halls meetings were conducted Dec 2022 through March 2023 wherein plans to expand and opportunities for comment were solicited from 65 attendees (p e59). In addition, a Parent Council, consisting of one parent per class meets monthly (p e59). The application provides that leadership practices included consideration of existing community assets (p e59). A list of existing community partners was provided including: Boys and Girls Clubs of Puerto Rico; the MAS Corp (public housing developments where our students and families reside); Vidalus Health; Centro para Emprendedores; UPR Psychologist School; L&M Mental Health Care Associates, Corp.; Peter Alford Foundation; Fundacion Colibri; Children's Health Fund; Meadows Mental Health Policy Institute; NewSchools Venture Fund; and First LEGO League (p e60). Letters of support were also provided from these community entities (letters of Support attachment). This is a thorough community-centered approach.

b A comprehensive timeline is presented with appropriate milestones, responsible personnel and a timeframe (pp e21-24); this timeline aligns milestones to objectives. In Table 8 of the application, (p e 61). a timeline that included community assets and input opportunities was presented. For example, the timeline milestones were identified as activities and frequency of soliciting feedback was included in the timeline (p e 61). As an example, the Instructional Leadership Team meets bi-weekly allowing teachers to use this mechanism to offer suggestions and input. As another example, the Board meets 9 times each year, surveys are all administered annually, and the community asset assessment is administered every 3 years (p e 61). This is appropriate.

Weaknesses:

a 1 No weakness noted.

2 No weakness noted.

b No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2023 05:12 PM