

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2012 04:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Day Charter Public School (U282P120006)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	13
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	15
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	14
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	14
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	10
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	6
Sub Total	95	82
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	100	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Collaboration Awards - 3: 84.282P

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Community Day Charter Public School (U282P120006)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Record and potential for success of collaboration

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant's past or existing collaboration has improved educational outcomes and operational practices; and
(2) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve one or more of the following demonstrable results:
 - (i) Improved operational practices and productivity among all partners in such areas as financial performance and sustainability, governing board performance and stewardship, and parent and community engagement;
 - (ii) Improved student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications);
 - (iii) Improved student attendance and retention, and improved high school graduation rates;
 - (iv) Improved rates of college matriculation and college graduation;
 - (v) Improved rates of attendance and graduation from other postsecondary (i.e., non-college) institutions or programs.

Strengths:

Applicant provides a comprehensive overview of how multiple schools have successfully used the applicant's unique and innovative data analysis tool to increase student achievement for minority and at-risk students. Applicant's partner school and district are expected to significantly increase their student's achievement levels if the applicant's small school model plan is implemented along with other operational practices. Applicant's proposal provides specific instances of improving student achievement and operational practices for all partners.

Weaknesses:

While applicant provides information regarding previous collaboration, the applicant fails to provide sufficient quantitative data regarding the overall improvement of their previous partners' student achievement. While applicant provides qualitative data related to previous partnerships, the applicant does not correlate their previous successes with student achievement.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

1. (1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student achievement (as defined in the NIA) and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school.
(2) Either--
 - (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school; or
 - (ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school and to which significant gains in student achievement (as

defined in this notice) have been made with all populations of students served by the charter school.

(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for students from low-income families and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average academic achievement results for such students attending other public schools in the State.

Strengths:

Applicant provides specific three year data regarding their overall student achievement compared to state performance. Applicant sufficiently described how the school's Hispanic students have closed the achievement gap over the past three years with the state's White students. Applicant provides comprehensive data that demonstrates that the applicant's Hispanic students are significantly outperforming the state's Hispanic students. The applicant's record of student achievement for their at-risk students is extremely strong overall and significantly higher than the corresponding state achievement levels.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the project design

1. The extent to which the applicant proposes a high-quality plan to use its Collaboration Award funds to improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools, including public charter schools.

Strengths:

The applicant utilized data and research to develop its professional development plan for its target partner school. Applicant's proposed three part approach to support teacher training, community outreach and dissemination of results to other groups is clearly explained and fully developed for this project. Applicant's proposed community outreach initiative shows strong potential to make a strong impact in improving the student achievement of AES's students.

Applicant plans on using a dissemination plan that is similar to previously successful dissemination projects to expand the reach of this project. The school's use of assessment data to ensure students reach academic achievement goal's was profiled as a best practice and is part of the dissemination portion of this grant. The applicant's proposal could reach and impact even a larger number of students through this piece of the project.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant includes a strong plan for partnering with a traditional public school, it does not include a plan to work with any charter schools. The applicant could have included information regarding any potential charter schools that might be part of the applicant's dissemination efforts.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Potential for scalability

1. The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners by other public schools or LEAs, including public charter schools and charter school LEAs, and sustained over the long-term.

Strengths:

Applicant demonstrates previous success in replicating its program by including sufficient evidence that the program was replicated three times previously. Applicant could successfully implement additional programs by leveraging their partnerships to expand the number of sites in Massachusetts. For the replication and scalability to be successful, the applicant will need to create partnerships with other high needs schools to develop turnaround plans for each school.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to include a finite or specific list of other possible schools that the proposed program could be replicated with great success. The applicant proposes that the program would be successful in communities similar to the proposed partner's community but does not include other potential areas that the program could be replicated in.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Innovation

- 1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposed collaboration, as well as its dissemination plan, are either (i) substantially different from other efforts in its area of focus; or (ii) substantially more effective than similar efforts in its area of focus.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence that the partnership is unique within the state due to the characteristics of the partners involved in the project. This proposed project would be the first time a charter school management organization will partner with a district placed into receivership by not taking over the school but by assisting the turnaround school via the transformation model. Particularly noteworthy is the temporary nature of the proposed partnership because by the end of the contract the school is returned to the district.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide sufficient documentation that the proposed project is substantially different from other national school reform efforts. Applicant does not provide any documentation that would demonstrate that the proposed approach would be more effective than other school turnaround strategies.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications 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 the following factors:**
 - (i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and**
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

Proposal includes the leadership of an extremely qualified project director that has extensive experience working with charter schools and with turnaround schools. Proposal includes utilizing the individual talents and qualifications of numerous qualified professionals to effectively manage and implement the proposed project. The proposal includes

sufficient information detailing the qualifications of all the potential individuals involved in the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. 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 adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

Applicant includes specific project responsibilities and the key personnel responsible for completing the particular project responsibilities. Applicant includes general milestones for the project and a realistic timeline to complete key activities.

Weaknesses:

Applicant's proposed management plan does not provide interim milestone and key events. Project management plan is not directly linked to the budget. Applicant does not link management plan to the objectives of the project.

Reader's Score: 6

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds

- 1. Turning Around Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools**

Note: In order to receive preference under this competitive preference priority, the applicant must specify that it is responding to this competitive preference priority.

To meet this priority, projects must be designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

- (a) Improving student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA) notice) in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).**
- (b) Increasing graduation rates (as defined in the NIA) and college enrollment rates for students in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).**
- (c) Providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools.**

Note: For purposes of this priority, the Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the School Improvement Grants Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved FY 2009 or FY 2010 applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

Strengths:

Applicant proposes to partner with several persistently lowest-achieving schools and to improve the student achievement of the partner district and schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2012 04:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2012 02:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Day Charter Public School (U282P120006)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	12
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	15
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	6
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	12
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	11
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	5
Sub Total	95	71
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	100	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Collaboration Awards - 3: 84.282P

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Community Day Charter Public School (U282P120006)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Record and potential for success of collaboration

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant's past or existing collaboration has improved educational outcomes and operational practices; and
(2) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve one or more of the following demonstrable results:
 - (i) Improved operational practices and productivity among all partners in such areas as financial performance and sustainability, governing board performance and stewardship, and parent and community engagement;
 - (ii) Improved student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications);
 - (iii) Improved student attendance and retention, and improved high school graduation rates;
 - (iv) Improved rates of college matriculation and college graduation;
 - (v) Improved rates of attendance and graduation from other postsecondary (i.e., non-college) institutions or programs.

Strengths:

The application highlights CDPCS' success in closing the achievement gap earning MCAS scores that were higher than all white students in the state for the past three years. Additionally, CDPCS has been the recipient of multiple awards, most significantly, the silver EPIC award for five consecutive years.

The Community Partners Initiative (CPI) formed by CDPCS has partnered with more than 50 charter schools, district schools, and charter support organizations. The application presents positive feedback from partnering schools.

Academic achievement targets were set, along with a goal of parent/community engagement.

Weaknesses:

Despite the strong backing by partners, there is insufficient data to conclude that these partnerships have resulted in demonstrable results.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

1. (1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student achievement (as defined in the NIA) and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school.
(2) Either--
 - (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school; or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school and to which significant gains in student achievement (as defined in this notice) have been made with all populations of students served by the charter school.

(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for students from low-income families and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average academic achievement results for such students attending other public schools in the State.

Strengths:

All components of these criteria were addressed with reasonable evidence from state testing (MCAS). CDPS serves a primarily Hispanic, low socioeconomic, demographic and state tests indicate that they are outperforming state comparisons, are closing the achievement gap, and have demonstrated increased student achievement results.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the project design

1. The extent to which the applicant proposes a high-quality plan to use its Collaboration Award funds to improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools, including public charter schools.

Strengths:

The plan was based on extensive research completed from a comprehensive needs assessment funded by the USDOE Promise Neighborhood Grant. Teacher training is outlined within the application, focusing on integrated assessment and data. Parent and community engagement is described with a focus on refurbishing the school library and providing literacy resources to families. Lastly, several dissemination strategies were highlighted.

Weaknesses:

The plan was lacking adequate description of the teacher training and core components that will fundamentally change the educational outcomes for students at Arlington Elementary school. It is unclear whether new teachers are being hired or whether the existing staff will remain in place. The roles between leadership/management at Community Day and Arlington Elementary are also confusing because it leaves the reader unsure of what the partnership actually looks like and the process for turnaround. There also was no mention of the grant benefiting other charter schools.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Potential for scalability

1. The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners by other public schools or LEAs, including public charter schools and charter school LEAs, and sustained over the long-term.

Strengths:

The application highlights key elements pointing towards the potential for scalability: prior experience, key partners, quality of agreement, applicability of model within the market, and affordability.

Within Massachusetts, there are 39 other schools classified as a 5 lowest performing within the state- that are also in need of drastic reform efforts. If this model is successful, it could be applied throughout the state as well as serve as a model nationwide.

Weaknesses:

While CSD has replicated other charter schools successfully, there is no direct evidence to clearly determine whether a turnaround model will be successful. The application focuses on several key elements but it is still unclear what some of these will look like, namely the essential agreements between the district and charter, such as the agreed upon fundamental reforms and the determined function of the central office.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Innovation

- 1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposed collaboration, as well as its dissemination plan, are either (i) substantially different from other efforts in its area of focus; or (ii) substantially more effective than similar efforts in its area of focus.**

Strengths:

The application highlights that these efforts are historic for the state of Massachusetts because Lawrence is the first district declared as under performing, in which a school is to be placed into receivership by a CMO for turnaround.

An important feature of this collaborative partnership is that it involves a 3-5 year contract, where at the end of the term, the school is turned back to district management. The application describes the mutual learning for both the charter and the district that will result from this partnership.

Weaknesses:

While these efforts are innovative for the state, there are other similar models taking place nationally. It is unclear what makes this model more effective or drastically different.

Reader's Score: 11

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications 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 the following factors:**
 - (i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and**
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The application provides appropriate documentation to justify the caliber of all project personnel and briefly describes the school's recruiting and outreach efforts.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The management plan includes a table defining responsibilities and persons responsible, coupled with timelines/milestones for teacher training, parent outreach/engagement, and dissemination.

Weaknesses:

The management plan made no mention of the student achievement objectives and progress monitoring/evaluation of these objectives. There was also no description of the budget so it is unclear exactly how these funds will be allocated most effectively.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds**

1. Turning Around Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Note: In order to receive preference under this competitive preference priority, the applicant must specify that it is responding to this competitive preference priority.

To meet this priority, projects must be designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

(a) Improving student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA) notice) in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).

(b) Increasing graduation rates (as defined in the NIA) and college enrollment rates for students in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).

(c) Providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Note: For purposes of this priority, the Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the School Improvement Grants Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved FY 2009 or FY 2010 applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

Strengths:

Community Day has a targeted partner with Arlington Elementary School, a USDOE Tier 1 SIG School with the intended outcome of improving student achievement. This clearly meets (c) of providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest achieving and evidence of meeting (a) improving student achievement.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2012 02:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2012 02:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Day Charter Public School (U282P120006)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	15
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	10
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	13
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	13
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	15
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Sub Total	95	84
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	100	89

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Collaboration Awards - 3: 84.282P

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Community Day Charter Public School (U282P120006)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Record and potential for success of collaboration

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant's past or existing collaboration has improved educational outcomes and operational practices; and
(2) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve one or more of the following demonstrable results:
 - (i) Improved operational practices and productivity among all partners in such areas as financial performance and sustainability, governing board performance and stewardship, and parent and community engagement;
 - (ii) Improved student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications);
 - (iii) Improved student attendance and retention, and improved high school graduation rates;
 - (iv) Improved rates of college matriculation and college graduation;
 - (v) Improved rates of attendance and graduation from other postsecondary (i.e., non-college) institutions or programs.

Strengths:

Community Day Charter Public School has presented a comprehensive plan that includes benchmark and formative assessment, curriculum mapping using state standards, individualized learning plans that were personalized educational goals for each student, Response to Interventions tiered-instructional methodology, small learning community configuration, and a parent and community engagement model. According to their report they are collaborating together with Arlington Elementary School in each of these areas to improve student achievement. Thus this aspect was adequately addressed, p 9.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

1. (1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student achievement (as defined in the NIA) and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school.
(2) Either--
 - (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school; or
 - (ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school and to which significant gains in student achievement (as defined in this notice) have been made with all populations of students served by the charter school.
- (3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, student

attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for students from low-income families and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average academic achievement results for such students attending other public schools in the State.

Strengths:

There was an adequate amount of data to prove how the superiority of the prescribed program has worked for Community Day Charter Public School.

Weaknesses:

It was stated on p. 14 that CD/AES was focused on improving student achievement Arlington Elementary School (AES). However, no evidence of data was identified in the grant application that examined how the project schools student achievement increased over the course of three years. Over the project period no percentages were found that spoke to the advantages of Arlington Elementary School partnering with CD/AES or if whether CD/AES had any improvements or demonstrated success in their students achievement was not documented or included definitively in the application. No data was identified in the application that revealed how students literacy proficiency rose or how subgroup proficiency rose for students with learning disabilities for the project school CD/AES. All relevant data that would reveal the data-driven results of student achievement was undocumented that addressed where the achievement gaps where over the past three years for the project school CD/AES. It is unclear as to whether CDCPS ever worked with or developed a collaborative partnership with CD/AES at all over the three years. No evidence was found that reveal that CDCPS piloted any other public charter schools in the state, other than the demonstratable goals alluded to on pp. 8-9.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the project design

- 1. The extent to which the applicant proposes a high-quality plan to use its Collaboration Award funds to improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools, including public charter schools.**

Strengths:

A detailed Needs Assessment Report, Appendix C pp. 1-43, was included in the application with detailed explanations of the geographic demographic, public safety, health, and specifically the education explanation that includes 16 indicators of high-quality planning to justify the requested funds directed toward improving educational outcomes for students. The Lawrence Turnaround plan included an aggressive forecast of more than 50% Student Growth Percentiles in 2012-2013 school year, p. 16, supports the overall notion of closing the achievement gap for underrepresented student subgroups as well as for improving student achievement overall.

In addition, a written assurance in the form of a partnership agreement was identified in the application on p. e116, a specific application requirement.

Weaknesses:

The application should have included a detailed explanation of the applicants past or existing collaboration efforts, as stated in the application requirements; instead, this required information was inadequately and vaguely addressed in the proposal as well as the Needs Assessment Report. Although a plan or collaboration agreement by TCG/CDCPS managers was said to be developed p. 16, no clear explanations were identified as to when this plan was developed or what segment of that plan was already in place to improve students achievement throughout the Lawrence Public Schools. If this was, in fact, a part of the Lawrence Turnaround Plan, further explanation is needed to develop and articulate this understanding for the readers of this application in reference to who are the recipient schools, i.e., ways to address specific needs of those schools and how this program would continue beyond the grant timeline.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Potential for scalability

1. The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners by other public schools or LEAs, including public charter schools and charter school LEAs, and sustained over the long-term.

Strengths:

A budget narrative timeline clearly and succinctly discussed the line items within the prescribed budget. The overall Lawrence District School and CDCPS have collaborated and have developed a foundational plan.

Weaknesses:

CDCPS and TCG have stated that they have documented examples of disseminating best practices with charter public and district public schools p. 23. However, no evidence was found in the proposal of these documented examples. Information that clearly addressed just how these partner schools would continue even after grant funds were gone was very unclear. CDCPS did not bridge the gap between what was stated in the collaboration model p. 23, and the objectives of the project. The information was at best vague and lacking substance.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Innovation

1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposed collaboration, as well as its dissemination plan, are either (i) substantially different from other efforts in its area of focus; or (ii) substantially more effective than similar efforts in its area of focus.

Strengths:

The unique innovative aspect of this proposed collaboration is evident in the fact that CDCPS is going to take over, temporarily, AES for up to five-years p. e14, all managerial rights and responsibilities from the Lawrence Public Schools. In addition, CDCPS will creatively facilitate their Lawrence Turnaround Plan, and then pull out after AES has accomplished the prescribed goals and targets.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications 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 the following factors:
 - (i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

All 12 personnel assigned to this project are highly qualified, each of them having Master of Arts degrees, with the exception of one who is the Accountant.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **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 adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

There is ample evidence to confirm that the project plan appropriately addresses the needs for optimum student achievement success.

Weaknesses:

No management plan was found that addressed how responsibilities, timelines, and milestones would be disseminated among the current AES staff after the grant cycle is complete.

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds**

1. **Turning Around Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools**

Note: In order to receive preference under this competitive preference priority, the applicant must specify that it is responding to this competitive preference priority.

To meet this priority, projects must be designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

(a) Improving student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA) notice) in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).

(b) Increasing graduation rates (as defined in the NIA) and college enrollment rates for students in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).

(c) Providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Note: For purposes of this priority, the Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the School Improvement Grants Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved FY 2009 or FY 2010 applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

Strengths:

Community Day Charter Public School has partnered with Arlington Elementary School, a U.S. Department of Education Tier 1 school p. 10. Therefore, this school grant recipient has met the States approval criteria.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2012 02:32 PM