

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2012 09:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jumoke Academy Schools (U282P120024)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	11
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	11
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	12
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	10
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	11
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	7
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	4
Sub Total	95	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	100	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Collaboration Awards - 2: 84.282P

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Jumoke Academy Schools (U282P120024)

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 schools students, as noted on page 4, have made strong gains in Reading and Science, increasing school-wide proficiency by 26.4 percent and 29.5 percent respectively since 2006.

Applicant had a strong 2011, also detailed on page 4, receiving some of the highest scores in their history with 89.7 percent of students scoring at or above proficiency in Math, and 92.6 percent of students scoring at or above proficiency in Writing.

Weaknesses:

W: Outside of performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test and data on 2011 study of how many applicant students are attending college, the application does not explicitly provide detail on how proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve the demonstrable results required by the criteria (e.g improve student attendance & retention, improve graduation rates, improve test scores, etc).

Reader's Score: 11

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:

A chart the applicant included on page 5 indicates the applicant school has a high percentage of students at or above proficient on the Connecticut Mastery Tests.

On page 5 the applicant notes a study conducted during the summer of 2011 reported that approximately 87 percent of high school graduates, who attended the applicant elementary and middle schools, are now attending a full time college program.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not break out the details of their success in closing the historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA.

Reader's Score: 11

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 project design (19-22) presents a proposed project design that is comprehensive and detailed.

The plan presented by the applicant (page 9) is aligned with goals that are congruent with the Hartford Public Schools (HPS) strategic plan and its reform initiatives.

Also, on page 9 the applicant notes the school District will identify each school for turnaround, establish expectations, and collaborate with Jumoke to develop, implement and document the turnaround efforts policies and experiences.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly detail as to how the list of activities in their plan (pages 19-22) provided will improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools.

Reader's Score: 12

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 comprehensive and systemic approach to school reform, utilizing research based best practices, can be adopted by any school willing to embrace the ideas and practices detailed in this application.

Weaknesses:

The applicant expresses confidence that the turnaround strategies described in this proposal will succeed (p 23) however, they do not address the extent to which the applicants proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners and sustained over the long-term by third party public and charter schools.

Reader's Score: 10

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 idea of a District partnering with a charter school as the lead to help turn struggling District schools around is an innovative and novel approach to improving the performance of the district schools.

Weaknesses:

The dissemination plan provided by the applicant lacks details about how they will help other public and charter schools adopt the critical elements of the proposed collaboration.

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 senior management team includes individuals with deep experience who have been working together for a long time. The CEO and CFO have more than 10+ years of experience and have been at the applicant school during its period of high performance noted earlier in the application.

Weaknesses:

There appears to be no dedicated key project personnel and it is unclear if anyone person will be dedicated to carrying out and ensuring the success of the proposed partnership.

Reader's Score: 7

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 school management appears to be well structured, "the central office is broken into three distinct departments, each with a very specific role in supporting the organizational network as a whole: the Executive Office, the Academic Office and the Financial Office" and has a long history of working together in supporting their schools (p24-25).

Weaknesses:

The budget indicates (p27) that applicant will be "identifying, facilitating and documenting effective sharing of practices, facilitating development and tracking of evaluation plan, organizing information and reports on progress, and ensuring accountability to the priorities, milestones and outcomes established by the team." Many of these elements quoted above, particularly a plan for achieving the grant objectives on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones, are required elements of this grant application, not work to be completed after award of the grant.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

The project will provide services to students at Milner School, a persistently low-performing Tier I school and the lowest performing school in the neighborhood District (pg 2 & 5) and references adding an additional school in each additional year of the grant.

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2012 09:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/11/2012 04:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jumoke Academy Schools (U282P120024)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	11
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	9
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	15
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	11
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	11
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	4
Sub Total	95	69
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	100	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Collaboration Awards - 2: 84.282P

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Jumoke Academy Schools (U282P120024)

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 charter school has seen a steady increase in the percentage of students that scored at or above proficiency on the state exams. In 2011 the charter school had over 90% of its student scoring proficient in writing and over 89% proficient in math. Reading scores are also improving with over 80% of the student proficient in 2011. All of these achievements are from the charter school that is located in an area with the same demographic makeup of the public school it will be assisting. Pg. 5

The applicant has an existing collaboration with the public school district working to utilize student demographic and mobility data to gather information about students and how best to meet their needs. This collaboration will be expanded this school year when the charter school will work with the lowest performing school in the local district. Over three consecutive years the charter school will work with three different district schools to help them achieve higher student performance. Pg. 5

Weaknesses:

There is no formalized plan to disseminate the success of this project to other charter schools and public school districts. While the applicant indicates it has ways of reaching key stakeholders through phone trees, newsletters and visitation days, these efforts will not give specific information on how the project works to schools that are interested in utilizing the information gained from this collaboration.

Reader's Score: 11

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:

The charter school has shown consistent growth in student achievement on state mandated reading and math tests, specifically over the past three years. Pg. 5

Results from a recent survey indicate that student who attended the charter school through elementary and middle school were successful in high school and that 87% of these students attended or are still attending college. Pg. 5

Weaknesses:

Even though the majority of students attending the charter school are minorities, the application would have been stronger if achievement data had been reported by subgroups as well as the group as a whole. It was difficult to determine if the applicant has been successful in raising the achievement level of educationally disadvantaged students.

Reader's Score: 9

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:

Using the successful strategies of the charter school practices and the categories as defined by the State Department of Education in their Turnaround Plan, the applicant has developed a framework that will work with the public school to provide assistance in key areas of school reform. Pg. 20 - 22

The applicant will form a management team that will work directly with the staff of the public school to identify areas of greatest need and begin to develop the infrastructure necessary to make changes. Pg. 9

The agreement between the charter school and the public school district is explicit with areas of responsibility defined. The agreement has several options that have been discussed relative to the turnaround of the district school. Pg. 9 - 10

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 strategies used to help this charter school achieve success in student achievement are not just theory they are tried and proven. These strategies can be taken to any school and implemented because they involve sound education practices. Using these strategies the applicant has demonstrated increasing student success since the inception of the charter school 15 years ago. Pg. 23

The results achieved by the applicant over the term of the charter demonstrate that this program can be sustained over time to the benefit of student achievement. Pg. 23

Weaknesses:

Because many of the practices utilized in the charter school are specific for low income families and the issues they face, some of these practices may not be necessary or even welcomed in other communities with significantly different demographics.

Reader's Score: 11

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 collaboration is a bold move by the public school district to bring in a high performing charter school to take the lead in turning around three of their lowest performing schools. This type of partnership is unique. pg. 9 - 10

Weaknesses:

The dissemination plan is not very specific outside of informing stakeholders and politicians about the charter school. There is not a plan to give wide spread specific operational information about the project.

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 members of the leadership team for the charter school have good qualifications for their specific positions. Additionally, each of these key leaders has worked with the charter school for several years thereby adding a thorough knowledge of the charter school practices to their list of attributes. Pg. 24 - 26

Weaknesses:

There is no statement about encouraging applications from underrepresented populations.

No specific information about the composition of the professional transformation team is given. The budget narrative indicates funds will be utilized to subsidize the initial cost of these individuals but there is nothing specific about the required qualifications or education levels. Pg. 27

A project director is not named nor is the position discussed within the application.

Reader's Score: 8

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 applicant has explained the structure of the charter schools upper level management positions. This structure has enabled the charter school to function efficiently and to meet the academic needs of their students. pg. 24 - 26

Weaknesses:

There is no timeline presented. It is difficult to determine if the applicant understands the process toward assisting the district school without some document in place that outlines the small and large tasks, timeframe for completion and responsible parties. A strong management plan would have made the application stronger.

The budget narrative indicates a professional transformation team will be in place to manage the project but the applicant does not give specific information about how the positions on the team will be filled new hires or existing staff. Much more specificity is needed relative to this selection criterion.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

The applicant will work with a public school that is recognized as a tier I school. This school is also one of the lowest performing schools in the state and has been in school improvement since 2009. This project is designed to increase student achievement in all areas. Pg. 24

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/11/2012 04:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/11/2012 11:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jumoke Academy Schools (U282P120024)

Reader #3: *****

	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	13
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	14
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	13
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	13
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	7
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 #2 - Collaboration Awards - 2: 84.282P

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Jumoke Academy Schools (U282P120024)

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:

- Jumoke has an MOU with the Hartford Public Schools (HPS) and a letter of support from the Connecticut Board of Education (attachments).
- Hartford implemented a portfolio of schools in 2007 which apparently improved test scores and graduation rates (p.3).
- In 2012 Hartford launched a second reform phase that includes alignment with charter school organizations, including Jumoke (p.4).
- In 2010, Jumoke began collaborating with HPS with support from the Gates Foundation (p.5).
- Jumoke has 15 years of experience in developing a high-performing charter school. Jumoke will use similar strategies with the Milner School that address barriers to education (such as social and economic challenges) (p.5-6).
- Jumoke has demonstrated significant success with a similar demographic population as Milner (p.6).
- Jumoke's management of the turnaround of Milner was shaped by state policy which included a statewide infusion of \$100 million to turnaround failing schools as well as tougher teacher evaluation. Further, the legislation gave permission to the Commissioner of Education to create a Commissioner's Network of 25 consistently underperforming schools. Jumoke's collaboration with Milner will benefit from this initiative (p.6).
- Working with the state and HPS, Jumoke has proposed to be the lead partner in the district's turnaround efforts with the goal of serving 10% of Hartford's students by 2016.
- As part of the Commissioner's Network, Jumoke will sign a 3-year performance contract that provides benchmarks to improve student achievement, oversight of Milner staff, effective use of time and curricular and enrichment programs (p. 7).
- The collaboration's strategy is to prioritize teacher coaching and evaluation, transitioning to common core standards, increasing access to high-performing schools, and communicating the impact of these priorities and the partnership as a whole (p.7).
- HPS plans on implementing TeachScape's Charlotte Danielson Rubric which Jumoke already has experience in shows collaboration (p.7).
- In 2014-15 Jumoke and HPS will transition together to a new assessment system known as the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium based on Common Core standards (p.8). This is another sign of significant collaboration.
- Jumoke will have access to HPS's curricula, assessments and online report cards and Jumoke will also participate in training and planning activities for curriculum development and standards-based report cards (p.8) which will assist in the dissemination process.

- Jumoke will develop a management turnaround team charged with creating infrastructure and a plan for opening 3 turnaround schools in 2012-2014 (p.9).
- The collaboration is also designed to increase organizational capacity by leveraging capacities that already exist among the partners (p.13).

Weaknesses:

- Jumoke's application would be strengthened by including a more detailed dissemination plan together which proactively seeks out other schools to learn from their best practices. This might include, for example, working with the state department of education, the state charter schools association and/or the national charter schools association.
- There is no formalized plan to disseminate or replicate outside of the district or the state.
- The application would have been strengthened by presenting more data.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

- (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:

- Jumoke has improved student performance as evidenced by an upward trend in math, reading, writing and science scores over the past three years. In 2011, scores in these areas ranged from the low 70% to the low 90% range (p.5).
- While only 48.2% of HPS students went on to post-secondary education (p.3), 87% of high school graduates who attended Jumoke went on to college (p.5).
- Jumoke appears to have substantial achievement with similar demographics as HPS whose make up is 44% Hispanic/Latino, 40% Black and 16% Caucasian (p.3).

Weaknesses:

- Jumoke does not provide any data on closing historic achievement gaps or that there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups. However, with such high test scores generally in math, reading, writing and science combined with its similar economically disadvantaged students as HPS, there is a strong indication that achievement gaps are minimal.
- The application would be strengthened if Jumoke provided breakdowns by subgroups.
- The narrative states on page 14 that there is an appendix that shows that Jumoke is one of the state's top-performing

schools. This appendix is missing.

Reader's Score: 13

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:

- This collaboration plan includes the following initiatives to increase the number of highly effective schools and improve student achievement:

1) A teacher coaching and evaluation initiative.

2) Improved student achievement through implementation of common core-based curriculum and assessments to provide data on student growth that will facilitate increased use of targeted instruction.

3) Replicating the successful model of Jumoke's holistic education approach, building the district's capacity to provide quality education to more students by implementing Jumoke's model in low-performing traditional public schools (p.12).

- The collaborations goal is a 10% increase in students served by high-performing schools by 2015 (p.13).

- The project design has been endorsed by HPS and the state (as indicated earlier).

Jumoke uses a holistic approach which includes three pillars: environment, education and expectations. These are supported by well-credentialed and experienced teachers (on average 7.9 years), using a 180 system that charts out every point of a child's status on the school spectrum to identify triggers and develop responses, and strong parent engagement (p.14-15).

- Jumoke has a low percentage of students with special needs at 4%; but it must be noted that Jumoke actively mainstreams students who might otherwise be labeled special ed (p. 17-18).

- Jumoke creates a strong culture of high expectations regardless of socioeconomic status, race or ethnicity.

- Jumoke's plan for Milner is outlined in greater detail around environment, education, and expectations which includes parent involvement (e.g. room parents), school climate (e.g. uniforms), school leadership (e.g. teacher empowerment), effective staff (e.g. teacher retention), effective use of time (e.g. extended time), curriculum (e.g. limit class size to 22), and data (e.g. using MAP) (p. 19-24).

Weaknesses:

- The application would be strengthened by data on subgroups and a plan to address them.

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:

- Jumoke has already been cited as an example of success and will establish a communication strategy that will focus on local and national stakeholders (p.10).

- The communication strategy will focus on 1) parents, community and opinion leaders, 2) corporations and philanthropic organizations, 3) legislative policymakers, 4) online audiences (bloggers, followers, Facebook friends) and 5) the media (p.11-12).
- Jumoke will use its best practices as a model to provide academic and operational services to Milner (p.22).
- Jumoke will use its 15 years of successful experience at Milner and lay the foundation for further impact with up to 10% of HPS (p.22).
- Jumoke's leadership has been preparing for this collaboration for three years (p.23).
- Jumoke Academy serves 500 students in three charter schools -- Steps to Prep Charter School, Jumoke Academy Honors CS and Jumoke Academy Honors Middle Charter School (p.24). Management of three separate schools suggests there have already been considerable collaboration and replication opportunities among the three schools.
- As stated, Jumoke enjoys support from HPS (evidenced by an MOU) and support by the state (evidenced by a letter of support and inclusion of Jumoke in the Commissioner's Network plan).

Weaknesses:

- It is unclear how Jumoke's plan will be self-sustaining after three years. Jumoke's requested budget of \$200,000 over two years does not seem adequate to provide this level of service and scalability in a sustainable way after three years. It would appear that Jumoke's collaboration with Milner and other HPS schools depends largely on district and/or state reallocation of funds and resources as well as building operational and cost efficiencies. The application would be strengthened by a clear and targeted commitment of funding and resources by the district and/or state to assist Jumoke in its efforts.

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:

- Jumoke's model which includes a unique and strong collaboration with HPS, the state and the Commissioner's Network is an indication and recognition of the district and states confidence in Jumoke as an innovative partner which can turnaround persistently low-achieving schools.
- Jumoke's project design (p.19-24) is innovative in its comprehensiveness and support of the needs of its students. Its project plan takes a holistic approach and enhances this approach through its strong environment, education, and expectations culture.
- The district and state's agreement to allow Jumoke substantial latitude in overseeing academic achievement and operations at Milner and other HPS schools over time seems convincing. The solidarity of this State, district, charter school collaboration is innovative in that such collaborations are rare or do not exist (especially to this extent).
- Jumoke has a communication plan that is already supported by HPS and the State (p.10-12).

Weaknesses:

- Jumoke's dissemination and communication plan are passive and do not address specific methods of dissemination to the other three schools, the state or beyond the state.

Reader's Score: 13

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 educational background, experience and accomplishments of Jumoke's Project Director are impressive and well suited to taking on this project (resume and accomplishments throughout narrative).
- The qualifications of other key project personnel (e.g. CFO, CAO, Senior Director of Strategic Planning) are also substantial (resumes).

Weaknesses:

- Jumoke does not state anywhere that it encourages applications from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented.
- Jumoke has not created a project team whose time is 100% dedicated to this project. Jumoke's project team is also responsible for managing Jumoke Academy's 500 students. The application would be strengthened by demonstrating how the project team has the capacity to carry out their objectives.

Reader's Score: 9

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 consists of a structure which creates three distinct departments (Executive, Academic and Financial) (p.24).
- Objectives are included in considerable detail as part of Jumoke's project plan as indicated in the Project Design criteria of the application above (p.19-24).
- Jumoke's goal is a 10% increase in students served by high-performing schools by 2015 (p.13).

Weaknesses:

- Jumoke does not include clearly defined responsibilities, a timeline and milestones for meeting their objectives.
- Without the above it is difficult to determine if the proposal will be within budget and on time.

Reader's Score: 7

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 te 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:

- There is a strong collaboration and an MOU with the Hartford Public Schools in which Jumoke will be the lead agency overseeing the Milner School (a Tier 1 school) (USDOE Website).
- Jumoke will provide academic and operational services to the Milner School (p.2 Abstract and p. 19-24 Project Design)
- One additional persistently lowest-achieving school (in turnaround status) will be added annually in 2012, 2013, and 2014 (p.9).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/11/2012 11:46 PM