

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2012 06:32 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Democracy Prep Public Schools (U282M120031)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Applicant Quality	50	42
<b>Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	10	8
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	10	10
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	24
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	4
<b>Total</b>	100	88

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Democracy Prep Public Schools (U282M120031)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

(1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

(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 schools operated or managed by the applicant, 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 schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).

#### Strengths:

For the past 5 years Democracy Prep 6th - 8th graders (all students) have outscored the sending district student scores (p. e81, appendix p. 4). The scores are impressive given Democracy Prep targets low income populations and currently 85% of the students network-wide qualify for FRPL (p. 1). Independent, quasi-experimental studies by Hoxby and Fryer conclude that Democracy Prep "...is outperforming even the best public charter schools in their region"(p. 5).

#### Weaknesses:

The Democracy Prep network serves k-12 students but most of the data was from the middle school level. It would be helpful to include all grade levels. It wasnt clear from the charts (p. e81, appendix p. 4) how many students were represented in the test scores reported. There was little explanation or analysis of student achievement in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 42

#### Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

For the past 5 years Democracy Prep 6th - 8th graders (all students) have outscored the sending district student scores (p. e81, appendix p. 4). The scores are impressive given Democracy Prep targets low income populations and currently 85% of the students network wide qualify for FRPL (p. 1). Independent, quasi-experimental studies by Hoxby and Fryer conclude that Democracy Prep "...is outperforming even the best public charter schools in their region" (p. 5). Figure 10 - 11 in the appendix provides comparisons of student achievement at Democracy Prep, KIPP and Success Academy that indicates that DPCM students outperform the other charter schools (appendix p. 11). Figure 12 provides evidence that the DPCM high school students outperform other charter and traditional high school students the New York State Regents exam. There is some evidence that the program also produces high achievement at the elementary level (appendix, p. 14). Democracy Prep attendance and retention rates are high by all students and by subgroups in the middle and high schools (appendix, pp. 18-19). The Democracy Prep school that has been in operation the longest received a Progress Report Grade of A from the New York State DOE (appendix p. 27).

### Weaknesses:

The Democracy Prep network serves k-12 students but most of the data was from the middle school level. It would be helpful to include all grade levels. It wasn't clear from the charts (p. e81, appendix p. 4) how many students were represented in the test scores reported. There was little explanation or analysis of student achievement in the narrative.

The comparison with other charter schools did not clearly indicate what grade levels were included in the average (appendix p. 11).

**Reader's Score: 17**

## 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 schools operated or managed by the applicant.**

**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 schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.**

### Strengths:

In the appendix, Figures 3 - 8 compare Democracy Prep middle school scores to those of New York State on the state English and math exams by subgroup: economically disadvantaged, Latino and Black and special education students (appendix pp. 6-8). In most cases Democracy Prep students in the subgroups outperform comparable traditional school students. Middle school special education students appeared to benefit from the DPCM program and from 2009 - 2011 outperformed New York State special education students (p. 8). Figure 9 shows that DPCM students (99% minority) began lower than white students on the state math exam in 2009 but by 2011, 7th and 8th graders were outperforming New York State white students (p. 9). An independent study found that the effect of attending DPCM does not appear to systematically vary by gender, ethnicity, or free or reduced eligibility (p. 9). There is also data that show DPCM middle school Latino, Black and economically disadvantaged students outperform New York State students in Math and English in most years (appendix, p. 6-7, Figures 3-6).

## Sub Question

### **Weaknesses:**

There is little analysis in the narrative so it is difficult to judge to what degree the differences are significant. It isn't clear why the data presented are limited to the middle school grades or how many students were in the samples.

**Reader's Score:** 12

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

### **Strengths:**

Democracy Prep specifically targets students with disabilities and English language learners. Seventeen percent of the DPPS population are classified as special needs students (p. 2). It also serves other educationally disadvantaged students (85%) (p. 5). Economically disadvantaged students at DPCM 2009-2011 outperformed New York State students (appendix, p. 6, Figures 3-4). Democracy Prep attendance and retention rates are high by all students and by subgroups (appendix, pp. 18-19).

### **Weaknesses:**

Data reported for grades K-5 and 9-12 were scarce and made it difficult to judge the effectiveness of the program at those levels.

**Reader's Score:** 13

## **Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

### **Strengths:**

For the past 5 years Democracy Prep 6th - 8th graders (all students) have outscored the sending district student scores (p. e81, appendix p. 4). The scores are impressive given Democracy Prep targets low income populations and currently 85% of the students network wide qualify for FRPL (p. 1). Independent, quasi-experimental studies by Hoxby and Fryer conclude that Democracy Prep ...is outperforming even the best public charter schools in their region (p. 5). Figure 10 - 11 in the appendix provides comparisons of student achievement at Democracy Prep, KIPP and Success Academy that indicates that DPCM students outperform the other charter schools (appendix p. 11). Figure 12 provides evidence that the DPCM high school students outperform other charter and traditional high school students in the New York State Regents exam.

Systems are in place at Democracy Prep to explicitly and intentionally recruit special education students (p. 15) provide

them with an Academic Collaboration Team to guide their instruction and lead to achievement gains (p. 14). There is also opportunities for parent engagement in all aspects of the school (p. 19).

**Weaknesses:**

Data was reported for grades k-5 and 9-12 were scarce and made it difficult to judge the effectiveness of the program. Demographic data for each school and area would have been helpful.

**Reader's Score:** 8

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

- 1. 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

**Strengths:**

The project design is comprehensive and coherent. The curriculum is well-developed and research based. The design presents clear and measurable goals and objectives and logical replication and expansion strategies. LEADER U and acquisition replication strategy are innovative and potentially provide 'best practices' for other charter schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

**(1) 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.**

**(2) The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools.**

**(3) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success.**

**(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality.**

**(5) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive**

**officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The DPPC network is designed to be efficient, effective and accountable. The network is responsible for management including back office support, professional development, curriculum materials and data management that will free the school site leaders to focus on instruction(p. 38). The core services teams address all essential areas of school development and sustainability (pp. 39-41). The staffing model including initiation and sustainability are likely to provide a foundation for continued success (p.42-44). The key personnel are highly qualified in essential areas (pp. 45-49). The organizational chart is clear and comprehensive (p. 49). The Management Plan Table contains essential information about the tasks, milestones, time frame, resources and person responsible for implementation (pp. 53-58). The financial plan demonstrates knowledge of the cost of opening and operating schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No plan for school closure was presented.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**

**Strengths:**

DPPS will hire outside, independent evaluators to collect quantitative and qualitative data and design quasi-experimental studies to examine school and network outcomes (p. 58-59). The dissemination plan will assure that evaluation reports and lessons learned will be available to all stakeholders (pp. 58-59).

**Weaknesses:**

While one can assume that the evaluation data will be used to improve all aspects of Democracy Prep's program, there was no indication in the application of how the data would be used other than disseminated (pp.58-60).

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/14/2012 06:32 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2012 10:20 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Democracy Prep Public Schools (U282M120031)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Applicant Quality	50	50
<b>Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	10	9
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	10	10
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	23
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	4
<b>Total</b>	100	96

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Democracy Prep Public Schools (U282M120031)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

(1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

(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 schools operated or managed by the applicant, 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 schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).

#### Strengths:

See subsections.

#### Weaknesses:

See subsections.

Reader's Score: 50

#### Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.

#### Strengths:

Five years of data is presented. There is evidence that DPPS has significantly increased student academic achievement on a multiple of measures and for a period of three to five years. The data is substantiated by an external evaluation, which determined an "enormous" gain for students while in the DPCS. Disaggregated data is included for each of the schools operated by DPPS.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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 schools operated or managed by the applicant.**

**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 schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.**

**Strengths:**

The data demonstrates that traditional achievement gaps have been closed by the applicant in multiple subgroups. Demographic data is presented for each of the four charter schools operated by DPPS and the group of schools as a whole.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

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

**Strengths:**

Attendance and retention data is presented and how retention is calculated is explained. Students that enter the system below grade level advance, in some situations, up to two grade levels in a year.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

**1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

**Strengths:**

The company's schools serve a higher than average percentage of students with disabilities. The founder started out as a Special Education teacher. The proposed new schools will be located in high-poverty regions with demonstrated need. The network has a strong record of achievement gains with disadvantaged students.

**Weaknesses:**

Demographic data from schools in the targeted locations would have made the application stronger.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

- 1. 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

**Strengths:**

The plan identifies expansion and replication at the currently-operating schools, new schools and at the company level. The LEADER U component is fully described and based on a best practice model that has already demonstrated success. Developing quality leaders is a major component for expansion and replication. DPPS appears to have quality leaders overseeing administrator development and a number of staff already in the pipeline.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

**(1) 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.**

**(2) The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools.**

**(3) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success.**

**(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality.**

**(5) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive**

**officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The management plan is detailed, specific and time-phased. The business plan is thoroughly explained and Financial Policies and Procedures are included as an addendum. A respectable number of partners are already engaged with DPPS. The leadership team is described and appear to have exemplary experience in developing new charter schools that are capable of significantly increasing student academic achievement.

**Weaknesses:**

A plan for possible closure is not included.

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**

**Strengths:**

A variety of methodologies will be used. There is a letter of support from an individual who is qualified to conduct the evaluation and is an external evaluator.

**Weaknesses:**

The plan for dissemination doesn't explain how outcomes from the evaluation will impact future DPPS expansion through a continuous improvement model.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/13/2012 10:20 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2012 09:53 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Democracy Prep Public Schools (U282M120031)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Applicant Quality	50	43
<b>Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	10	10
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	22
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>89</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Democracy Prep Public Schools (U282M120031)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

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

(1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

(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 schools operated or managed by the applicant, 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 schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).

#### Strengths:

See subsections 1-3 for responses.

#### Weaknesses:

See subsections 1-3 for responses.

Reader's Score: 43

#### Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.

#### Strengths:

Applicant utilizes a No Excuses (p6) approach, one that research has shown is a highly effective approach to organizing a school.

Applicant references (p5) two independent studies that indicate DPPS outperforms highly acclaimed schools.

In Attachment A and on p4 the applicant provided 3+ years of data showing mostly stronger achievement in math and english relative to the district.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

In attachment A and on p5 it shows applicant schools were outperformed by district schools in 2009 on math and english for grade 6

**Reader's Score: 18**

**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 schools operated or managed by the applicant.**

**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 schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.**

**Strengths:**

In attachment A and on p.6 the charts provided show strong attainment for educationally disadvantaged students above state average, particularly strong in Math.

An independent evaluator found the effect of attending applicant schools does not appear to systematically vary by gender, ethnicity or FRPL eligibility (attachment A & p9).

**Weaknesses:**

In attachment A and on p 7 the data shows that in certain sub-groups the state performance was higher than applicant (2009 grade 7) although the future years the applicants results (years 2 & 3) were much stronger.

**Reader's Score: 13**

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

**Strengths:**

Applicant school ranked #1 on NY City Progress reports out of 1,500 city schools (p10).

The attendance and retention data presented by applicant is strong.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant operates elementary, middle and high schools, yet they only provide performance data for their middle schools.

**Reader's Score: 12**

## Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students

1. **The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

### Strengths:

On p12 applicant discloses an advisory relationship applicant has with Dr. Hehir at GSE for special education.

Per the application narrative, and I am quoting directly here: "applicant will seek to modify curriculum as infrequently as possible, yet it will provide accommodations as frequently as necessary to help students progress as guided by students IEP and their individuals needs." (p13).

Applicant serves highest concentration of homeless students of any charter located in NYC. (p16)

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

### Strengths:

The project design (p 20-37) has clearly articulated goals, objectives and outcomes that are clearly specified, measurable and attainable.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

(1) **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.**

(2) **The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal**

funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools.

(3) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success.

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality.

(5) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

Central administrative functions are well thought out and organized along critical core service teams (38-41)

Applicants management team (45-49) has breadth and depth of school start-up and management experience and strong education credentials.

The multi-year financial plan & model (p50-55) articulates plan to sustain program solely on public funds within 5 years.

Applicant includes multiple letters of support from myriad agencies and municipalities (52-53 & appendices).

**Weaknesses:**

Applicant did not provide a detailed plan for closing schools that do not meet high standards of quality.

**Reader's Score:** 22

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes using an external, independent evaluator performing quantitative and qualitative analysis where applicant plans to collaboratively obtain an unbiased estimate of the causal effect of being offered an applicant seat on student achievement (p58-59).

**Weaknesses:**

Dissemination portion of evaluation plan (p60) discusses dissemination externally but not utilization of the evaluation to continuously improve internally.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/18/2012 09:53 AM

