

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/25/2014 05:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rhode Island Mayoral Academy Blackstone Valley (U282M140020)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	45
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	7
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

Total

121

101

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 84.282m - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Rhode Island Mayoral Academy Blackstone Valley (U282M140020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

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

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 45

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 (20 points).

Strengths:

The network was founded in 2009 with one grade at one school (kindergarten). It now serves 1,000 students in three schools and will open a Next Generation Learning Challenges Breakthrough high school. Last year it joined the portfolio of the Charter School Growth Fund. Over three years, middle school students demonstrating math proficiency has doubled, and the eighth grade had the highest percentage (94%) who were proficient or above this past year.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

2. 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).

Sub Question

Strengths:

Hispanic students are not only doing better than their statewide peers, but are exceeding the average population in all areas except writing, grade 8.

Weaknesses:

Although ELL and special education scores could not be reported, alternate forms of documentation of success would have strengthened the grant.

Reader's Score: 12

3. 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 third year in a row, network scholars outperformed the state averages on state tests (grades 3-8, in reading, math, and writing). Students at network schools had an average attendance rate of 97%, compared to the state average of 94%.

Weaknesses:

The application would have been strengthened by providing retention rates and more data related to special education and ELL students.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

Low income students are outperforming the state average population in all areas except reading grade 5 and math grade 4. In writing, grade 8, their scores are equal to the state average population. The applicant describes the ELL program (page e11) as structured immersion, and has made a commitment to hire at least 50% of staff who are proficient in Spanish. An ELL coordinator is on staff. The special education program is described (pages e39-25) and includes

universal screenings, a three-tiered Response to Intervention process, and progress monitoring. Saturday morning Opportunity Days are provided during the year as well as a three week Summer Academy for additional instruction. Based on an evaluation of ELL programming during the 2013-14 year, additional professional development will be offered, a year-long professional learning community will be developed at the middle school, and supplemental materials will be purchased.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide disaggregated data related to success in improving outcomes for students with disabilities and ELL students. A series of assessment tools for ELL students are mentioned, (page e11) but results are not provided. Results are not provided for special education students.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 14

Sub Question

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

Strengths:

The goals are specified, measurable, and attainable. Planned growth will be gradual, and similar to the prior growth of the organization. In 2014, there were 1,935 applications for 185 seats.

Weaknesses:

Part of the growth model includes starting a high school the first year of the grant, and then growing by one grade each year, and this will be new to the organization.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

Strengths:

As evidence of promise, correlational analysis conducted by Dr. Wong and Dr. Kramer at Brown University concluded that students who attended BCP are 132% more likely to be proficient in Math and 30% more likely to be proficient in reading than their peers in the four sending districts (pages e46-47). The study concluded that "BVP is succeeding in raising the academic achievement of its students dramatically."

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The management plan on pages e49-50 includes critical tasks, responsible party, and timing.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The model includes academic, operational, and fiscal monitoring to maintain quality. The network is committed to operating on public funding at scale and the Director of Finance meets with school leaders at least monthly to discuss adherence to the budget and any necessary reallocations. Each year's operating budget is built only with those funding streams that are committed. The Board checks on the network's progress using board-specific data dashboard.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 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**

Sub Question

projects long-term success (4 points).

Strengths:

A five year financial model is provided on page e61. The network has received funding from the Charter School Growth Fund, the Walton Family Foundation, the Rhode Island Foundation, the Next Generation Learning Challenge, the Louis Calder Foundation, the Nellie Mae Foundation, and the Rhode Island Mayoral Academies. Letters of support are included from most of these organizations as well as the mayors of the four communities that serve as feeder districts, the director of the Urban Education Policy Program at Brown University, and the superintendents of two of the school districts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant cites reasons for losing a charter but not its own processes for closing one of its schools.

Reader's Score: 0

5. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

The management team is qualified and appropriately experienced.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear who the project director will be or what the requirements for hiring will consist of.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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 chart providing details related to outcomes, data collected related to those outcomes, and the frequency of the data collection is provided on page e70. As part of the grant, the network, in partnership with Brown University, and will use the natural experiment of the lottery application process to arrive at unbiased estimates of the effect of attending BVP on student achievement. It will also conduct an internal audit to determine how well the needs of school, families, and students are being met through a partnership with SchoolWorks.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low Income Demographic**

- 1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families (as defined in this notice).**

Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.

Strengths:

The current student enrollment is at 62% free and reduced lunch, compared to the State average of 46% and the averages in the four districts served 86%, 22%, 29%, and 75% (page e28).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

- 1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).**

Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in

ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, " ESEA Flexibility" guidance at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States ' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding under this grant), taking active measures to:
 - a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
 - b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
 - c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note 1: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body, or to avoid racial isolation.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, " Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

Strengths:

The network of schools has an ELL population of 18.5%, special education 12.8%, African American 11%, and Hispanic 47%. The four districts served have ELL populations of 25%, 2%, 2%, and 12% (page e28). The special education population of these districts are 22%, 17%, 14%, and 15%. The intentionally diverse community of students come from two urban (lower-income) and two suburban (higher-income) schools. The applicant is of thirteen schools nationwide to become a member of the National Coalition of Diverse Charter Schools and was one of seven charter schools profiled as a successful example of an integrated charter school in research published by The Century Foundation in May, 2012. A network-wide diversity committee develops annual measurable diversity goals and the organization participates in national diversity trainings.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

1. This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall/additional comments

General:

The Blackstone Valley Prep Mayoral Academy proposes to expand from 3 current schools serving 1000 students to 2,500 students in 7 schools. The network has a weighted lottery which has been approved in their charter renewal (2013) and is allowed under State Charter Regulations. The purpose of the weighting is to ensure that at least 50% of students attending are from families qualified to receive free lunches.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/25/2014 05:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2014 04:21 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rhode Island Mayoral Academy Blackstone Valley (U282M140020)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	35
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	12
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	2
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

Total

121

85

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 84.282m - 2: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Rhode Island Mayoral Academy Blackstone Valley (U282M140020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

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

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 35

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 (20 points).

Strengths:

The school is a K-8 school serving 1000 scholars with the intention to prepare every student for college. 100% of Kindergarten students scored proficient on reading assessment in 11-12 school year. 12-13 school year applicant states that the school continued to perform at record levels. New 5th grade students increased their reading levels from 61% to 81% in just one year. 94% of 8th grade students in mathematics were proficient compared to 57% in the state. Math and reading averages are surpassed in every grade (year not specified)

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide specific on how subgroups have performed. Furthermore applicant does not specify each grade level or subject but rather states area of superior performance. The applicant does not make clear how other sub groups are performing and solely references the Latino population. Applicant does not make clear the 3-year positive trend of improvement across all subgroups, grade levels and students.

Reader's Score: 13

2. 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).

Sub Question

Strengths:

The school states that it is successfully closing the achievement gap for Latinos vs. the general population. BVP Latinos are outperforming their peers on statewide assessments by 25 points in reading, 37 points in math, and 30 points via statewide average. School also states low socioeconomic students are also outperforming their peers.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide specific on how subgroups have performed. Furthermore applicant does not specify each grade level or subject but rather states area of superior performance. The applicant does not make clear how other sub groups are performing and solely references the Latino population. Applicant does not make clear the 3-year positive trend of improvement across all subgroups, grade levels and students.

Reader's Score: 10

3. 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:

School states that it is successfully closing the achievement gap for Latinos vs. the general population. BVP Latinos are outperforming their peers on statewide assessments by 25 points in reading, 37 points in math, and 30 points via statewide average. School also states low socioeconomic students are also outperforming their peers. The school states that it has achieved a 97% average attendance rate.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide specific on how subgroups have performed. Furthermore applicant does not specify each grade level or subject but rather states area of superior performance. The applicant does not make clear how other sub groups are performing and solely references the Latino population. Applicant does not make clear the 3-year positive trend of improvement across all subgroups, grade levels and students.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

The school states that it demonstrates a personalized community. Implements PRIDE values (perseverance, respect, integrity, discipline and enthusiasm). Uses scaffolds for English language learners. Utilizes standards based grading, provides AP courses. Grounded in tech like a champion methods and differentiation. Implements Extended Learning Opportunities and RTI for students in need and believes in providing the least restrictive environment. BVP's service delivery model provides Collaborative In-Class Support, Co-Teaching, Pull Out small group instruction and has established a transitional learning classroom for students with severe behavioral and emotional needs. Applicant discusses professional learning communities and how they will support the needs of English language learners.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide data on the results for English language learners and students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)**

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 13

Sub Question

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant's objectives are clear and outcomes are aligned to objectives. For example: Scholars will outperform region on 80% of assessments, and 100% of students will be accepted to 2 or 4 year colleges.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not make clear how socioeconomic goal of serving over 60% of free and reduced scholars will be obtained.

Reader's Score: 3

- 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

Strengths:

Research studies by external universities are provided to demonstrate the promise of the instructional program.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None found

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 12

Sub Question

1. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

Timeline is present, tasks and responsible parties for tasks are identified.

Weaknesses:

Timelines provided are vague; lacking specific details regarding methods.

Reader's Score: 2

2. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

Facilities are identified for the 15-16 year. Fiscal oversight is conducted via multiple pathways including monthly and quarterly reporting, annual board review, audits and compliance reporting. 8 Member board supported by High Bar and each school has a family leadership council. Unique recruitment strategy exists where mission fit and grit are areas of observation. BVP has received funding from a variety of sources: Charter school growth fund, Nellie Mae foundation, Rhode island foundation etc. Lead personnel are all qualified and experienced.

Weaknesses:

The school would benefit from a more explicit business plan.

Reader's Score: 2

3. 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

Sub Question

projects long-term success (4 points).

Strengths:

Fiscal oversight is conducted via multiple pathways including monthly and quarterly reporting, annual board review, audits and compliance reporting. BVP has received funding from a variety of sources: Charter school growth fund, Nellie Mae foundation, Rhode island foundation etc

Weaknesses:

The application would benefit from more information on support from stakeholders.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Strengths:

Board of education responsible for approving and renewing charters and determining if certain charter schools will be closed

Weaknesses:

The school provides little methods about it's process for closing schools.

Reader's Score: 2

5. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

The school has in place an 8 Member board supported by High Bar and each school has a family leadership council. Unique recruitment strategy exists where mission fit and grit are areas of observation. BVP has received funding from a variety of sources: Charter school growth fund, Nellie Mae foundation, Rhode island foundation etc. Lead personnel are all qualified and experienced.

Weaknesses:

None found

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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 states that data will be collected to determine if they are adequately meeting their outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The application would benefit from a more extensive evaluation plan. It is unclear how qualitative data will be used and how the quality of the schools will be measured. It is also unclear how this data will be used to further strengthen the impact of the schools. Supportive documents from "School Works" has been included in the artifacts however it is unclear how this work is integrated and used to measure the effectiveness of the educational program via the quality review.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low Income Demographic**

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families (as defined in this notice).

Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.

Strengths:

The applicant states that 60% students are eligible for free and reduced lunch. On page e28 district averages are included.

Weaknesses:

Applicant just meets requirements, projection of how stable this figure is and will be in the coming years is not provided.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

Strengths:

Response is not provided in application

Weaknesses:

Response is not provided in application

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding under this grant), taking active measures to:

- a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note 1: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body, or to avoid racial isolation.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, " Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

Strengths:

School has a diverse student body 2% Asian, 11% black, 47% Hispanic and 39% white. 12.8% students with disabilities and 18.5% English language learners. Diversity committee implemented. Materials are sent home in English and Spanish; Creole and Portuguese is also provided as needed. The school belongs to the national coalition of diverse charter schools and is one of seven serving as an example of a diverse charter school by Century Foundation.

Weaknesses:

NONE

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

1. This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to

the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

No response provided.

Weaknesses:

No response provided.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall/additional comments

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2014 04:21 PM

Status: Draft

Last Updated: 08/21/2014 11:25 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rhode Island Mayoral Academy Blackstone Valley (U282M140020)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	42
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	12
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	3
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Low Income Demographic		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
School Improvement		
1. CPP 2	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

Total

121

94

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 84.282m - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Rhode Island Mayoral Academy Blackstone Valley (U282M140020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

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

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

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 (20 points).

Strengths:

Blackstone Valley Prep (BVP) Middle School one of three commended middle schools by Rhode Island Department of Education and BVP Elementary School 1 was a commended elementary school. (p. 6) BVP students have outperformed the state average on the state assessment for three years. 94% of eighth grade students are proficient or proficient with distinction in math; the highest percentage in the state. (p. 7)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

2. 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).

Strengths:

Latino students at BVP outperformed their peers in Rhode Island and exceed the results of the average student population. (p. 8) bested peers - exceeding average population. The application provided research referencing the

Sub Question

gaps that exist for Latino students in Rhode Island. (p. 7) BVP's data also appears to demonstrate success in improving achievement for low socioeconomic status students. At all grade levels these students outperformed the general population in reading and math. (p. 9)

Weaknesses:

BVP explained the population of students with disabilities and ELL students was too low to report subgroups; however other measures should have been included to demonstrate success with this population. Overall the data was vague for both groups.

Reader's Score: 10

3. **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:

In an effort to demonstrate their success over the last three years, BVP cited a 97% attendance rate and 98.4% recommendation rate from parents. (p. 10) Additionally they have 1935 applications for 185 seats (p. 5) and high retention rate - 99/98%. (p. e125)

Weaknesses:

There are a few areas in the application and data where the students are performing below state/district average

The discussion of all of the data in relation to the state was insufficient. (pp. e125-135)

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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.

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly discussed the four locations or communities where their schools will be located and provided letters of support from leaders. (pp. 11-14)

Specific examples of additional support of ELL students were provided in the application, as well as plans for enhancements to the program for those students. (p. 15) Those enhancements were based on programs evaluations that BVP conducted.(pp. 15, 25-27)

BVP's special education instructional model was thoroughly discussed and compliance data was provided in an effort to demonstrate their success for students with disabilities.

Weaknesses:

The lack of disaggregated data for sub-populations weakens their case for meeting the all students' needs.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)**

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 12

Sub Question

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

Strengths:

The overall goals of BVP's project: to continue growth and serve 2500 students; and prepare every student for success in college is measurable and attainable based on their current academic and operational model. The project objectives are tied to measurable outcomes and include data that is aligned to their current practices and achievement results. An example of this is seen in the objective comparing the weighted averages of the sending districts to BVP's students. (p. 30)

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

2. 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).

Strengths:

Blackstone Valley Prep cites a Brown University study as evidence of promise. That study showed that BVP's practices are dramatically raising academic achievement. (p. 29) The study found students at BVP were 132% more likely to be proficient in math and 30% more likely to be proficient in ELA than their peers from sending districts. (p. 30)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a logic model with inputs, outputs, and the relationship between the key elements of the program. It is unclear how the elements described will be replicated in the new schools. This is especially the case for high school, since they currently do not offer all grades or have data to demonstrate the effectiveness of their practices.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

Reader's Score: 14

Sub Question

1. 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 (4 points).

Strengths:

The management plan includes clearly defined single school opening and growth timelines. The plan is reasonable and provides the responsible parties for each task. (pp. 32-33)

Weaknesses:

The details for opening multiple schools at one time not discussed. For the level of expansion that is projected a more extensive plan would help demonstrate the capacity of the team to implement a project of this size.

Reader's Score: 2

2. 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

Sub Question

schools (4 points).

Strengths:

The comprehensive business plan includes extensive explanations for all aspects of school operations and oversight. Emphasis on teaching staff and professional development demonstrates an understanding of what contributes to the schools success. The governance structure is explained and includes the use of High Bar's Board on Track to maintain and track meeting documentation; demonstrating the comprehensive nature of the business plan.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. 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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

The application cited extensive support from communities and various foundations. That support is documented with letters of support. BVP's financial has transitioned from a year-to-year budget to a larger systems approach which will aid in the overall expansion. The basis for the financial model is explained; conservative projections based on 4 years historical data with revisions provide the foundation for growth. (pp. 45-46)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

No details on the actual closure plan were provided. It is unclear what the organization will do if the school is not high quality or meeting standards before RIDE revokes charter.

Reader's Score: 0

- 5. 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The application identifies qualified individuals who are assigned to key project roles and a discussion of their relevant experience. (pp.47-52) Their included resumes provide evidence of the team's ability to manage a project of this size.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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:

There is a clear plan for evaluating project. The data collected is relevant and the process will be implemented through their partnership with Schoolworks. Brown University will continue to study schools effectiveness through natural experiment study.

Weaknesses:

The qualitative data to be gathered is briefly addressed, but it is unclear how the data will be used to inform project decisions and overall practices within the system.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low Income Demographic

- 1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families (as defined in this notice).**

Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.

Strengths:

The applicant states that 62% of the students at Blackstone Valley Prep are eligible for free and reduced rate lunches, which meets the priority requirement. (p. 2) Two of the schools have averages of 75% and 86%. (pp. 11) The state average is at 46%.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

Strengths:

Not Addressed

Weaknesses:

Not Addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 3 - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding under this grant), taking active measures to:
 - a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
 - b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
 - c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note 1: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body, or to avoid racial isolation.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

Strengths:

Blackstone Valley Prep was designed to leverage intentional diversity. They specifically chose four unique sending districts with different income levels and ethnic make-up. (pp. 2-3) They are one of 13 schools that are members of the National Coalition of Diverse Charter Schools. Additionally, they were profiled in research published by the Century Foundation as a "successful example" of an integrated charter school. (p. 3) Active measures for promoting diversity, serving students with disabilities, and serving ELL students include specific outreach activities, translation at family events, and a variety of services models to meet students' needs. (pp. 4, 23)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

- 1. This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at www.hud.gov/promisezones.

Strengths:

Not Addressed

Weaknesses:

Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

- 1. Overall/additional comments

General:

Blackstone Valley Prep presents a strong case for replication of their schools. Their efforts to provide diverse schools are exemplary. The academic data is strong and shows promise for the students at the schools. There is a demonstrated interest in the schools and a willingness to share the best practices of the schools.

Reader's Score:

Status: Draft
Last Updated: 08/21/2014 11:25 AM

