

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

Status: Draft

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green Dot Public Schools (U282M140014)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	43
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	19
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	4
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

Total

121

105

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 84.282m - 1: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Green Dot Public Schools (U282M140014)

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: 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 (20 points).

Strengths:

The applicant has provided adequate evidence of that they have consistently increased student academic achievement in their participating schools over a multi year period.

Weaknesses:

n/a

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:

i. n/a

ii. The applicant has provided sufficient evidence that demonstrates that over the past 3 years, students in the various subgroups have made academic achievement gains.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

- i. The applicant did not identify any achievement gaps among its participating students citing rather that all students are minority and therefore no racial gaps exist. Applicant didn't provide comparison state data.

Reader's Score: 8

- 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:

The applicant has provided adequate evidence that demonstrates that students in participating schools have greater performance on statewide test, and increase graduation rates, college attendance rates, school attendance rates and college persistence rates, both collectively and by subgroup as compared to LEA and statewide data.

Weaknesses:

No weakness were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 has provided sufficient that their proposal will increase the achievement of disadvantaged students through personalized intervention, highly effective teaching, community engagement and data driven management systems.

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 10

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 applicant has provide evidence of achievable goals and objectives that they propose will increase student achievement. The goals are specific and measurable.

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant has provided an adequate proposal that supported by evidence of promise. The applicant has provided previous results where ELL and high poverty students achieve at rates that are comparable to that of neighborhood schools, and where the schools outperform state measures.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a bibliography that references their research used for the project.

Reader's Score: 9

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: 19

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 applicant has provided an adequate management plan that delineates specific activities and assigns responsibility to key personnel. These activities will likely be successful in the timeline demonstrated by the applicant and within the budget requested.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide milestones for how they will stay on project tasks.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

The applicant has provided a proposal that demonstrates their emphasis toward fiscal responsiveness that is aligned to student achievement in that their schools are self sustaining.

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses 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 applicant has provided evidence of ongoing support by several nationally recognized philanthropic organizations. In addition, the applicant has provided evidence of support by several community service providers within the areas to be serviced.

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:

The applicant has provided evidence of a high quality turnaround model that includes replacing school level leadership and closing schools if all models of improvement fail to increase student achievement.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 4

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 applicant has provided evidence of high quality management leaders who are experienced in school leadership and charter management.

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:

The applicant has provided evidence of a high quality evaluation that will review the measurable outcomes of each of the objectives. The proposal includes project wide and school specific performance measures.

Weaknesses:

n/a

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 applicant has demonstrated that 94% of students served qualify for free or reduced lunch.

Weaknesses:

n/a

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 has provided sufficient evidence that they have been asked by the LEA to replicate their model in 10 under-performing schools in the city.

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 4

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:

no strengths noted

Weaknesses:

- a. The applicant has not demonstrated how they reduce racial isolation among its student groups.
- b/c The applicant has indicated that they will serve ELL and special ed students at the same rate as the LEA.

Reader's Score: 0

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 noted

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not answer this question.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall/additional comments

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Draft
Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/25/2014 02:47 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green Dot Public Schools (U282M140014)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	40
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	18
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	4
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

Total

121

101

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 84.282m - 1: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Green Dot Public Schools (U282M140014)

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: 40

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 applicant demonstrates increasing academic achievement among its students (primarily educationally disadvantaged) over the last 6 years. This demonstrates a strong consistent record of performance in increased academic achievement (p. e28-30).

The applicant also provides evidence of increasing performance on high school exit exams over the past five years and consistent or increasing levels of graduation rates among its startup and turnaround schools (p. e31-33).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's turnaround schools show a slight dip in their graduation rates and A-G requirements in 2013, but given the difficulty of the turnaround work and the switch to the Common Core, this does not overly affect the network's consistent record of performance (p. e32-33).

I have discussed this particular component of the application with my fellow peer reviewers, and this score is a reflection of my professional assessment.

Reader's Score: 19

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

Sub Question

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:

The applicant demonstrates subgroup data that indicates that gains have been made over a multi-year period and consistently exceeded LAUSD and students in the state of California on average. Without explicit information from the applicant, reviewers must assume that the state of California data represents the non-disadvantaged groups.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explicitly provide state data for the disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged cohorts of subgroups necessary to compare the performance of the network's subgroups and definitively establish the existence or nonexistence of achievement gaps (p. e32-34).

Reader's Score: 6

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:

The applicant demonstrates significant academic growth among its students compared to the LAUSD and students across the state of California in both Math and English proficiency (p. e37).

The applicant also demonstrates higher graduation rates among socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English language learners, and minority students when compared to LAUSD and students across California (p. e38-39).

A-G graduation rates for socioeconomically disadvantaged students, minority students, and English language learners far exceeds the performance of LAUSD and California students on average (p. e40-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 describes the rigorous curriculum, its emphasis on bilingual education where the student population warrants it, using the RTI approach for students with disabilities, wraparound services, and an intimate learning academy model (p. e42-44).

The applicant discusses its effective teaching model that is focused on accelerating student growth and its focus on strong school leadership (p. e. 45-51).

The applicant discusses how it works with the community and parents to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged students, including a Parent Academy and a Parent Leadership Academy. The applicant notes that its schools routinely enroll the same percentage of minority, ELL, and SPED students as neighboring schools (p. e51-52).

The applicant will be expanding three middle schools in Los Angeles, opening two middle schools and two high schools in Tacoma, and turning around 10 middles and high schools in Memphis over the course of the project. The student bodies will be representative of the minority, ELL, and SPED populations in neighboring schools (p. e15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 applicant has included measurable objectives that are specific and attainable given the network's prior experience and work (p. e55-62). The objectives include opening the schools, focusing on a specific student

Sub Question

population, developing a rigorous curriculum, developing human capital and providing comprehensive wraparound services. The objectives reflect objectives for the network and the schools over all, distinct from the project measures that are addressed in a different area of the application. The objectives measurement is addressed in the evaluation section of the application.

The applicant will be serving similar populations in the various states it already serves. The applicant adequately demonstrates its successes in serving these populations among its current schools (p. e55).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a logic model with measurable outcomes and clear inputs, objectives, and outcomes which are described in detail in the following section (p. e54).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a bibliography to support the references indicated in the application.

Reader's Score: 9

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: 18

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 applicant includes a replication and expansion timeline with clearly defined responsibilities and activities as well as a school launch schedule (p. e63-64). This corresponds to the applicant's goals and objectives as indicated in the application.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide milestones for accomplishing project tasks nor explicitly address how they will stay on budget during the project. This calls into question the applicant's ability to sustain the project and meet project objectives on time and in a financially responsible way.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

The applicant provides an extensive business plan that addresses its facilities, financial management, central office operations, student academic achievement, human resources, partnership with charter authorizers, and governance, all key areas. As described in the application, the business plan demonstrates the applicant's ability to ensure the quality of and performance in the charter schools it seeks to replicate or expand.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 applicant provides information that asserts all of its schools are self-sustainable on public revenue by year 4 of their operation. It explains its financial and operating model and how all schools thus far have met their sustainability targets (p. e69).

The applicant provides detailed information regarding its support from philanthropic partners in the regions in which it works, including the Charter School Growth Fund, the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, the Sheri and Les Biller Foundation, the Poplar Foundation, the Pyramid Peak Foundation, and the Wasserman Foundation (p. e70-71). The applicant has also provided letters of support from a wide range of stakeholders including all the local school districts in the districts the applicant will be operating and education and community providers in each region. These partnerships demonstrate a collaborative effort between the applicant, the local education agencies and community partners that will enhance the quality of the schools to be created and create the environment for a long-term successful engagement in those regions.

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).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant addresses the criterion and provides information on how it will monitor progress and implement targeted supports where necessary. The applicant also discusses how it has closed one school in its 14 year history because of poor performance. (p. e72)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Overall, the key project personnel demonstrate relevant experience and training for the roles they are to fill, including the Chief Academic Officer, the Chief Growth Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and Chief Operating Officer and includes resumes in the appendix to support the claims in the narrative (p. e73-75).

Weaknesses:

The Chief Talent Officer does not seem to have any relevant experience managing projects of the same size and scope given her prior experience as a curriculum professional (cluster director/area superintendent)that focused on community partnerships and the implementation of the Green Dot educational model (p. e75). Prior to [REDACTED] hire by Green Dot [REDACTED] had no human resources experience or training. There is nothing in [REDACTED] resume to assess that [REDACTED] will be able to lead the massive human capital efforts to ensure the successful opening of 20 schools across three different regions as the project requires.

I have discussed this particular component of the application with my fellow peer reviewers, and this score is a reflection of my professional assessment.

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:

The applicant indicates that its Chief Information Officer with its Knowledge Management Team will manage project evaluation. They have experience working on other federal grants and programs. The applicant also provides information on objectives and measurable and attainable performance measures along with specific school/achievement/culture/program measures by which the network will evaluate itself. The evaluation plan includes quantitative and qualitative measures (p. e76-78). Although the applicant is conducting an internal evaluation, it demonstrates it has the staff capacity to design and implement that work successfully.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 applicant provides proof that over 60% of all students it serves qualifies for the federal free and reduced program (p. e19).

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:

The applicant will be undertaking the efforts described in the criterion for the schools it plans to open in Tennessee (p. e19).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate how it will prevent racial isolation among its schools that have an overwhelming African American population, therefore not meeting the minimum standard for this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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 noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall/additional comments

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/25/2014 02:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2014 01:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green Dot Public Schools (U282M140014)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Eligible Applicant		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	43
Significance		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	19
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	4
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 3	5	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
Promise Zones		
1. CPP 4	2	0
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

Total

121

105

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 84.282m - 1: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Green Dot Public Schools (U282M140014)

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: 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 (20 points).

Strengths:

Applicant provided ample and convincing evidence of their success with increasing student achievement by 77 points in reading and math over a multi-year period – since 2005. Multiple data sources such as API growth, California State Assessment results, and school exit exams were clearly presented in graphic formats (pp. 11-15).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

I have discussed this particular component of the application with my fellow peer reviewers, and this score is a reflection of my professional assessment.

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:

Subgroup achievement data demonstrated gains across all populations of students served by the charter schools operated by the applicant (pp. 17-19). Students with disabilities, a challenging subgroup, made an 18% gain in a three year period.

Data presented by subgroup documented that Green Dot students (in aggregate) consistently exceeded district and state benchmarks in student growth measures (p. 20).

State and district comparisons in English and Math were provided (p. 21). Three years of data for cohort graduation rates by minority students, socially-disadvantaged students, and ELL students were also provided (pp. 22-23).

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not identify achievement gaps as they stated all students are minorities. There was no comparison to state data by sub-group; therefore, no determination could be made if the applicant has had three years of closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups.

Reader's Score: 8

- 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:

Graduation rates and attainment of advanced course completion improved by 11 points for “a-g” requirements for Green Dot students over a three year period (pp. 16-17). Rigorous course completion rates were also presented for the same subgroups as graduation (pp. 24-25).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

Applicant discussed the five tenets of their model, including: Tenet A, Personalized Interventions. Green Dot states they actively seek to serve disadvantaged students and offer specific supports and interventions that address their social and learning needs. By offering a rigorous curriculum, interventions informed by Student Success Teams and RTI framework, wrap-around services and student learning academies, all struggling students, but particularly students with disabilities and ELL, will be aptly served and supported (pp. 26-29).

Table 2 on p. 39 delineates the 20 schools that Green Dot proposes to open with grant funds. The 10 turnaround schools are all located in Memphis, TN. The 10 startup schools are located in WA and Los Angeles. When operating at capacity, they anticipate each school will accommodate up to 600 high-need students maintaining the intimate-school environment (p. 29).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

Green Dot presented one overarching goal – serve 36,400 students with a high-quality, college-ready education. The five objectives were: open 20 new schools; enroll a diverse and inclusive student population; develop a rigorous curriculum; engage high quality educators; and provide wraparound services were accompanied by measurable outcomes (p .38). Each objective is discussed with examples of activities and evidence of success when available (pp.39-46).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The logic model (p. 38) states the project's goal (inputs described in detail in Section B), five objectives with five measurable outcomes. The logic model provides a viable framework for the applicant's proposed project.

Green Dot's success in recruiting and sustaining results for diverse populations, particularly Hispanic students, was validated by a quasi-experimental study and presented as evidence of their success in achieving two outcomes: sustaining diverse enrollments equal or higher than neighborhood schools and Green Dot schools outperforming neighboring schools on district and state measures (pp. 41-42).

Green Dot has invested in the Charlotte Danielson model for teacher evaluation. A study conducted in Cincinnati schools documented that an effective teacher promotes student growth (p. 44).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a bibliography to support the references indicated in the application.

Reader's Score: 9

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: 19

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:

A project timeline table is provided that delineates five management tasks, assigned responsibility, and frequency (pp. 42-43). Tasks were listed for a planning year and the first two years of operation.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide milestones in their management timeline.

Reader's Score: 3

- 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:

Green Dot's business model provides autonomy to its local schools for budgeting, personnel decisions and daily operations. Corporate centers in-state and CA headquarters support facility, financial, communications and data collection management. Corporate also provides the curriculum, schedule of professional development in collaboration with local specialists to ensure alignment with state curriculum and standards (pp. 49-51). Regional executive directors liaise with state chartering authorities, local regional boards and human capital management. This business model is effective in providing key infrastructure support and oversight freeing time for school personnel to focus on the business of educating students.

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 applicant has proposed a vast undertaking to successfully scale up 20 schools in five years. Both their record and goal of having each new school be self-sufficient by year 4 is notable. Their stated track record that all Green Dot schools have met their sustainability targets by their fourth year is convincing (p. 53). Their understanding of the availability and coordination of federal school support funding streams will benefit this undertaking (pp. 52-53). Their relationship and secured commitments of foundation funding is impressive and aids in the conviction this endeavor is doable (pp. 54-55). Letters of support from key stakeholders, funders and LEAs were included (e127-138).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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:

A comprehensive and considerate school closure process was described. In 14 years, Green Dot has closed only one school. In that case, all students were offered places at other successful Green Dot schools. In this process closure notices are sent to parents, students, and the authorizer. A final audit is conducted and school records are efficiently transferred (p. 56).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 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:

Brief bios for key corporate leaders were provided (pp. 57-59). Their resumes documenting their expertise and capacity to provide oversight were included in Attachment 1. Second tier staff resumes were also included in Attachment 1 along with job descriptions for regional and school based staff that will need to be recruited to support start-up and operations.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

I have discussed this particular component of the application with my fellow peer reviewers, and this score is a reflection of my professional assessment.

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:

Applicant has proposed a viable plan for evaluating progress toward project objectives. The oversight falls to the corporate knowledge management team who will work with regional executive directors and school-based personnel during quarterly meetings at which the team will monitor progress, identify opportunities for improvement and document best practices. School based staff conduct monthly progress monitoring and an annual review of management and school performance is conducted (p. 60).

Project performance measures aligned with project objectives, and specific school-based measures with targets are realistic and measurable (pp. 60-63). The outlined process will provide both formative and summative program information.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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:

Applicant stated that 93.4% of students enrolled in Green Dot schools qualify for FRPL. They surpass the district enrollment of African American and Latino enrollment by 72% and the state by 48% (p. 5). The ELL student enrollment is 18% at Green Dot, above the district's 17% enrollment and state's 14% enrollment. The applicant more than meets this criterion (p. 6).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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:

Applicant provides sufficient documentation of its track record in successfully transforming schools identified for improvement. Based on their track record of successfully transforming two high schools and one middle school in Los Angeles, Tennessee invited Green Dot to work in their state designated Achievement School District (p. 3 & Guidebook).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

While their enrollment reflects surrounding community demographics, the applicant did not discuss how they will promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation. Therefore, this criteria was not met.

Reader's Score: 0

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 noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not seek points for this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall/additional comments

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2014 01:52 PM