

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC (U282M140028)

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

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

1. Overall Comments

0

0

**Total**

121

102

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 84.282m - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC (U282M140028)

## 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: 50

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

The first network school opened in 2006 in Harlem and has grown to 32 schools serving approximately 9,000 students in New York City. In 2009, the first year the network had students that were tested on state assessments, every student passed the state math exam and 95% passed the state ELA exam. In 2013, 100% of all students in the network passed the state science exam. 82% passed math, compared with 30% of district (NYC) schools. 58% passed English Language Arts compared to 26% in the district and 31% in the state. In 2013, the network as a whole performed in the top 2% of all NYC elementary and middle schools.

#### 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:

In 2012, 98% of the African American students and 97% of Hispanic students in network schools passed the state math exam compared to 73% of white students in the state. 89% of both African American and Hispanic students passed the state English Language Arts exam compared to 66% of white students in the state.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 15

- 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:

Network students have an average of 96% attendance, teachers 99%. Extra effort is made to get students to school. This may include personal wake up calls, and even personally escorting students to school. No student has been expelled. The annual attrition rate is 9%, compared to NY 14% and co-located schools 21%. Attrition rate for special education is 12% and ELL 9%.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 network serves about 14.26% student who are current or former special education students. In 2013, these students outperformed their peers in the district by 49% in math and 23% in reading on state assessments. On average, about 7% of network students on IEPs graduate to general education. In 2013-14, this figure was 11.4% compared to the latest figure in district schools (2011-12) of .6%. The ELL population is about 8.3% compared to the district average of 13%.

Last year, more than half of these students graduated to general education status. Most become proficient in English within three years compared to the district average of five years.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were 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: 13**

**Sub Question**

- 1. 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 and objectives, listed on pages e46-47, are specified, measurable, and attainable. The network currently has a waiting list of 10,000 and has served all the grade levels. The schools will be placed in districts similar to the ones currently served. This grant will be used to add seven new elementary and seven new middle schools (expanded from 11 current elementary schools) in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens.

**Weaknesses:**

The goals and objectives appear to apply more to the overall network than this replication and expansion grant. Charters for the new schools have not yet been approved by the Charter School Institute of State University of New York.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

An external analysis has been conducted by the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, validating that the network school model has a substantial effect on the educational outcomes of high-needs children. The study compared the performance of children selected by lottery at the founding school to those not selected and who did not apply, from geographically and demographically comparable neighborhoods. Those selected and attending did 13-20% better than the control group.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

The application would have been strengthened by providing the research related to some of its key curriculum components

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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:**

The timelines and responsibilities for opening new schools are imbedded in descriptions on pages e63-66.

**Weaknesses:**

The application would be strengthened by having clear project goals and objectives tied to defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones.

**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:**

The network has already invested in developing four key areas (page e44): a strong central office, an innovative school management software system, a training and professional development institute, and a balanced and sequenced K-12 college prep curriculum. Historically, elementary schools in the network are financially self-sufficient in four years, requiring only public per-pupil funding to operate. The network has standardized how it assesses and trains teachers in order to improve educational outcomes. This year it will train more than 1,000 of its own faculty.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

## Sub Question

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:

A multi-year financial and operating model is provided on page e70. On July 1, 2014, the separate non-profit organizations (each school that was managed by the CMO) merged into one. This allows students to transfer among network schools, feed into secondary schools, and allows the network to fund new schools with surplus from older, self-sustaining schools. Current partners of the organization include the Fisher Fund, the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, the Walton Foundation, the Charter School Growth Fund, the Peter and Carmen Lucia Buck Foundation, the William E Simon Foundation, and the Kovner Foundation.

### Weaknesses:

No letters of support for this project were provided, not details provided as to the type of support the current partners provide.

Reader's Score: 3

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 application did not address this, except to mention in the budget that costs may be incurred when a school closes.

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 central office is organized around three key functions: schooling, advancement, and business operations. Each of these areas is managed by an executive vice president, who reports to the CEO. The key personnel are well qualified.

### Weaknesses:

It is not clear who the project director or what qualifications will be required.

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 framework exists within the organization for evaluating all schools within the network.

**Weaknesses:**

The objectives on page e71 do not match those on e46-47 and neither are clearly project objectives. Responsibilities are not included in the evaluation framework. The statement is made on page e71 that all schools opened with the Replication and Expansion grant funds will be evaluated by the following framework, but the first four objectives relate to how many schools will be opened.

**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:**

76% of the students currently served by the network qualify for free or reduced lunch. When considering future sites, the CMO looks for public schools that are underutilized and have consistently poor academic track records.

**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](http://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:**

No strengths were noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this priority.

**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:**

A variety of outreach strategies are used to ensure that underserved families are reached and to create a diverse student body. The application is currently available in Chinese, Spanish, Russian, French, and English. The current student population is 65% African American, 22% Hispanic, 8% Multi-Racial, 8.2% ELL, and 14% students with disabilities.

**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](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones).

### Strengths:

No strengths were noted.

### Weaknesses:

The application did not address this priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

## Overall Comments - Overall Comments

### 1. Overall/additional comments

#### General:

The Success network currently operates 32 schools in New York City and proposes to open 20 elementary, 10 middle, and 2 high schools in the next five years. It is unclear how many of those schools are included in this proposed project, different numbers are presented on different pages. In addition, the organization applied for charters for 14 new schools in July, 2014 to the Charter School Institute at the State University of New York, and these have not yet been granted. Clear project goals and objectives and an evaluation and management plan tied to these are not included.. It appears, from the budget narrative that the majority of grant funds will be used for technology for new schools.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2014 04:32 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC (U282M140028)

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

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

1. Overall Comments

0

**Total**

121

104

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 84.282m - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC (U282M140028)

## 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: 50

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

Success Academy's students in 2009 passed mathematics exams at 100% and English exams at 95% and have seen achievement at above 80% since. In New York state the school ranks in the top10% and higher in all grades, years and subjects as measures on standardized tests. Success academy students of color outperform white peers across the state measured on standardized assessments. The academy additionally outperforms New York City's charter schools.

#### Weaknesses:

None found

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:

Success Academy's students in 2009 passed mathematics exams at 100% and English exams at 95% and have seen achievement at above 80% since. In New York state the school ranks in the top10% and higher in all grades, years and subjects as measures on standardized tests. Success academy students of color outperform white peers across the state measured on standardized assessments. The academy additionally outperforms New York City's charter schools.

### Weaknesses:

None found

**Reader's Score:** 15

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:

Success Academy's students in 2009 passed mathematics exams at 100% and English exams at 95% and have seen achievement at above 80% since. In New York state the school ranks in the top10% and higher in all grades, years and subjects as measures on standardized tests. Success academy students of color outperform white peers across the state measured on standardized assessments. The academy additionally outperforms New York City's charter schools.

### Weaknesses:

None found1

**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:

ELL and SWD students at success academy become proficient in 3 years compared to 5 years with the city. Extended school day is implemented to meet the needs of all students and continue to make gains. The school uses a project based learning methodology and hands on learning o further engage a variety of learners and most class periods are 50

minutes long.

**Weaknesses:**

The application would benefit from clear information on how 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. Specific graduation rates from campuses not included.

**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:**

School has a very aggressive expansion underway and goals include 80% of students achieving a level 3 or level 4 on standardized tests, parent satisfaction, attendance and uniform requirements.

**Weaknesses:**

Goals are broad and not clearly specified with outcomes.

**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:**

The school has been the subject of 2 external analysis conducted by the University of Pennsylvania and another entity; both validating the effectiveness of the Success academy model.

**Weaknesses:**

**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 organizations strong central network aids the schools expansion by developing academic curriculum, facilities troubleshooting and other operational processes. The school includes broad goals to be accomplished by this and other teams.

#### Weaknesses:

The goals provided are vague in the management plan.

Reader's Score: 3

- 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 leadership team is extensively qualified based on experience and formal schooling. The organizations strong central network aids the schools expansion by developing academic curriculum, facilities troubleshooting and other operational processes. Various leadership summits and professional development will ensue shortly after approval. The school has successfully raised \$27.5 million dollars from various partners including the Fisher Fund, The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, The Walton Family Foundation, The Charter School Growth Fund, The Kovner Foundation and others. The school includes a broad financial plans and details funding that will be received from the city.

#### Weaknesses:

None found

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 projects long-term success (4 points).

#### Sub Question

##### Strengths:

The school has successfully raised \$27.5 million dollars from various partners including the Fisher Fund, The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, The Walton Family Foundation, The Charter School Growth Fund, The Kovner Foundation and others. The school includes a broad financial plans and details funding that will be received from the city.

##### Weaknesses:

None found

**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:

None found

##### Weaknesses:

A clear plan for closing schools was not included.

**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 leadership team is extensively qualified based on experience and formal schooling

##### 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 schools objectives and frequency of data collection (annual data collection) are clear.

##### Weaknesses:

The application would benefit from the inclusion of a more extensive evaluation plan. Data categories such as "Basic Education Data" are not clear on how or what kind of data is used. It is unclear how 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. Objectives are not consistent throughout the document.

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 schools population is roughly 69% low income in a city where more than 42% of families live below the poverty line

#### Weaknesses:

None found

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](http://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:

None stated

#### Weaknesses:

None stated

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:

Applicant demonstrates a commitment to diversity by ensuring mailings are sent out in multiple languages, tours and informational sessions are available.

#### Weaknesses:

None found

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](http://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 04:32 PM

Status: Draft

Last Updated: 08/20/2014 11:24 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC (U282M140028)

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

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

1. Overall Comments

0

**Total**

121

105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 84.282m - 2: 84.282M

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

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC (U282M140028)

## 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: 50

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

The data provided to demonstrate success includes a comparison of Success Academy schools and state, district, and "co-located" schools' results. The data shows Success Academy schools in the top 10% of schools in the state for the last five years. (p. 6) Overall Success Academy schools show a passing rate on state exams that far exceeds that of district and co-located schools. (p. 6)

#### 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:

The data submitted since 2010 demonstrates growth and achievement for the all students in Success Academy Schools. (pp e82-e86) NY State Pass rates by subgroup demonstrates high rates and ranks them in the top 1% in

**Sub Question**

the state in math & top 7% in ELA. This data demonstrates Success Academy's ability to close the achievement gaps and maintain achievement for all students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 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:**

Extensive non-academic data provides indicators of their success over the past three years. That data includes: high attendance - 94-97% and above; retention rates of 90% or above; and 14,500 applications for 3,000 open spots. Additionally one of the schools was recognized as a national Blue Ribbon School in 2012 by the USDOE. (p. 7)

**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 application included a complete discussion of the locations of schools to be opened. (p. 30) Details regarding the success of students with disabilities and ELL students graduating to general education programs were provided. 11.4% of the students with disabilities were able to graduate, compared to 0.6% for district school students. (p. 10) ELL students become proficient in English and are able to move out of the program in 3 years, compared to 5 years in New York City Schools. (p. 10)

**Weaknesses:**

The student population to be served in the new or expanded locations was not addressed as required by the notice.

There is no discussion of why the schools are having the success with the special populations. How this success will be replicated in the new schools is unclear.

**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: 14**

**Sub Question**

- 1. 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 application specified that 32 new schools will be opened with 26,000 new seats.

There are goals and objectives included in the narrative that include attainable measures.

They have been very successful for meeting existing

**Weaknesses:**

The goals are fairly broad and not specific for the project. Specific outcomes and objectives related to the project are not provided.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

Evidence of promise included the University of Pennsylvania study, and the quasi experimental study of results based on lottery students. The study found that SAs model has a substantial effect on the educational outcomes of high need students. (p. 33) Additionally, inputs and practices were described extensively in relation to what makes SA successful.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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. 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 thorough explanation of opening a school was provided in the application. Goals for the overall system were included in the application.

**Weaknesses:**

Timelines were not specific to the project, but for opening a school. It is unclear how will the team will manage the opening of multiple schools at a time. Specific milestones and responsibilities related to the entire length project are ambiguous.

**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:**

An extensive explanation of the business plan included the training institute to ensure teachers and leaders are prepared; school management software; and a strong central network. The Network is able to "carry schools until they are at capacity" and able to be financially viable.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 4**

## Sub Question

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:

A comprehensive explanation of the financial model including audits was included. Based on their data, Success Academy has demonstrated a record of financial, operational & instructional competency. The application included a discussion of partners and support of stakeholders, including strong parent support. (pp. 52-54)

The applicant is not requesting funding for personnel, which means funds are going to the opening of the schools and directly benefits the students. (p. e159)

### Weaknesses:

Letters of support from the various foundations were not included. While Success Academy has a number of current philanthropic partners their continued support is undocumented.

**Reader's Score: 3**

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 application included a contingency budget for school closures. (p. e165) Success Academy will work with the NY State Education Department and the NYC DOE to ensure all students are accommodated at another school.

### Weaknesses:

The school closure plan was not adequately addressed.

**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 application describes the qualified personnel that are already in place for the implementation of the project. They have a variety of backgrounds with demonstrated experience relating to projects of this scope. (pp. 38-43) Resumes are included for the project team.

### 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 framework for evaluation of all schools is provided in the application. Data collection related to the project will occur annually with regular discussions regarding data and success measures of the schools. (p. 56)

**Weaknesses:**

No specific details regarding the evaluation of project implementation is included.  
The objectives cited are inconsistent in the narrative of the grant.

**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:**

Evidence was provided for all of the schools in the network. The average FRL rate for the network is 75.6% compared to 75% for the city of New York. It is above the required 60%.

**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](http://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:**

The applicant addressed a variety of active measure they take to promote diversity, serve students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. Methods include extensive outreach campaigns, staff training, participation in school breakfast/lunch programs, and implementation/compliance with Federal laws. Applications and marketing materials are available in multiple languages and reflect the ELL population of the communities they serve.

**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](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones).

**Strengths:**

Not Addressed

**Weaknesses:**

Not Addressed

**Reader's Score:** 0

### Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall/additional comments

**General:**

Success Academy has a demonstrated record of improving academic achievement and closing the achievement gaps. They have a strong leadership team, operational practices and engaged families, which contribute to their success.

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Draft  
**Last Updated:** 08/20/2014 11:24 AM