

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Replication & Expansion - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Across the Bridge Foundation (U282M150045)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (Note: Please provide your detailed comments for each of the following factors in the Quality of the Eligible Applicant Sub-Questions.)

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

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

(2) Either

(i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

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

General:

The applicant has an incredibly high degree of success, and many classes of graduates and alumni to point to which exhibit its overall success. Out of 16 classes of alumni, there are amazing successes to point to. The school is clearly making a difference in a particular population of need, and is a quality applicant to replicate.(e28-30). DCP schools outperform their districts of residence and the State of CA in serving educationally disadvantaged students across 14 of 15 comparisons (Appendix F, pg 43). DC high school outperforms the district and state on all six subgroup comparisons, indicating that it is, in fact, closing the achievement gap.

Reader's Score: 47

Sub Question

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 1

(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).

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant has a long history of success, including success over the past three years. It has been in operation for 16 years (4 charter terms) and outscores on 14/15 API scores. In the top 1% of all high schools in CA (pg e20). These students graduate college at six times the national rate (e19).

Weaknesses:

The only weakness here is that due to the shift in CCS, three years of data were not available and additional or other data was not presented in its place.

Reader's Score:

2. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 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 applicant serves majority subgroup population and therefore there are no significant differences in scores vs. other subgroups. DCP schools outperform their districts of residence in 14/15 API comparisons and in doing so is closing the achievement gap for these students (pg 11).

Weaknesses:

The applicant serves a lower special education population than the district. (e24)

Reader's Score:

3. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 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 strengths in this section are numerous. DCP graduates twice the number of students with the A-G coursework than in the state overall, while simultaneously serving a much higher proportion of at risk and under-served students. They have a 96% matriculation rate into college after high school (12 classes of seniors). Additionally, the applicant boasts significantly higher attendance rate than the district, and has an unbelievable 61% college graduation rate (narrative pg 10). Lastly, only 7% drop out rate (compared to almost 12% in district).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

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 clearly closes the achievement gap and improves educational outcomes for educationally disadvantaged youth at high rates. Of their first 500 alumni, 90% are from low income families, 80% performed two plus years below grade level in English upon arrival and 96% were of Latino decent. 20-25% of students are undocumented immigrants and the proposed new locations mirror current locations and expand current high schools to create pipeline. (see narrative pages 9-11)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Strengths:

The program design in this application was clearly designed in all arenas. There is a clearly designed and developed academic and social support curriculum, well documented teacher education and teacher professional development program, a clearly designed parent involvement and communication protocol.

The project design is to create two middle school feeders and expand current high schools to double seats with 3 specific, attainable and measurable goals:

- o Grow network in San Jose to approach parity with parent demand for seats
- o Develop Middle School to HS pipeline so graduates are better prepared for college and career success
- o Demonstrate partnership with districts

pg 22-27, 30-31.

DCP is clearly partnering with its district and has distinct goals, objectives and outcomes to serve this educationally disadvantaged community.

DCP clearly articulates its goals and values and demonstrate how they play out in the curriculum (pg 17). They also include several scope and sequences which clearly indicate that their model is well thought out and aligned throughout the curriculum and grade levels.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. (Note: Please provide your detailed comments for each of the following factors in the Quality of the Management Plan Sub-Questions.)**

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-

(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).

(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).

(3) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project 's long-term success (4 points).

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

(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 (6 points).

General:

Overall, the management and operations of this applicant, along with its academic success make it a clearly replicable model. The strengths of this applicant are clearly on their overall academic success and the upward trajectory that they have set for their students and their families. (see chart on page 32). Their firm commitment to the population of first generation college bound students and their families has reaped benefits in their achievement.

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

- 1. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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).

Sub Question

Strengths:

The design is well thought out with a 5 year total timeline with staggered three year periods for planning and implementation of each new or significantly expanded school (31)

The applicant is very realistic and has created a well documented process for project completion

The applicant has strong Central office organization which relieves principal to focus on school level issues and improvement (33-34)

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

2. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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:

Project management for new school creation and growth schools is well developed. They have delineated part of the grant for business development of the CMO to build capacity and part to staff and expand their new schools (pg 35)

The project clearly articulates portions attributable to grant and those beyond the grant scope. (pg 35-37)

Weaknesses:

Individuals to run or work in the newly identified schools have not been selected or noted.

Reader's Score:

3. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 project's long-term success (4 points).

Strengths:

The applicant has a clear and manageable financial plan for growth. (see appendix G: Supplemental Organization budgets and Financial Information). This clearly indicates the applicant's ability to maintain sound financial practice after the life of the grant. The ask is modest for the schools being replicated as well as the CMO development. (42-43)

Weaknesses:

The applicant ran a deficit in one of the last three years. The applicant maintains a low degree of total assets for replication.

Reader's Score:

4. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 4

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant has practice stance in data management; begins with interventions to support improvement efforts aligned to need that arises

The applicant has clearly identified School closure procedures (Appendix H)

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

5. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 (6 points).

Strengths:

Central office leadership has extensive experience and longevity with the organization (pg 46-51). Strong board of directors oversight included in the plan and application (pg 33-37). The current senior management team will play an integral role in the replication and expansion project (46)

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted in this portion of the proposal.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Strengths:

Assessment plan for schools clearly is articulated and very specific (see chart on pg 53-56)

Applicant is currently engaged in 2 year investigation on persistence in college after DCP (pg 57-58)

Schools have been externally evaluated and demonstrate a high degree of success in all areas

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not discuss evaluation of plan related to its 3 outcomes (increased seats, pipeline and partnerships)

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Serving High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Serving High-Need Students (0, 1, 4, or 5 points)

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive priority points for only one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1. Therefore, an applicant should address only one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and

must specify which element (i.e., (a), (b) or (c)) it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing element (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the element addressed in the application that has the highest maximum point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular element of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting Students who are Members of Federally Recognized Indian Tribes. (0 or 5 points)

To meet this priority, an application must demonstrate that the proposed project is designed to improve academic outcomes or learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate how the proposed project is designed to serve students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes through a variety of means, such as creating or expanding charter schools in geographic areas with large numbers of students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes, conducting targeted outreach and recruitment, or including in the charters or performance contracts for the charter schools funded under the project specific performance goals for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points)

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 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 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 Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility", at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects would complement efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in the State's approved request for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point)

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

Note: To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The link to HUD Form 50153 (Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation), which has been cleared by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act, is http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

The applicant meets the criteria of school improvement. It serves at least 38% Latino students and 90% low income with 41% of parents who have less than a high school education (pg 3). The school has been recognized and ranked as top 2% of high schools in California, and top 1% nationwide, extremely high college readiness index.

The applicant clearly works with SJUSD and SCCOE and wants to partner with FMSD (which has Gates compact—pg 4)—already works with new school district through dissemination grant. The applicant far exceeds college graduation rates of districts and states for these populations.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are evident in this criteria.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Diversity (0 or 3 points)

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 2--Promoting Diversity is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that 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. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department s Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf) and "Schools' Civil Rights Obligations to English Learner Students and Limited English Proficient Parents" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html).

Strengths:

The applicant's goal is to serve first generation college bound students, therefore it exceeds state average of ELLs (pg 6) and talks about many initiatives designed to recruit ELLs and other minority populations. The school serves special education students and has many initiatives designed to ensure their success throughout their lives in the school.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this criteria.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/31/2015 09:23 PM

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Replication & Expansion - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Across the Bridge Foundation (U282M150045)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (Note: Please provide your detailed comments for each of the following factors in the Quality of the Eligible Applicant Sub-Questions.)

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

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

(2) Either

(i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

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

General:

This was a very strong application. They have a proven track record and experience replicating.

Reader's Score: 49

Sub Question

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 1

(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:

In appendix F, page 45, Downtown College Prep (DCP) shows growth in the API score over 3 years (2010-11 through 2012-13 due to no API in CA for the past two years during common core transition) for all students including educationally disadvantaged students.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

2. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 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:

DCP is closing the achievement gap in terms of college admission and college persistence. Page 10 of the project narrative talks about 96% of its students matriculating into college after high school as compared to 49% nationally. 61% of their students have graduated or are still in college, which is almost at the rate for wealthier counterparts (75%).

Weaknesses:

They did not clearly state the case for this metric. They made comparisons within subgroups and the reader had to infer that they are closing the achievement gap. It is obvious from the application that they meet this metric and are very high quality, but they didn't address this metric specifically.

Reader's Score:

3. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 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:

They outperform on all of these metrics. Their college-persistence rate is 61% as compared to 9% for similar populations. The UC/CSU completion rates for DCP students are double/triple their counterparts in the districts and the state.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

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:

DCP is exceeding state standards for educationally disadvantaged students, especially ELL. They are serving a slightly smaller special education student population than the districts, but are working towards increasing those numbers and addressed those needs in the application. Their ELL population is much higher than the districts and they are serving helping them get to and through college at much higher rates than the districts.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Strengths:

The goals were detailed and attainable with the two expansions and two replications happening in a staggered fashion. They are building their capacity as a CMO to take on the additional work in a very thoughtful way. They were very specific in the table on page 30/31 of the narrative on how many new students and the five-year timeline makes it feasible.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. (Note: Please provide your detailed comments for each of the following factors in the Quality of the Management Plan Sub-Questions.)

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-

- (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).

(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).

(3) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

(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 (6 points).

General:

I thought the management plan was very strong and feasible.

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

1. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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:

In appendix F, page 45, Downtown College Prep shows growth in the API score over 3 years (2010-11 through 2012-13 due to no API in CA for the past two years during common core transition) for all students including educationally disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

2. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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:

They have proven they can open and manage high-quality schools. The application clearly shows us that and the speed at which they are choosing to grow is very manageable. Their sustainability plan with the schools' public revenue covering costs after full enrollment is reached is clear.

Weaknesses:

None.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

3. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 project 's long-term success (4 points).

Strengths:

The grant budget is being used for the new schools and for staffing CMO time for the new schools. The projections are very reasonable and the budget narrative was very clear on how much was going for each school and for which expenses. They have support from their districts and their community. The stakeholder support is very obvious.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

4. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 4

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

Strengths:

The plan for corrective action was very clear and in the case of closure, they laid out very clearly what steps they would take.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

5. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 (6 points).

Strengths:

They have a great team in place and they're ready to take on this sort of project. Their team is very impressive and obviously has a track record of high-achieving performance. They highlighted the importance of their board and governance. Their leadership team has longevity.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Strengths:

The evaluation is very strong including an independent evaluator. The plan is very clear and focused on continuing to keep a high-quality track record. They are using many types of testing processes and the 6-8 week feedback loop with data seems like it's working.

Weaknesses:

There was a disconnect between the outcomes of the grant and their evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 9

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Serving High-Need Students****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Serving High-Need Students (0, 1, 4, or 5 points)**

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive priority points for only one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1. Therefore, an applicant should address only one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and must specify which element (i.e., (a), (b) or (c)) it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing element (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the element addressed in the application that has the highest maximum point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular element of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting Students who are Members of Federally Recognized Indian Tribes. (0 or 5 points)

To meet this priority, an application must demonstrate that the proposed project is designed to improve academic outcomes or learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate how the proposed project is designed to serve students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes through a variety of means, such as creating or expanding charter schools in geographic areas with large numbers of students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes, conducting targeted outreach and recruitment, or including in the charters or performance contracts for the charter schools funded under the project specific performance goals for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points)

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 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 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 Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility", at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects would complement efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in the State's approved request for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point)

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

Note: To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The link to HUD Form 50153 (Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation), which has been cleared by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act, is http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

DCP is working with the districts on collaboration and is also serving a very educationally disadvantaged population. Page e22 describes the grants and resources that DCP has received to share best practices to help district schools improve their college access culture. All of the districts DCP works with are looking to DCP for their best practices.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Diversity (0 or 3 points)

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 2--Promoting Diversity is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that 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. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department s Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf) and "Schools' Civil Rights Obligations to English Learner Students and Limited English Proficient Parents" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html).

Strengths:

DCP is serving a very diverse population within its schools and reflective of the surrounding district. DCP serves a higher ELL population than the state of CA at 27.9% versus 22.5% for the state as per page e24. They also have a plan in place to increase the special education population to one more reflective, but they are only slightly below the district on this population. Their special education population is 8.5% versus 11.3%, which is slightly lower than the state, but they acknowledge that they have a plan in place and they also acknowledge that the strength of their program may be helping students mainstream who may have been tagged with IEPs if it were not for their program.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/28/2015 02:58 PM

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Replication & Expansion - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Across the Bridge Foundation (U282M150045)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. (Note: Please provide your detailed comments for each of the following factors in the Quality of the Eligible Applicant Sub-Questions.)

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

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

(2) Either

(i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

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

General:

See strength and weakness comments for more detail.

Reader's Score: 50

Sub Question

1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 1

(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 a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Though Academic Performance Index (API) data is only available in 2012-2013 due to the transition to the Common Core standards and assessments, DCP schools outperform their neighborhood districts and state average in serving educationally disadvantaged students cross 14 of 15 comparisons. DCP El Primero High School outperformed its neighborhood schools and the state across all six subgroup comparisons including socio-

Sub Question

economically disadvantaged students, English learners, Hispanic and Latino youth. (p. 11). Due to the transition to Common Core standards/assessments, DCP was unable to provide three years of recent data for comparison.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score:

2. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 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 applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, in 2012-2013 DCP El Primero and Alum Rock Hispanic/Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged and ELL students outperformed their peers at the district and the state average in API scores (Appendix F – p. 44). Due to the transition to Common Core standards/assessments, DCP was unable to provide three years of recent data for comparison.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score:

3. Quality of the Eligible Applicant - Part 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 a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, twice as many DCP graduates complete the coursework that makes them eligible to attend the University of California and California State University systems than the state overall – 87% compared to 42% (Appendix F – p. 35). DCP has graduated 12 classes of seniors – 96% matriculate to college directly after high school, compared to 49% of similar students nationwide (Appendix F – p. 38). Sixty one percent of DCP graduates to date have graduated or are still enrolled in college, compared to 9% of similar students nationwide (Appendix F – p. 38). In addition, DCP maintains an average of over 95% attendance across campus over the last three years though not disaggregated data is provided (Appendix F – p. 39). Dropout rates from 2011-2014 indicated lower

Sub Question

rates than the district and the state in all subgroups (Appendix F – p. 41-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score:**Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

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

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 demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, the network serves 27% English language learners exceeding the California State average of 22.3% and 8.5% students with disabilities which is slightly less than the average of 11.3% (p. 6). Appendix E provides an overview of existing DCP schools and confirms high levels of ethnic and racial enrollment (p. 31-34).

In 2012-2013 DCP El Primero and Alum Rock Hispanic/Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged and ELL students outperformed their peers at the district and the state average in API scores (Appendix F – p. 44). Due to the transition to Common Core standards/assessments, DCP was unable to provide three years of recent data for comparison.

DCP uses a variety of recruitment strategies including partnering with the district to be listed on the district's annual Choice Forms, works collaboratively with area schools and district office staff to share information (p. 6-7). DCP also works with local churches, community centers, and other community organizations to hold informational meetings (p. 7).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, the applicant has identified three goals: (1) grow the DCP network, develop a middle to high school pipeline, and demonstrate that charters can work in partnership with the district and county authorizers (p. 30-31). For each goal, the applicant has identified actions and measure. In addition, DCP has developed a five-year timeline for this project, with staggered three year periods for the planning and implementation of each new or expanded school (p. 31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**1. (Note: Please provide your detailed comments for each of the following factors in the Quality of the Management Plan Sub-Questions.)**

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-

(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).

(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).

(3) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project 's long-term success (4 points).

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

(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 (6 points).

General:

See strength and weakness comments for more detail.

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question**1. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, DCP has developed a network configuration which provides individual school sites and leaders

Sub Question

with the autonomy to lead their unique schools coupled with a central office to provide support in key functional areas such as finance, operations, community engagement, and achievement (p. 34). The management plan details major activities, milestones, key participants and specific responsibilities over the five year grant cycle aligned with the project goals (p. 35). DCP had also targeted their professional development efforts to three major subgroups: developing school leaders, developing teachers and developing non-academic staff (p. 38). In addition, DCP's evaluation practice is aligned to their goals all DCP staff receiving at least one summative evaluation annually (p. 40).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score:

2. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, the DCP senior management team has developed a multi-year strategic plan that provides institutional direction and is accompanied by a multi-year business plan (p. 40). DCP schools are primarily funded by state and federal revenues (p. 40). The central office supports recruitment efforts of students and staff (p. 41). DCP Board of Directors and Central Office provide oversight and support in the areas of governance and compliance (p. 40). DCP leverages relationships with community partners and local districts to secure long term and affordable facilities for each of the schools (p. 40). All four schools are currently located on district-owned properties, with the two middle schools co-located with district schools on under enrolled campuses (p. 41-42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion

Reader's Score:

3. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 project 's long-term success (4 points).

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a partial understanding of the criterion requirements. The applicant has addressed some of the factors but has not sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, the applicant has developed a five year financial plan. Roughly 81% of the funds will be used at the site level to open two new middle schools and expand two existing high schools (p. 42-43). The remaining 19% will be used by the DCP central office to build upon its existing infrastructure and expand its capacity to support specific schools and enhance project data and evaluation (p. 43) The application also includes letters of support from the Santa Clara County Office of Education, the Sobrato Family Foundation and a community member and volunteer (Appendix C).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion

Reader's Score:

4. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 4

(4) The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, the applicant has established clear guidelines for school closure. An overview of this plan includes documentation of the official action of the Board of Directors, notification of authorizers, receiving districts, County Office of Education, SELPA, the retirement systems and the California Department of Education (p. 45). In addition, the overview notification of parents and students and transfer of student records (p. 46). Financial records and all assets of the school are also discussed in this section. Appendix H includes the full school closure procedures (p. 45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion

Reader's Score:

5. Quality of the Management Plan - Part 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 (6 points).

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. The applicant has provided profiles of the senior team which demonstrates extensive experience in charter school development, expansion, replication, high school, middle school and prior academic success serving the target student population (p. 46-51).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. The applicant will increase its investment in data and evaluation, contracting with an independent evaluator to design and conduct a quasi-experimental study of all DCP schools to (1) collect quantitative and qualitative data on the impact of student achievement, college readiness and college graduation rates and (2) identify similarities and differences between

DCP schools in both results and practices (p. 58). The applicant also provides information on the management of the evaluation project as well as the types of data that will be collected and analyzed (p. 58-59). DCP has experience in program evaluation through a two-year investigation into patterns of success and failure that DCP alumni have experienced as they pursue their college degrees (p. 57). Published in 2013, I Am the First: DCP College Success Report, captures key learnings on the first 500 DCP alumni (p. 57). In addition to the evaluation plan, the applicant has also included a dissemination plan to share best practices and lessons learned to the broader community through annual reports, interim findings reports, presentations at conferences and facilitating school site visits (p. 59).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Serving High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Serving High-Need Students (0, 1, 4, or 5 points)

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive priority points for only one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1. Therefore, an applicant should address only one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and must specify which element (i.e., (a), (b) or (c)) it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one element of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing element (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the element addressed in the application that has the highest maximum point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular element of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting Students who are Members of Federally Recognized Indian Tribes. (0 or 5 points)

To meet this priority, an application must demonstrate that the proposed project is designed to improve academic outcomes or learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate how the proposed project is designed to serve students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes through a variety of means, such as creating or expanding charter schools in geographic areas with large numbers of students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes, conducting targeted outreach and recruitment, or including in the charters or performance contracts for the charter schools funded under the project specific performance goals for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points)

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 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 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 Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility", at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects would complement efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in the State's approved request

for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point)

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

Note: To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The link to HUD Form 50153 (Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation), which has been cleared by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act, is http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. DCP currently works with two authorizers – San Jose Unified School District (SJUSD) and Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) - in operation of its schools (p. 4). Also works with the Franklin-McKinley School District and other partners in disseminating DCP's best practices in the field of college success, through a Charter School Dissemination Grant awarded by the California Department of Education (p.4). DCP will replicate a new middle school in FMSD and plans to leverage the relationship and seek to join the existing compact. DCP and SJUSE developed a compact agreement to guide their mutual commitment to work collaboratively to achieve the goal (p. 5/Appendix C: Letters of Support).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Diversity (0 or 3 points)

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 2--Promoting Diversity is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that 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. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department's Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Department of Justice entitled, "Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf) and "Schools' Civil Rights Obligations to English Learner Students and Limited English Proficient Parents" (www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html).

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, has addressed all of the factors and has sufficiently demonstrated alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out, and subsequent impact. Specifically, the network serves 27% English language learners exceeding the California State average of 22.3% and 8.5% students with disabilities which is slightly less than the average of 11.3% (p. 6). Appendix E provides an overview of existing DCP schools and confirms high levels of ethnic and racial enrollment (p. 31-34).

In 2012-2013 DCP El Primero and Alum Rock Hispanic/Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged and ELL students outperformed their peers at the district and the state average in API scores (Appendix F – p. 44). Due to the transition to Common Core standards/assessments, DCP was unable to provide three years of recent data for comparison.

DCP uses a variety of recruitment strategies including partnering with the district to be listed on the district's annual Choice Forms, works collaboratively with area schools and district office staff to share information (p. 6-7). DCP also works with local churches, community centers, and other community organizations to hold informational meetings (p. 7).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/01/2015 05:05 PM