

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

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M150012)

## 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:

Overall, the applicant has shown a consistent history of outperforming city schools serving similar populations. In 2014, the applicant exceeded the pass rate in NYC by an average of 35% in math and 29% in ELA on the end of course exam (pg. e18). Since 2009 (for 6 years), the applicant has been ranked in the top 10% of schools state-wide in ELA and Math (pf. e19). The applicant has been named a Blue Ribbon school in multiple years (pg e20) and special populations (FRL and SPED) are excelling at high levels (pg. e21)

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).

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The applicant has clearly demonstrated consistency over the past three years of significantly increasing academic achievement and attainment for all students, including educationally disadvantaged students which remains the applicant's primary focus in most of its locations. In all co-locations, the applicant is outscoring district school by mind-blowing margins (see chart on page e20). The applicant remains in the top 1-3% of schools in the state of NY, and has never had a campus drop out of the top 10% of schools in the state of NY. The applicant has won multiple Blue Ribbon awards.

SWD are twice as likely to pass math at SA than at NYC public schools (p e21).

Although the applicant only serves 8% ELLs, they are nearly 8 times more likely to pass math test than in NYC (pg e 23)

Attendance rate of 97% (pg e24) and retains a high degree of students (89% on average-- pg e24)

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses evident in the quality of the applicant.

### 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 clearly demonstrates consistency over the past three years in closing the achievement gap, especially with subgroup populations (ELL and SWD). SWD are twice as likely to pass math at SA than at NYC public schools (pg e21).

For AA and Hispanic scholars, the applicant is reversing the achievement gap. The applicant has been granted 14 new charters in NY in districts where very few high quality schools exist (pg e26)

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in the quality of the applicant.

### 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).**

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The applicant has significant strengths not only in their test results (see section 1 of this review), but also in its attendance rate which remains at 97%. Appendix H clearly demonstrates their commitment to educating every scholar that walks through its doors and demonstrates its results, year over year, which demonstrate that the CMO manages schools with significantly above average academic achievement for students in New York.

### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not demonstrate any weaknesses in this area.

### 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 high community engagement prior to school openings, and uses underutilized buildings and goes specifically where there is poor achievement (pg e 27).

The applicant demonstrates through its ongoing educational data that the achievement gap can be reversed as the minority students outperformed white and asian students in NYC last year (e22).

Success Academies also serve a large portion of special education students (15%)-- (e22), and the outperform NYC special education students by 73 percentage points in math and 28 percentage points in reading. Students with disabilities at Success Academies were twice as likely to pass the math as NY State's students without disabilities (e21)

Although ELLs only make up 8% of SA's student body, they are serving them well by transitioning them in three years on average, in comparison to 5 in NYC schools (e23) In 2014, ELLs at SA were nearly eight times as likely to pass the path and 14 times more likely to pass ELA than those same populations in NYC.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section of the proposal.

**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 has clearly developed a program design not only for school structure and implementation but also for their growth model. SA will open 22 additional elementary schools, 11 more middle schools and three more high schools in the next 5 years (p e34). The chart on page e67-68 clearly outlines timeline from a school opening and all that needs to happen in clear detail and in every area of school operation and development.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses noted in the proposal.

**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 applicant has a clear plan for growing and managing the new schools and has clearly demonstrated the capacity to do so not only through past efforts, but through clear and careful planning and deliberation. The applicant has an ambitious but measured 5 year growth plan including charters already awarded. The locations of the schools are selected and expansion sites are identified. The applicant discusses its replicable curriculum – clearly thought out and detailed (pg e41-e48). The applicant's graduation requirements are clearly articulated—higher requirements prepare kids for success beyond HS (pe49)

**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).**

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The management plan is clearly articulated on the chart from page e67-68, and defines responsibilities and timelines for accomplishing all of the necessary tasks prior to school opening. The applicant has followed this timeline in the past and the results are incredibly positive. The management of tasks is set out clearly with timelines and people responsible for different tasks to keep different people accountable in this challenging time.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

### 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:

It is clear that the applicant has developed rigorous training programs and provides year-round professional development to all of its employees on an ongoing basis to ensure their ongoing success (pg e51). Each school has a Business Operations Manager who is responsible for all faculty, procurement, food and health and safety issues (e66) The finance team carefully monitors the organization's finances to ensure all components of the program are accomplished within budget and there is a clear process to review finances regularly. SA is planning to be sustainable beyond the grant period.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

### 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:

Financial model is strong and demonstrates a commitment to growth, development and ongoing success of the charter school CMO (pg e50). The applicant points to a broad base of financial support for its past campuses and has a strong fundraising plan for the future.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

### 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 plan for closing a charter school is articulated and has never had to be implemented in the CMO's history. However, SA will follow the most recent dissolution plan issued by the SUNY Charter Schools institute (e70). In addition to the plan, it is clear that SA would meet with students families to ensure that students are being served well by the educational system

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

### 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:

SA's senior management team has a balance of educational leaders, business professionals, legal representatives, human resource experienced professionals, etc. to ensure success in all parts of the educational endeavor (e57) The current team is experienced and has had demonstrated success at SA (VP of schooling since 2009, CFO with more than 30 years experience (e60-63)

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

### 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 is currently engaged in independent, rigorous randomized experiment of the impact of SA schools on academic achievement using a control design and actual researchers (pg e69)

### Weaknesses:

Program evaluation is evaluating school success in outcomes, but not related to the opening of the new schools (which might have delayed outcomes)

**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](http://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](http://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](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf).

**Strengths:**

The applicant does not apply for or provide evidence for this competitive priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not apply for or provide evidence for this competitive priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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](http://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](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html)).

**Strengths:**

The applicant ensures all children learn at high levels—ELLs, SPED, and points to rigorous RTI (pg e28). The applicant has had 5 schools recognized for diversity, and others have racially diverse populations (pg e27). Success Academies spends a significant amount of time recruiting diverse students and has results that clearly indicate that they are not only enrolling special populations in an amount equal to or greater than the surrounding district, but also that they are having success with these populations (see performance data and response in Quality of Applicant)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score:**      **3**

---

**Status:**                Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      08/31/2015 09:08 PM

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M150012)

## 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 quality of this applicant came through clear in the application due to the phenomenal results the group has achieved.

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:

Success Academy has one of the most outstanding performance track records of NYC schools. After the 2011 change in testing in NYS, SA was able to outperform most of its peer CMO schools with the more rigorous test. They continue to outperform even with the extraordinary growth in the network. The charts starting on page e233 show an extraordinary picture of outperformance. All of their schools no matter what demographic constitution are outperforming the district and the state.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses observed.

**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:**

Page e21 definitively shows that SA is closing the achievement gap between low-income and minority children and their more affluent peers, but also with wealthier suburban districts (in Math).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses observed.

**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 NY state standards changed in 2012 and all tested schools took a large dip. According to SA's 2013-2014 Accountability Report starting on pg e198, SA Harlem 1 still ranks in the top 6% of all elementary schools statewide. On all other measures of outperformance, SA schools are hitting the mark by closing the achievement gap and creating its own new high bar.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses observed.

**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:**

SA has proven that they can close the achievement gap between educationally disadvantaged students and affluent suburban students. Test score data and accountability measures mentioned above all attest to that.

**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:**

SA has a strong results-oriented culture with an emphasis on quality of teaching and leading. This is very apparent throughout the application, but this section specifically speaks to the program design. The amount of detail in this section is helpful in understanding how they have achieved their results to date. Page e36 talks about school culture and page e40 talks about the extended school day model. Those are both very important components of their success as seen in their results.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses observed.

**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:**

The quality of the management plan was very high according to the application. Success Academy laid out a detailed and clear plan and they have the personnel and capacity to execute on it.

**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).**

**Strengths:**

The plan is very detailed and well-laid out as well as feasible. SA has a tremendous amount of organizational capacity to execute on the plan to open new schools. The table on pages e67 and e68 provide detailed ownership of tasks information and timing.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses.

**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 organization is high-capacity and well-resourced. All of the areas of sustainability are covered in the application and are well-thought through and presented. Page e63-e68 has a lot of detail on each area of the business plan.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses observed.

**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).**

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The plan is clearly laid out overall and is included in the budget narrative starting on page e264-e265. The schools and locations are chosen to open is clearly marked in the application. Stakeholders of very high political standing and foundation support are invested in SA's success according to all of the letters of support (starting on page e106). Partnerships are being formed on the new school leadership and teacher training programs.

### Weaknesses:

No multi-year model was provided. The school-specific budget is missing a crucial cell, the total grant dollar amount (pg e239). Partnerships should be formed at the community level with orgs that are also working with the same populations.

### 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:

SA has had a 100% renewal track record and does not anticipate closing schools due to performance, but did lay out a plan in the case that it was necessary. Pages e70 and e71 describe in detail the closure plan.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses observed.

### 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 organization has the capacity to implement on the grant funds and the plan to expand/replicate. The leadership team is made up of leaders from the private sector with decades of experience in their respective fields. As a well-resourced organization, they have the ability to pay well for those leadership positions. The resumes start on page e81 and give a good indicator of the quality of their personnel.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses observed.

### 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 plan is high-quality and intrinsic in the culture of the organization. The group has laid out very specific metrics to measure themselves against making the evaluation plan easy to follow. The emphasis on technology is apparent throughout the application (should have had more detail in the section on the data group at SA).

**Weaknesses:**

There was little emphasis placed on the technology work that SA is doing. These new structures could inform their evaluation, but they could have laid that out more directly in this section.

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](http://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](http://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](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf).

**Strengths:**

This priority was not addressed in the application

**Weaknesses:**

This priority was not addressed in the application

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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](http://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](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html)).

**Strengths:**

Success Academy is working hard to promote diversity in their schools by creating mixed-income and diversity in ethnicities in their schools. Success Academy is trying to prove that all levels of income are demanding high-quality public options and while doing so, truly diversifying their schools in the process. Pages 14-16 go into depth on how Success has served special ed and ELL students and what interventions have worked for their successes.

**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: Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc. (U282M150012)

## 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. Specifically, the applicant demonstrates an extraordinary track record of consistent academic achievement over a six year period for all campuses (p. e19). SA scholars have continued to outperform more affluent areas in and around New York City (.e19). For example, 69% of SA scholars earned an advanced score in math which is double the rate of NYC student who were proficient (p. e20). Another indicator of success is the pass rates for

### Sub Question

scholars who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch – 93% of SA schools passed the math exam compared to 35% of all students citywide and 62% of FRPL students passed the ELA exam compared to 29% of all student citywide (p. e21). Additional evidence is provided for each goal of the 2013-2014 accountability plan for math and ELA (p. e206-219).

#### 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 2014, African American and Hispanic scholars at SA significantly outperformed white and Asian students citywide in both math and ELA (p. e22). SA demonstrates alignment between what is proposed and how it will be carried out in the application as well. Specifically, SA hires special education teachers and therapists, offers integrated co-teaching classes, provides 12:1:1 (12 students, two adults) for services. Special education students at SA outperform NYC special education students overall by 73% in math and 28% in reading. At SA, ELL students become proficient in English within three years, compared with five years at NYC district schools (p. e23). In addition, SA ELLs were nearly eight times as likely to pass math and 14 times more likely to pass EAL, and SA special education students were more than nine times more likely to pass math and more than is times as likely to pass ELA on state tests in 2014 (p. e23). Additional evidence is provided on page e237 which demonstrates in school campus comparability between subgroup from 2011-2014 (p. e237).

#### 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, appendix H provides strong multi-year attendance rates for all campuses (p. e24/p. e247) with

**Sub Question**

no campus receiving less than 95% over a five year period. The applicant demonstrates strong retention rates across the network for the fives exceeding 90% on average for campuses in 2011-2013 (p. e248). One student was expelled from SA in 2014-2015 which represents the first expulsion in the CMO's history (p. e249).

**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 application includes the use of a variety of methods to engage parents of children who may be categorized as students with disabilities, ELLs, students from different racial and ethnic groups and economically disadvantaged students including mailings and bilingual distributions, tours of existing SA schools, information sessions at public and private venues frequented by families of young children (p. e28). In addition, SA provides scholars who are struggling with support that include tutoring, practice groups, and special education services (p. e29). SA also demonstrates quality results for ELLs through its English language immersion model (p. e29).

In addition, the applicant demonstrates prior success in serving educationally disadvantaged students. In 2014, 69% of SA scholars earned an advanced score in math which is double the rate of NYC student who were proficient (p. e20). Another indicator of success is the pass rates for scholars who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch – 93% of SA schools passed the math exam compared to 35% of all students citywide and 62% of FRPL students passed the ELA exam compared to 29% of all student citywide (p. e21). Additional evidence is provided for each goal of the 2013-2014 accountability plan for math and ELA (p. e206-219).

Special education students at SA outperform NYC special education students overall by 73% in math and 28% in reading. At SA, ELL students become proficient in English within three years, compared with five years at NYC district schools (p. e23). In addition, SA ELLs were nearly eight times as likely to pass math and 14 times more likely to pass EAL, and SA special education students were more than nine times more likely to pass math and more than is times as likely to pass ELA on state tests in 2014 (p. e23). Additional evidence is provided on page e237 which demonstrates in school campus comparability between subgroup from 2011-2014 (p. e237).

**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 four strategic components/goals of the project design: a replicable school model, a strong central office, a commitment to and expertise in the training and development of school leaders and faculty and a technology backbone that supports the networks operations (p. e41). The applicant defines the curriculum replication as each grade level served – elementary, middle and high school (p. e41-49). In addition, the application includes the rationale behind the project design and strategies to support the proposed plan implementation including recruitment of school leaders and extensive principal training (p. e50-51).

#### **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, the applicant has provided information on the senior management team, comprised of the CEO and three Executive VPs of Schooling, Advancement and Business Operations. In addition to the senior team, SA has also identified a project implementation co-directors (p. e57). The senior team meets weekly to track and drive progress. Each month, the senior team meets with wider group of directors, managers, and leaders to review the performance of the entire network (p. e57). In addition the Associate Director of Finance will also serve as the project director for the replication and expansion project (p. e58). The application also provides a timeline and milestones in preparing to open new schools that includes the roles and responsibilities of the talent recruitment team, the enrollment team, the schooling team (p. e63-65). On page e67, the applicant provides a comprehensive table which includes the timeline, project owner and goals/actions needed.

**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 applicant has provided information on leadership summit and faculty orientation (p.e65) as well as the role of business operations manager and finance team in monitoring the organizations 'health in all components of the program (p. 66).

**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).**

## Sub Question

### 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 provided letters of support from US Senator and House of Representatives, the Charter School Growth Fund (p. e113), the Gates Foundation (p. e144), the Broad Foundation (p. e115) and the Walton Family Foundation (p. e116). In addition, the applicant has provided a five year budget projection growth plan that provides information on personnel, facilities, instructional materials, technology, management fees in the aggregate and by proposed campus (p. e238-239).

The application also clearly defines the role of the staff and board to work collaboratively to ensure high quality planning, implementation and oversight of the business model (p. e72). The application also indicates that philanthropy is used mainly for startup costs and to run the schools until they become self-sustaining on per pupil funding by year three for elementary schools (p. e74).

### 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 will follow the dissolution plan issued by the SUNY Charter Schools Institute (p. e70). This plan includes the roles and responsibilities of the school principal to dissolve the school. SA will also work closely with the appropriate representatives of the CSD of the school to develop and implement the plan (p. e71). The school will conduct a series of meetings for parents to provide information about the dissolution and to support them in making decisions regarding the selection of educational program for their children (p. e71). The dissolution plan will provide that all property that the school has leased, borrowed or contracted for use will be returned (p. e71).

### 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 and success for over a decade (p. e58-63).

## Sub Question

### 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 has aligned the goals and objectives with an evaluation plan that is measurable and attainable. Specifically, the application will continue to outperform neighborhood district schools, close the achievement gap, maintain strong daily attendance and retain 92% of students. In addition, the application includes the methods of evaluation which includes research questions pertaining to the current performance, network capacity, school leadership, finances, demand, space and talent (p. e70). Appendix H also provides an assessment schedule to evaluate the academic program while page e185 includes a monitoring plan.

### 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](http://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](http://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](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf).

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not address the criterion requirements anywhere in the application.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the criterion requirements anywhere in the application.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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](http://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](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html)).

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of the priority 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 application includes the use of a variety of methods to engage parents of children who may be categorized as students with disabilities, ELLs, students from different racial and ethnic groups and economically disadvantaged students including mailings and bilingual distributions, tours of existing SA schools, information sessions at public and private venues frequented by families of young children (p. e28). In addition, SA provides scholars who are struggling with support that include tutoring, practice groups, and special education services (p. e29). SA also demonstrates quality results for ELLs through its English language immersion model (p. e29). SA also seeks out areas where it is possible to create mixed income and racially integrated school communities (p. e31). In 2014, five SA schools were recognized for their diversity by the National Coalition of Diverse Charter Schools (p. e32). In addition two SA schools also qualified as diverse (3 or more racial groups with populations of at least 10%) (p. e32). Though no data is provided to compare demographics at the district or surrounding area, significant data is provided that demonstrates the prior success in serving ELL and students with disabilities.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found for this criterion.

**Reader's Score:**     **3**

---

**Status:**             Submitted  
**Last Updated:**    09/01/2015 04:56 PM